

REVIEW ARTICLE

Classic Bureaucracy and Contemporary Change: A Critical Perspective

Ao Chen¹

(Received: October 12, 2020; Revised: February 25, 2021; Accepted: March 30, 2021)

Abstract

Classical bureaucracy has been regarded as the dominant form of organization for ages due to its technical superiority and great efficiency. But, along with the rapid developments on technology, economy and society, the technical superiority and efficiency of classical bureaucracy has not kept up with advanced speed of contemporary business culture and even block survival and sustaining development of organizations. In order to deal with the dynamic environment, the aim of this paper is to discuss how today's bureaucratic organizations change themselves to meet demands of post-modern business culture. The results reflect that the change do not mean the demise of bureaucracy and new forms of organization take over, on the contrary, they are merely seen as a further evolution of bureaucracy itself rather than a completely revolution.

¹ Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Chinese Graduate School, Panyapiwat Institute of Management,

Email: freedom_cha@msn.com

Keywords: Bureaucracy, Contemporary Change, Evolution, Post-modern
Business Culture

บทความวิชาการ

ระบบราชการแบบดั้งเดิมและการเปลี่ยนแปลงร่วมสมัย: มุมมองเชิงวิพากษ์

Ao Chen¹

บทคัดย่อ

ระบบราชการดั้งเดิม (Classical bureaucracy) ถูกพิจารณาว่าเป็นรูปแบบองค์กรที่มีบทบาทสำคัญในทุกยุคทุกสมัย เนื่องจากระบบดังกล่าวมีลักษณะเฉพาะและประสิทธิภาพที่เหนือกว่า อย่างไรก็ตาม ภายใต้การพัฒนาอย่างรวดเร็วทั้งทางด้านเทคโนโลยี เศรษฐกิจ และสังคม ลักษณะเฉพาะที่เหนือกว่าและประสิทธิภาพของระบบราชการดั้งเดิมไม่อาจตามทันวัฒนธรรมธุรกิจร่วมสมัยที่เปลี่ยนแปลงไปอย่างรวดเร็ว และแม้กระทั่งไปขัดขวางการอยู่รอดและการพัฒนาองค์กรอย่างยั่งยืน ดังนั้น เพื่อรับมือกับสภาพแวดล้อมที่ไม่หยุดนิ่ง วัตถุประสงค์ของบทความนี้มีเพื่ออธิบายว่าองค์กรระบบราชการในปัจจุบันเปลี่ยนแปลงตัวเองเพื่อตอบสนองความต้องการของวัฒนธรรมธุรกิจหลังสมัยใหม่ด้วยแนวทางใด ผลการวิจัยสะท้อนให้เห็นว่าการเปลี่ยนแปลงดังกล่าวไม่ได้หมายถึงการล่มสลายของระบบราชการและไม่ใช่ว่าองค์กรรูปแบบใหม่เข้ามามีบทบาทเหนือกว่า แต่ในทางกลับกัน เป็นเพียงแค่มุมมองที่ถูกมองว่าระบบราชการยังคงมีวิวัฒนาการต่อไป ซึ่งมีใช่เป็นการปฏิวัติโดยสิ้นเชิง

คำสำคัญ: ระบบราชการ การเปลี่ยนแปลงร่วมสมัย วิวัฒนาการ วัฒนธรรมทางธุรกิจหลังสมัยใหม่

¹ ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. วิทยาลัยบัณฑิตศึกษาจีน สถาบันการจัดการปัญญาภิวัฒน์

Introduction

“What do the Vatican and General Motors, NASA and the British Health Service have in common? Regardless of whether the institution concerned is public or private, scared or secular, devoted to profits or to preaching, to saving life or to ending it” (Beetham, 1996), merely focusing on the most general features of organizations and efficiency, the answer is not difficult to respond, they are all bureaucracies. Bureaucracy as an administrative instrument of industrial age has been the dominant form of organization for long time due to its great technical superiority. However, rapid development of technology, economy and society bring enormous impact on contemporary business environment, which is shaking the dominance of bureaucracy. Classical bureaucracy has not kept up with step of rapid development, and is causing problems in the contemporary organizational administration.

