

# Analysis and Explanation of Intellectual Fundamentals of Bureaucracy

Fereydoon Azma\*, Mohammad Ebrahim Jorjani Sorkhavan Kalate

*Department of Entrepreneurship, Aliabad Katoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, Aliabad, Iran*

\*Corresponding Author Email: [Azmafereydoon@yahoo.com](mailto:Azmafereydoon@yahoo.com)

**ABSTRACT:** rationality is accepted as the new foundation of new era bureaucracies among the scholars of organization sciences. The organizations that are established in the framework of rationalist paradigm, seek to obtain the best results with spending the least resources. In this article, the most important theories of Weber on increasing rationalization in western societies, forms of hegemony and the effect of protestant behavior on emergence of capitalism and bureaucratic organizations were investigated. Bureaucracy is kind of organization that existed in the course of history. Almost all of the ancient empires and rulers, more or less, used bureaucratic organizations. This is approved by the investigations on the history of Rome, China and Ottoman empires. One of the inevitable consequences of industrialization was propagation of bureaucratic organizations, because the traditional organizations could not meet the needs of the industrialized societies. In these societies the labor was divided among individuals and institutions. This division was based on professional and technical qualifications not on family relations. The high division of labor must lead to coordination for which the mechanism of the organization is responsible. In modern societies, the labor is not only divided among individuals, but also it is divided among different organizations in different fields such as political, economic, educational, familial and governmental, each of which seek specific goals (Scott, 1995; Scott, 2000). The existence of bureaucratic organizations is inevitable for guiding today's complex societies, supporting social benefit, producing goods and services and solving the problems of society. According to Scott, when the civilization reaches a specific level of maturity, bureaucracy emerges. As the societies advance in cultural, economic, social and technologic fields, democracies also growth and the effect of bureaucratic organizations on people is also more in these societies. Rationality, impersonality and emphasis on efficiency which are of the characteristics of these organizations, have deep effects on individual and past societies (Amiri, 2005).

**Keywords:** Explanation of Intellectual, Fundamentals of Bureaucracy.

## INTRODUCTION

Industrialization and bureaucratization are consolidated in the modern societies such that even human behaviors are affected by bureaucratic organizations. Bureaucratic organization, because of its rational nature, is the most efficient and most appropriate kind of organization in the industrialized capitalist societies and its presence in such societies is inevitable. When the bureaucracy is totally established in societies, its destruction would be so difficult like any other social institution. Consequently, it would be impossible to eliminate bureaucratic organizations to which are dependent individuals' affairs.

## **Concept of bureaucracy**

The word bureaucracy was coined by the French economist De Gournay in 1745. He added the Greek suffix “cracy” meaning governing to the term “bureau” meaning office and created bureaucracy and compared it to kingdom, aristocracy and democracy in them an individual, an elite class and the populace, respectively, are rulers. In bureaucracy, government and administrative officials are rulers. In fact, bureaucracy is a force which is applied through administrative officials and bureaucrats are the ruling class in bureaucracy. Later, the term bureaucracy was broadened and included all large organizations. Though it is not very old, bureaucracy is an important concept in sociology, political, organization and management sciences and is frequently used in public conversations and mass media.

Usually, three different usages or main concepts of bureaucracy are distinguished in social sciences. The first and the oldest usage were in political sciences. In political sciences, bureaucracy is defined as governing through administrative officials. In this government, authority system is based on legal power. Different sections of government are staffed with non-elected (appointed) officials and are organized hierarchically and this way the order is established in the society. The second concept or usage of bureaucracy which became very common among sociologists and organization and management thinkers starts from Max Weber. In this concept, bureaucratization means rationalization of social activities. In this concept, bureaucracy emphasizes on impersonal laws, accurate definition of duties, division of labor and responsibilities and authority hierarchy in the organization. In the third concept which is the most common and usual definition of bureaucracy, it has unpleasant implication and is tantamount to as strict rules. It is also believed that hierarchy, overspecialization and number of administrations and units, disables individual in doing their affairs and makes them resistant to change. However the organization is more rational and bureaucratic, the members and officials work more mechanically and ignore the purpose and meaning if their behaviors (Qolipour, 2001).

Though it is very difficult to study the effects of complex phenomena like bureaucracy in the society, he sociologists have investigated the effects of bureaucracy and bureaucratic organizations in the societies. Max Weber was the first one who systematically studied bureaucracy. His most important work in organization sociology was the theory of bureaucracy. Rational organization is the distinctive characteristic of modern societies. According to Weber, reaching rational functioning is only possible from the top of the organization by extending and developing rules that try to guide and direct all activities toward maximum efficiency.

In Weber’s idea, bureaucracy is a specific kind of administrative structure which is based on rational-legal. In many discussions on Weber, his bureaucracy model is presented as a simple set of characteristics in bureaucracy forms. These characteristics include:

- Fixed division of labor
- Hierarchy of offices
- Creation of rules to govern performance
- Separation of personal from official property and rights
- Selections based on qualifications
- Clear career paths

Rationality was realized in different forms in industrialized societies and one of the most important instances of rationality is bureaucratic organization. Weber emphasizes goal-oriented rational actions in bureaucracy and modern societies. In modern societies, individuals’ behavior is not affected by traditions, but is affected by rationality. Rationality in western societies is instrumental or purposive rationality; a rationality that utilizes the most appropriate and efficient instruments to attain the goals in which goal oriented rationality is dominant. When human actions are based on instrumental rationality, logic and science, naturally, the calculation of costs and revenues is done efficiently.

## **Organization, as a rational system**

The concepts of rationality and efficiency are at the center of discussions in organization theory. In Weber’s idea, rationality implicates required ways to attainment of goals. An organization is called rational only if it chooses the most efficient ways to for achieving goals. However, accordingly, the goals of organizations are only taken into consideration and the individual goals of members are ignored.

Richard Scott classified the theories of organization and management into three categories of rationally, natural and open. Classic organization and management theories emphasized the rational organization. Rational

organizations are the manifestations of rationality in western societies that emerged as bureaucratic organizations. From a rational system perspective, organization is an instrument which is designed for attainment of specific goals. The term rational refers to a set of activities that are organized such that they attain specific pre-determined goals with maximum efficiency. Thus, rationality considers not only the goals, but also the ways to attain them. From the perspective of rational system, an organization behavior is referred to activities that are done through coordinated and purposeful factors. Rational system theorists put an emphasis on the characteristic of goal setting and formality because each of these factors plays a major role in rationalization of organization activities. From the perspective of rational system, structural arrangement is considered an instrument that is intentionally designed for effective recognition of goals. All theorists that utilize this attitude consider the normative structure of organization which means setting goals and formality of regulations and roles. Based on this framework, classic theories of organization like Taylor's scientific management, Fayol's administrative management and Weber's bureaucracy theory are considered as close rational theories whose attitudes toward society and organization are respectively based on structural order and rationality (Manouchehri, 1999).

Thompson presents a simple summary of the foundations of rational system; structure is a basic instrument through which organizations achieve a limited rationalism. Specifying the occupations, defining the roles, laws, regulations and norms that direct the decisions are functions that channelize the behaviors toward a pre-determined goal. Individuals can only behave rationally only if the alternative options are limited and their choices are conditional. Though more generally, rationalism lies in the organization itself not in the individuals of the organization. To emphasize the structural characteristics rather than individual characteristics, Bennis dubbed the rational system perspective "organizations without people". In the top of the organization, value fundamentals that govern all decision making structures lie out of the system. These values are only clear enough as far as they present clear criteria for decision making. These fundamentals can support a rational structure, regardless of its unusual or deviant content. In lower levels of the organization, rational behavior is tantamount to suppressing wise judgment and critical thinking and forcing the individuals to obey the regulations and compromise with performance plan, blindly. Analyzers and critics of rational system, overemphasizing the normative structure neglected behavioral structure of organizations. They explain many factors like plans; principles, roles, rules and regulations, but they state nothing about practical behavior of organizational individuals. The main theories and schools of rationalism include: scientific management (Taylor), administrative theory (Fayol) and bureaucracy theory (Weber). Taylor and his proponents insisted that it is possible to scientifically analyze the duties of workers thus they focused on using time-and-motion studies to optimize work procedures and increase productivity. Though they focused on analyzing the individuals, rationalization of labor in individual level led to inevitable changes in the total structure of working arrangement. It was not only the workers who should have changed through presenting the principles of scientific management. The role of managers also should have changed so that managers' capricious activities were replaced with scientific and analytic management procedures. Both workers and managers' activities must be rationalized and they should equally be exposed with new scientific dominance. In Taylor's view, human is a entity that seeks more benefit with rational actions. That is, human is a rational-economic entity. Thus, if human entity is considered as the base of Taylor's analysis, it can be realized that the base of his own analyzes are rational-economic and he always seek the most efficient ways with lowest costs and thus all of his discussions on employer and employee, are about benefit, profitability, increase of wages, reducing work hours and improvement of living conditions. In Taylor's idea and from the perspective of scientific management, organization is a rational instrument for attainment of goals (Mouzelis, 2006).