This paper is going to focus on discussion of classical bureaucracy and contemporary change from a perspective of critical organizational management. The perspective will bring a different understanding of bureaucracy and contemporary organizational administration in the existing literature. The first section will give a brief introduction of definition and source of bureaucracy claimed by Max Weber. The second section is going to focus on the characteristics of classical bureaucracy. And then, according to traits of classical bureaucracy, the third section will display the strength of classical bureaucracy through two aspects of efficiency and rationality. Next, a brief discussion of classical bureaucracy in the changing world to elicit the main questions of

this paper: how does bureaucracy change to meet the diverse demands? And whether the change means the demise of bureaucracy and new forms of organization take over? Following, a comparative analysis of the difference between classical bureaucratic administration and contemporary organizational demands will be conducted to present the problems of classical bureaucracy in the contemporary organizational management. In the end, this paper is going to attempt to answer why the critique of the demise of bureaucracy is oversimplified image in terms of foregoing discussions.

Brief Introduction of Bureaucracy

There is a sea of scholars and practitioners talk about bureaucracy in the history of management literature. Bureaucracy just like a star of classical theories has been challenged and examined all the time in the organizational analysis. But, initial word of bureaucracy began in France in the eighteenth century by compounding the French word for an office (*bureau*) with the Greek word for rule (Clegg *et al.*, 2005). By the twentieth century, the first time, bureaucracy as a management theory was brought by a German scholar, Max Weber, to the world's attention. Especially, after World War Two, Weber's works were widely translated into English (Clegg *et al.*, 2005). The bureaucracy was like a blast of whirlwind swept the whole western societies.

According to Weber's view, bureaucracy was a form of organization which emphasized speed, precision, regulation, clarity, reliability and efficiency. This was achieved through creating a fixed

division of tasks, imposing detailed rules, regulations and procedures, and monitoring through hierarchical supervision (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004). In other words, bureaucracy as a tool of technical superiority developed a full range of conceptions of organizational administration, which emphasized division of specified specialization, hierarchical organizational structure and authority, continuous career system, impersonal and rational rules and regulations, and continually pursuit of advanced knowledge, to acquire maximized efficiency.

Characteristics of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy as a tool of organizational administration has been distinguished ten or eleven of characteristics by Weber (Beetham, 1996). In order to be more convenient to present and discuss the use of bureaucracy in the organizational administration, Beetham (1996) recombine these characteristics into four main features: division of labor, authority hierarchy, continuity and impersonality. Below section will focus on generally discussion of the four features to draw a whole picture of classical bureaucratic administration. Simultaneity, through examining the different characteristics of classical bureaucratic administration, we can see how each of them could contribute to meet the criteria of efficiency.

In the first place, systematic division of labor is the central feature of classical bureaucratic administration. Weber inherited a part of conception of scientific management and emphasized the importance of the division of specialization in the principle of bureaucracy. He specified that complex administration problems

should be broken down into manageable, repetitive and well-defined tasks. And each the province of a particular office coordinated under a centralized hierarchy of command (Weber cited in Beetham, 1996). Just like a program of mechanical analogy, the subdivision of a complex set of movements into their constituent elements, and their reassembly into a coordinated process, achieves an enormous expansion of scope, precision and cost-effectiveness of operation (Beetham, 1996). In the early of industrial mass production of capitalism, the division of elaborated task was the favorite form of work designed for most of large industrial organizations due to division of labor produced highly efficient and repetitive working.

Secondly, hierarchy of authority is another main feature of bureaucracy, but it does not exclusively belong to bureaucracy. According to Dumont's (1967) view, hierarchy of authority actually is a pervasive trans-culture and trans-historical characteristic that cannot be exclusively attributed to bureaucracy (cited in Kallinikos, 2004). Therefore, Weber just borrowed the tradition institution and endowed it with new use values in his bureaucracy. The authority hierarchy emphasize that each official has a clearly defined competence within hierarchical division of labor, and is answerable for its performance to a superior (Beetham, 1996). In other words, a firmly ordered system of super-ordination and subordination emphasized that each position is under controlled by a higher one, and the higher offices possess authority to supervise the lower offices. Workers clearly know to whom they are responsible while has a right of appeal and of grievances to higher offices (Weber, 1947). The hierarchical authority system of this two-way of

supervision and complaint as a positive contribution was developed in all bureaucratic form of organizations, including ecclesiastical structures, large party organizations and private firms (Fischer & Sirianni, 1994). Until today, despite organizational structure has tended to be flatter and more flexible, we still can see that original traces of organizational structure of classical bureaucracy in the most of contemporary large organizations.

Thirdly, the emphasis on aspect of organizational continuity formed the original concept of career of bureaucracy. For Weber, “office constitutes a full time salaried occupation, with a career structure that offers the prospect of regular advancement” (Beetham, 1996). People move from lower, less important, and lower paid to the higher position, more important and higher paid to follow a fixed career path within the hierarchical organizational structure. Money is the regular compensation for their service, and it is measured in terms of status or length of service of personnel rather than work done (Fischer & Sirianni, 1994). Moreover, people who work in the bureaucratic organizations, they accept the specific obligation while they receive the job security. As the modern bureaucrat is a full time professional, organization need a sufficient salary and job security to keep personnel stay in the job for life, otherwise, organization will not be efficient because an elaborate division of labor requires stable staff take enough time to get used to coordinated nature of bureaucratic work (Mommsen, 1989; Kilcullen, 1996). In public bureaucracies, “the position of the official is held for life...the tenure for life is protected by the civil service law, which would secure their old age and provide increased guarantees against their arbitrary removal from office”

(Fischer & Sirianni, 1994). Therefore, classical bureaucratic administration designed the career system to keep personnel stay in and recorded each transaction in the files in order to keep an organizational memory and continuity. Although the initial purpose of bureaucratic career was designed for officials in the public organizations, it could be used in various types of organizations through adjusting its scope and degree of administration (Su, 2007). A mechanical fixing of the conditions of promotion and career system were designed for organizational continuity and efficiency in all bureaucratic form of organizations (Weber, 1947).

Finally, the impersonal principle of bureaucracy regulated human behavior in organization and emphasized the work is conducted in terms of prescribed rules, without arbitrariness or favoritism (Weber cited in Beetham, 1996). Namely, people impersonally, objectively, apply the rules to implement their tasks, at the same time, their own duties and rights within the organization are defined by rules applied to them impersonally by their superiors (Kilcullen, 1996). Obedience is owed to role people fill rather than the person or the title they hold (Clegg *et al.*, 2005). The impersonal rules and standard procedures ensured that organizational actions can be performed in predictable and routine manner. The authority in the bureaucratic organization was based on rational and legitimate principle rather than nepotism, whim or fancy, which offered a possibility of being the most impersonal and efficient and reduced bias in the work (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004). All purely personal, irrational and emotional elements were totally forbidden in the bureaucratic organizational actions. People were hired according to their technical competence rather than

friendship, family ties, and favoritism, which dramatically reduced work performance (Alazzawi, 2008). As Weber said, “bureaucracy was the most efficient form of social organization precisely because it was so coldly logical and did not allow personal relations and feelings to get in the way of achieving goals. It is always, from a formal, technical point of view, the most rational type” (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004).

Strength of Classical Bureaucracy

The advantage of bureaucracy has always been the purely technical superiority (Fischer & Sirianni, 1994). As Weber described, bureaucracy was always an instrument of technical superiority and the most efficient machine of standardization, which emphasized “precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal cost---these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration” (Fischer & Sirianni, 1994). And the ideal type of bureaucracy in positive terms...it is more rational and efficient form of organization than the alternatives that preceded it (Alazzawi, 2008).

On the one hand, bureaucracy was like a standardized machine. Depending on rules, regulations and precedent and standard operating procedures, bureaucracy achieved a maximized efficiency. Each individual was like a single cog in the machine, follow the fixed routines, and engage in the elaborated and specialized task. The operation of every part of the bureaucratic machine follows from established routines and records in the files. The performance of every worker can be mathematically

measured (Sahay, 1998). Little time and money were spent on checking whether information or current activities are meeting stated goals, which saved large numbers of operational cost. Furthermore, through application of normative rules, regulations and procedures, not only the employee's behavior was under control and predictable, but also organizational goals and achievements can be calculated. And application of fixed career system ensured a continuity of organizational operation which reduced the risk of knowledge lost causing by personnel leave. As Weber said, "that the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization is, from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency ... it is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability" (cited in Beetham, 1996). The bureaucracy is completely indispensable in terms of the needs of complex and large-scale administration.