Fayol's administrative theory that was developed simultaneously with scientific management emphasized the functions of management and tried to establish general administrative principles for rationalization of organization activities. Since Fayol compared the world to a machine, he also considered the society as an objective phenomenon which is independent of mind and human and is based on order. In his perspective, an organization is also an instrument for attainment of specific goals. Fayol sought to remove obstacles in the path of success and improvement in organizations in the framework of the new order that governs the modern world based on instrumental rationality which invites everyone to utilize the nature for success and improvement. The works of Marx Weber, the famous German sociologist, were published simultaneously with scientific management and those who tried to formulize the administrative principles, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Weber's analyses of administrative structure are small instances of his great interest to unique aspects of western civilization.

Weber defines power as the chance to impose one will on others' behavior. With respect to intellectual system and social values, he divided the power in to two parts; legitimate and illegitimate. Legitimate power is the one which is based on the culture and value system of the society and is dependent on the acceptance by the members of the society, while illegitimate power is the one which is imposed by force. Weber's analysis of official power or authority led him to the fundamentals of obedience to authority or power. Thus, though his analysis is in social and

power structure level, his methodology is inevitably dealing with individual level and explaining the mutual interactions.

Unlike Marx and Hegel, Weber does not interpret the history in a linear manner in relation to rationalism or rationalizing. Though Weber rejected the linear interpretation of history, he observed a common line in the process of developments of western society. This line includes a progressive movement toward limiting and narrowing the realm of mythological, magic and supernatural beliefs and developing and broadening the realm of rational, predictable and ordered thinking in the explanation of the phenomena. Weber called this process rationalization. He considered rationalization as developing the scientific-methodical realm of truth such that, there is no place for accidents and spontaneity. Weber believed that bureaucratization is a form of such rationalization processes and is closely related with other manifestations of this process. Manifestations like standardized production of economic units and the unprecedentedly high level of technology development that led to freedom in political life and emergence of democracy (Mirzaei ahrnjany, 2006).

In Weber's discussion of rationalization, bureaucracy received a high level of rationality and was regarded more rational in relation to other administrative arrangements. Weber uses the term "rationality" in a specific and technical meaning but he does not claim that this is the only meaning of rationality. Weber writes:

*A bureaucratic individual cannot break free himself from the organization in which he is engaged. The professional bureaucratic is chained to his activity in his entire economical and ideological existence. The individual bureaucratic is, above all, forged to the common interest of all the functionaries in the perpetuation of the apparatus. And this mechanism dictates a fixed and repetitive path to him. There are specific duties for him in his position. However, he himself is not able to launch or stop it; this is only possible for top levels of organization. Furthermore, the interests of the bureaucratic individual are chained to the common interests of all factors involving in the preparation and movement of bureaucratic apparatus and the progressive hegemony which is rationally organized.*

This writing shows that Weber was aware of human dignity in the subtle bureaucratic apparatus. Weber could see human's inability and his tendency to surrender in facing with such apparatus. Weber had no imagination of merger of human and organization and the above lines indicate that he created the first original insight of the complex relation between human and organization.

### **Protestant ethic and foundations of emergence of capitalism**

In his book "protestant ethic and capitalist spirit", Weber, trying to explain the distinctive characteristics of modern capitalism, drew a distinction between capitalist institution and seeking for interest per se. tendency to wealth existed in most times and places and it is not related to capitalist action which involves a regular bias toward obtaining more interest from economic exchange. Seeking wealth, interest and money, even in highest possible levels per se is not related to capitalism. Different individuals in different situations in all eras and all lands may feel this hunger to wealth. The infinite hunger for gaining wealth is not tantamount to capitalism. However, capitalism can be tantamount to subduing and adjusting this irrational instinct. In fact, capitalism is seeking interest through a progressive rational and capitalist activity in search of renewable interest. Capitalism existed in the form of commercial activities in Babylon, Ancient Egypt, China, India and medieval Europe. However, it was only lately in western societies that capitalist activities conjoined rational organization of labor. By rational organization of labor, Weber meant a routine administration of the labor in the framework of institutions with permanent activity. In the eastern societies, except for trading and banking and credential operations, their activities were irrational and usurious and they obtained wealth by imposing force on others and more traditionally through looting and plunder. This was done either through directly through wars and fights or indirectly from taking heavy taxes or exploitation of peasantry. But western societies experienced a different kind of capitalism; rational capitalistic organization of (formally) free labor. In other areas, only the early stages of this kind of capitalism were observed.