On the other hand, bureaucracy was like a symbol of rational-legal authority which emphasized impersonal rationality. For Weber, bureaucracy is progressive because it breaks down the structure of old patrimonial authority and removes religion power in the traditional organizations, and constituted the foundation of rational-legal authority (Su, 2007). People do what managers tell them, it is not because people think that they have a natural right to give orders, or it is not because they hold some divine power, but because people acknowledge that their exercise of power is legitimated. As Weber said, "an organization based on legitimate authority would be more efficient than one based on either tradition or charismatic authority" (Pugh, 1973). Within the

traditional authority, “the legitimacy is based on the sanctity of the order and the attendant powers of control as they have been handed down from the past, have always existed” (Weber, 1947:341). The obedience is owed to the individual who possess the traditionally position of authority, rather than the impersonal order. And within the Charismatic authority, “the legitimacy was the special relationship claimed between, for instance, Christ and the disciples. Here the obedience of the disciples is premised upon the extraordinary grace and magnetism of Christ’s personality” (Clegg, 1990). Both of tradition and charismatic authorities were not based on rational principle, so that they are not suitable to be the foundation of modern administration. Only bureaucratic authority was the unique legitimate authority due to “it was not establish on a relationship to a person, like the vassal’s or disciple’s faith in feudal or in patrimonial relations of authority” (Fischer & Sirianni, 1994), but was based on rational and legitimate principle that provided a possibility of being the most rational. “People obey orders because they believe that person giving the order is acting in accordance with the duties stipulated in a code of legal rules and regulations” (Albrow cited in Clegg *et al.*, 2005).

Bureaucracy in the Changing World

Time has changed. The industrial epoch has been replaced by information age, even knowledge era. The massive restructuring of the economy and the successive change of organizational structure and career system, have an enormous impact on modern organizations and individuals. Especially, technological development in electronic communications and e-commerce are changing the

way that we live and societal practices. The traditional idealistic business culture has changed and a new transformed one is forming. Under this dynamic environment, the traditional bureaucracy with systematic, methodical, rational-legal instrumentality has been seen as an institution that inhibits economic growth and threatens individual liberty (Hayek cited in Kallinikos, 2004). Even according to some claims of radicalism, it has indicated that bureaucracy has repeatedly received a severe verdict that predicts its unmistakable demise (Kallinikos, 2004). And today's some basic forms of organization are more like to be called as "the entrepreneurial" or "network-shaped organization" (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994; Rifkin, 2000), rather than bureaucratic. Although these claims about the demise of bureaucracy has been not supported by the systematic investigation of the organizational and occupational order of modernity, we can already see that the bureaucratic machine of industrial age no longer works so well as organizations face new challenges. Today's organizational environment is characterized by continual change. In order to adapt changeable environment, the classical bureaucracy have to transform itself in line with contemporary business culture. But the question is how to change? And whether the change means that demise of bureaucracy and other new forms of organization will take over? Below the sections will focus on discussion about these questions.

Classical Bureaucracy and Contemporary Demands

The world is rapidly changing. Classical bureaucratic administration has not kept up with diverse demands of contemporary organizations. Over-bureaucratization is causing

inefficiency and slow-respond competence of organization. Below table 1 shows the features of classical bureaucratic administration and contemporary organizational demands.

Table 1
Bureaucracy and modern changes

Classical bureaucracy	Contemporary demands
Division of elaborated specialization	Cross-function/department transfer, networking and project team
Longitudinal organizational hierarchical structure	Flatter and unconventional flexible Organizational structure
Stability and predictability	Dynamism and uncertainty
Job security, pay related to tenure and career training and development	Investment in employability, reward for performance and self-management, self-realization, updated technology and competence for flexibility
Organization needs take over individual needs, rational control and impersonal obedience	Self-reliant, counter-conventional practices, soul-seeking and match organizational goals with individual goals.
Loyalty, conformity and commitment	Long hours, added responsibility, broader skills and tolerance of change and ambiguity, willingness to work in a dynamic situation

From the table above, we can see that many traits of classical bureaucratic administration have not been in line with demands of today organization. Even some of them are seemingly blocking the survival and sustained development of organization. Therefore, how to change to sort these problems out that has

become the vital task for contemporary bureaucratic organizations, especially private firms. Following section will concentrate on a comparative analysis of differences between classical bureaucratic administration and contemporary organizational demands to present the problems of classical bureaucracy in the contemporary organizational management while suggest some possible outlets.

First of all, the division of over specialization locked personnel in their field of specialization, which inhibits rotation and technological communication between different departments. Especially, contemporary business culture, which need those employees have a wide variety of skills and knowledge to cope with demand of complicated tasks, division of over specialization limit technical improvement of employees and indirectly reduce organizational creativity. Today organizations tend to develop more flexible patterns of work, such as cross-department transfer, networking and project team, etc. to increase its adaptability and recover its creativity. However, the application of new forms of managerial practices does not mean organizations give up the division of specialization. On the contrary, all of these practices are based on the original division of labor to further pursue higher efficiency.

Secondly, a vertical and rigid organizational structure of bureaucracy emphasized that the authority of decision-making resides on the top of organization that ensured a maximized control and centralization of authority (Giddens, 1971; Perry, 2002). But the right of decision-making is always at the one point on the top, which not only limit subordination to contribute to decisions, but also block effective channels of information transmission

upwards from the grass root of organization. As the result, the responsibility and positivity of subordination were stifled in the cradle, and errors were hidden, flexibility, initiative and speed were lost (Alvesson & Willmott, 1996, 2003). Therefore, in order to gain a more rapid-respond competence, today's bureaucratic organizations require a flatter and more flexible structure to increase its efficiency and reduce time-waste in the complex hierarchical system. But, the concept of flatter and more flexible structure tend to be translated as a relatively flat and flexible rather than an absolutely horizontal structure.

In the third place, the highly bureaucratic structure did not have to adapt quickly to the changes because the environment was both of stable and predictable. But, time is difference, we cannot return to "the good old days" (Baruch, 2004). Themes of contemporary business culture have been characterized by dynamism and uncertainty. Borrowing a core concept of contingency theory to explain demand of today's organizations is that depending on different situations, using different solutions (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004). Traditional stable and calculated bureaucratic model has not been able to deal with enormous internal and external changes. The slow-respond competence, poor speed of information transmission, officialdom and red tape, all of them reduce organizational efficiency and productivity. In order to be more effective, bureaucratic organizations must adjust its strategy in a manner to meet changeful environment and technological innovation. Dealing with dynamism and uncertainty has been seen as an indispensable competence for contemporary bureaucratic organizations.

Next, job security and regular advancement were seen as a sort of motivated and guaranteed system which ensured organizational memory and continuity and over time. But, today, the purest type of bureaucratic career does not hold the dominance anymore due to the model of transformed career has taken over. Although the traditional career model still deeply embed in the public bureaucratic organizations, but the career system in the private firms has seemingly changed from single hierarchical promotion to multifaceted development (Eagleton, 2012; Friedman, 2002). According to Littleton et al. (2000) views, the emergent pace of economic change has resulted in a shift from ‘bounded’ careers that are characterized by pre-ordained and linear development paths within an organizational hierarchy to ‘boundaryless’ careers. Instead of lifelong employment, organizations promise to invest in personnel’s employability, reward for their performance, encourage self-management and self-realization, and support their technological and knowledge update. For instance, dual career ladder, self-employment, boundaryless career and part-time employment, are designed to satisfy those diverse demands of contemporary organizations and individuals.

Following, classical bureaucracy emphasized organizational needs take over individual needs. All activities are based on rational and impersonal principles. Self-reliant and heroic actions were regarded as “counter-bureaucratic” and “counter-institutional impulses” (Casey, 2004), which were absolutely unacceptable in the organizational administration and production. In other words, there was no such thing called individualism in the bureaucratic

workplace. However, profound changes in the social institutions of work and production in recent decades has changed people's idea and conception of organizational management. Pure collectivism and bureaucratization has not satisfied the demand of postmodern business culture (Crouch and Streeck, 1997; Watson, 2012). Today, more and more people start to pursue self-interests, self-expressiveness and spirituality in the organizational life. These used to be seen as "counter-conventional", "counter-rational" and "counter-bureaucratic" (Casey, 2004) activities, today, has almost become signs of the new form. For example, crystals, statuettes of the Buddha or pictures of yoga gurus, these were seen as unconventional and counter-rational things have been overtly exhibited in bureaucratic workplace (Casey, 2004). Contemporary bureaucratic organizations are moving to accommodate the diverse demands. Employees are not seen as cogs anymore but human beings. And organizational needs no longer control individual needs, instead, organizations are effort to match organizational needs with individual needs on both aspects of material and spiritual.

Finally, the traditional bureaucratic career matched traits of early industrial age and emphasized loyalty, commitment and shared long-term obligation between employers and employees (Johnson & Gill, 1993; Morgan, 2006). But the road map guidelines for career have become fragmented, and a transformed model is forming. Today's employees need more responsibility for their own careers. They prefer to offer long hours and assume added responsibility for organization. In addition, they provide broader skills and tolerate change and ambiguity, in return, they also ask for high pay and reward for their performance rather than status or

tenure. The inner feeling of achievement has sometimes been seen as more important than the traditional hierarchy of promotion.

According to above statements, it has clearly pointed out that the gap between administrative traits of classical bureaucracy and demands of contemporary organizational administration. Simultaneity, it has also suggested the ways out of cage of formalism. Right now, the only question left is whether the outlet means demise of bureaucracy and more rapid-respond forms of organization take over?

Evolution Rather Than Revolution

According to Kallinikos's (2004) view, "the critique of the demise of bureaucracy and more rapid-respond form of organization take over is based on oversimplified and stylized images of the bureaucratic form of organization, and it is lack of history awareness and adequate evident" (p14). Although many business organizations has already reduced formalization and bureaucracy in order to gain creativity, flexibility and rapid-respond competence needed to accommodate contemporary business environment, there is no obvious and credible evident prove that bureaucracy has gone. All of those changes above that I have mentioned are just seen as the emergent rescuing options but not final answer. And they are never ever able to break down the bureaucratic skyscraper because they did not even threaten the substratum of the skyscraper. Standardized behavior, centralization and functional specialization constitute the substratum of bureaucracy, which are not only the foundation of bureaucratic

administration but also are the source of all organizational actions. Without standardization, centralization and functional specialization, any forms of organization will not be capable to implement effectively their organizational management activities. As Pugh *et al.* (1963, 1968) mentioned, an organization could emerge as more or less bureaucratic, which is really dependence on the degree of standardization, centralization and functional specialization in its operations. And most of modern organizations also have more or less standardization or centralization in their administrative actions. Therefore, we can see that exist of bureaucracy in the contemporary organizational administration is indispensable, and the critique of demise of bureaucracy is merely an oversimplified and stylized image of traditional bureaucracy. As Haferkamp (1987) reminds us, bureaucracy was “necessary”, “unavoidable” and “unbreakable” (Weber, 1920; cited in Clegg, 1990) features of organization in the modern world. If you want modernity, suggested by Weber, then you have to have bureaucracy (Clegg *et al.*, 2005).

In addition, we cannot simply equate the bureaucratic form of organization with routines, rigid structure and operating procedures, no matter how important they are. The routines, rigid structure and operating procedures are merely the elements that form the organizational superstructure or super-stratum. Along with rapidly change of internal and external organizational environment, bureaucracy is able to re-assemble the super-stratum to meet the diverse demands. For example, just like what I have mentioned in the foregoing discussions, although organizational structure needs to be flatter and more flexible, this concept of flat and flexible is relatively flat rather than absolutely horizontal structure. Moreover,

organizations need new types of work functions, such as project team or cross-department transfer, to increase organizational adaptability and productivity, but all of those advanced actions are based on the standard division of labor. Therefore, as Kallinikos (2004) said, “bureaucracy is different institution from the conventional image that identifies bureaucratic organizational form with a sort of behavioral mechanics and incapacity to change” (p24), on the contrary, contemporary bureaucratic organizations are capable to meet demands of social, economic and technological change through reshuffling, recombination and redesign of its superstructure (Kallinikos, 2004:27). Simultaneity, the change or reassemble does not mean demise of bureaucracy and new rapid-respond form or organization take over because these changes just happen on the top level of bureaucracy. The foundation of bureaucracy is still the root of social, cultural and economic institution of capitalism and do not change following the superstructure. Demise of bureaucracy may mean demise of social, cultural and economic institution of capitalism and that is totally unacceptable. Therefore, contemporary changes are merely seen as an advanced evolution of bureaucracy itself to accommodate demands of new dynamic business culture. And they are certainly not a completely revolution before birth of any new forms of organization.

Conclusion

Concluding the above comparison and discussion, after the analysis of characteristics of classical bureaucracy, strength and problems in the changing world, the vital concern of this paper is concentration on the debate that classical bureaucracy had been regarded as the dominant form of organization for ages due to its technical superiority and great efficiency. But the rapid developments on technology, economy and society that have profoundly altered the way that we live and social practices. The technical superiority and efficiency of classical bureaucracy has not kept up with advanced speed of contemporary business culture and even block survival and sustaining development of modern organizations. In order to adapt the dynamic environment, today's bureaucratic organizations have to change themselves to meet demands of post-modern business culture. However, the change do not mean the demise of bureaucracy and new forms of organization take over, on the contrary, they are merely seen as the reassemble of super-stratum elements of bureaucracy. The standardization, centralization and functional specialization are the foundations of bureaucracy and the source of all organizational actions. Beside of it, any change on the bureaucratic administration can be regarded as a further evolution of bureaucracy itself rather than a completely revolution for any new forms of organization take over.

Thus, in order to better deal with the current issues that the management of contemporary organizations are facing, such as economic decreasing and market pressure caused by COVID-19 pandemic and so on, we should re-think the way of how we

understand the form of organization and its nature today. If we consider we are running some kinds of completely new thing, then we have to figure out a new way of solution indeed, which may works or may not. However, if we see it as the evolution of what we have already studied for couples of decades and it has been demonstrated its function and its advantages on the control and performance, then why wouldn't we keep going, do what we are good at and to sharp our "weapon" rather than study from the beginning.

References

- Alazzawi, M. (2008). *Bureaucracy*. Retrieved March 26, 2020, from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/2440655/Bureaucracy>
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2003). *Studying Management Critically*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1996). *Making Sense of Management*. London: Sage.
- Avgerou, C. (2000). IT and organizational change: an institutionalist perspective. *Information technology & people*, 13(4), 234-262.
- Baruch, Y. (2004). *Managing Careers: Theory and Practice*. Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Beetham, D. (1996). *Bureaucracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From Street-level to System-level Bureaucracies: How Information and Communication Technology is Transforming Administrative Discretion and

- Constitutional Control. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 174-184.
- Buchanan, D., & Huczynski, A. (2004). *Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text*. Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Casey, C. (2004). Bureaucracy Re-enchanted? Spirit, Experts and Authority in Organizations. *Organization Articles*, 11(1), 59-70.
- Clegg, S., Kornberger, M., & Pitsis, T. (2005). *Managing and Organizations: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Clegg, S. (1990). *Modern Organizations: Organization Studies in the Postmodern World*. London: Sage.
- Cordella, A. (2007). E-government: towards the e-bureaucratic form? *Journal of Information Technology*, 22(3), 265-274.
- Cordella, A., & Tempini, N. (2015). E-government and organizational change: Reappraising the role of ICT and bureaucracy in public service delivery. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 279-286.
- Crouch, C., & Streeck, M. (1997). *Political Economy of Modern Capitalism: Mapping Convergence and Diversity*. London: Sage.
- du Gay, P. (1994). Making up Managers: Bureaucracy, Enterprise and the Liberal Art of Separation. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 45(4), 655-674.
- Eagleton, T. (2012). *Why Marx was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fischer, F., & Sirianni, C. (1994). *Critical studies in Organization and Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Friedman, M. (2002). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: London: UCP.
- Giddens, A. (1971) *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory*. London: CUP.
- Johnson, P., & Gill, J. (1993). *Management Control and Organizational Behavior*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Kallinikos, J. (2004). The Social Foundations of the Bureaucratic Order. *Organization Articles*, 11(1), 13-36.
- Kilcullen, J. (1996). *Max Weber: On Bureaucracy*. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from <http://www.humanities.mq.edu.au/Ockham/y64l09.html>
- Littleton, S. M., Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (2000). The future of boundary-less careers, in Collin, A. and Young, R.A (Eds), *The Future of Career*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mommsen, W. J. (1989). *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber*. London: Polity.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. London: Sage.
- Perry, M. (2002). *Marxism and History*. Palgrave: Basingstoke.
- Pugh, D. S. (1973). *Organization Theory* Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- Rhodes, C., & Milani Price, O. (2011). The post-bureaucratic parasite: Contrasting narratives of organizational change in local government. *Management Learning*, 42(3), 241-260.
- Sahay, A. (1998). *Max Weber and Modern Sociology*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Su, Y. (2007). *Modern Western Management Schools*. Shanghai: Fudan University Press.

Watson, T. (2012). *Sociology, Work, and Organization*. London:
Routledge.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*
translated and edited by A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons,
New York: Oxford University Press.