Weber related the formation of rational organization in west to protestant ethics. Protestant ethics provided the conditions for the developments and growth of industry and trade in western countries. In Weber's opinion, there is a close relationship between protestant ethics and spirit of capitalism. However, he did not claim that protestant ethics was the only factor contributing to the emergence of modern capitalism. In catholic faith, the only way for survival and being forgiven was good deeds. Calvin however, believed that humans' destinies are pre-determined and those who are going to be forgiven are already chosen, thus, there is no reason for good deeds. This idea agitated the Protestants that who these elected individuals are. Calvin broached the idea of divine providence and stated that the sign of being of the elected is being successful in this world. In Weber's view, austere Protestant

created a spirit that was in line with capitalism. The relationship between these two factors is very simple. Calvinists and Protestants' main doctrine is the faith in predetermined destiny and fate. In Calvinists' belief, God has already selected his righteous servants the signs of whom are austerity, diligence, virtue and piety. The prominent effect of this belief is that, on one hand, according to the diligence and austerity principle, the individual works harder and puts more energy on his work and on the other hand, based on the principle of virtue and piety he cannot enjoy the results of his efforts. In Weber's view, the essence of the spirit of capitalism is the attitude that gaining money is the ultimate goal of the life not a tool for meeting other needs. It is difficult to explain the tendency in individuals to seek wealth while they are reluctant to worldly pleasures. How can the employers, who are associated with the rational capitalism, combine the wealth seeking tendency with contentment life style?

Weber found the answer to this question in the concept of "jobs as duties" in Puritanism "mundane austerity". The answer of Protestant ethics to this ethic and spiritual question was that individual must invest the added value of his work where it contributes to the survival of life and gives meaning to humans existence; occupation. This was how Protestant ethics created the rational tendency to limited consumption and led to saving and investment. It was very simple for capitalists (the rich individuals), because it was not only considered as sin, but also it was in line with God's command and satisfaction. Overconsumption, wasting the capital, self-indulgence, welfare and luxury was considered unethical. This led to the provision of the required capital for emergence of business and modern capitalist organization. Protestant ethics was in line with hard work, diligence, perseverance, parsimony, maximum efficiency, maximum benefit, rationality, success, empiricism, and scientism and generally with individualism and the prominent role of individual in the society, the characteristics that were appreciated in classic rational organizations. In economic aspect, what happened in the history of Europe was that order and discipline was tied with asceticism and life was totally controlled and benefits and losses were chained to asceticism and divine providence. Beside the role of rationalization of religious ethics, Weber also stated some other important social-economic factors in the emergence of modern capitalism (Weber, 2003).

### **Triple patterns of domination in Weber's view**

The first thing that Weber paid attention to in the study of bureaucracy was the patterns of domination that tied up the social actions. The most forms of social actions are emerged in the investigation of domination structure. The structures of domination form the social actions and lead toward dominant interest. Weber, in his famous typology, divides the legitimate authority into three types:

**Traditional authority:** It is based on the established belief of divinity old traditions and legitimacy of imposing force under those traditions.

**Rational-legal power:** It is based on the belief of legitimacy of law and the rights of those who are in power based on the law.

**Charismatic authority:** It is the power legitimized by a leader's exceptional personal qualities, which inspire loyalty and obedience from followers.

According to Weber, only the rational-legal and traditional authority are stable enough to form the foundations for a permanent administrative structure and in the last century, particularly in western societies, the traditional structure was gradually replaced with rational-legal structures. The most prominent manifestations of rational-legal structures are in new governments and advanced capitalist institutions (in technical terms).

Legitimate legal power does not gain its legitimacy from the venerability of traditions or from the vulnerability of individuals. Rather, it gains its legitimacy from specific rules. With specifying a general framework for selecting the rules, those rules are accepted that are rational, justly and impersonal such that makes it possible to dynamically rule over a modern society in this framework. Obeying these rules is impersonal. That is, obedience is based on the legitimacy and rationality of the rules not of the individuals who set the rules. Put simply, rules, not individuals, are obeyed. Weber clearly states that this kind of domination and legitimacy on authority is peculiar to bureaucracy. Weber emphasizes that the collaborations that are rationally adjusted in the framework of the structure of domination, find their best place for emergence in bureaucracy. The kind of bureaucratic organization that led to the emergence of a kind rational-legal authority has characteristics that distinguish it from the other two types of authority (Qolipour, 2001).

In bureaucratic societies a charismatic leader plays a minor role and creativity and guidance of the charisma are replaced with impersonal and official bureaucracy rules. The impersonal principle in bureaucracy is in contradiction with the effect of charismatic character. The rules of bureaucracy are not based on tastes and interests and the imposed authority is based on rules and regulations. Unlike social organization in which the relationship between individuals is defined by the interaction between them, in bureaucracy the relationships are based on positions and a system of rules and regulations. Based on the chain of command, the boss commands and the subordinate obey the

command blindly. However, the commands are based on the rules and regulations. Unlike social organizations in which the relationship is informal between individuals, in bureaucratic organizations command giving and command receiving are in the nature of positions and the supervisor individual is only an instrument (Manouchehri, 1999).

The interesting point of Weber's typology is not only the fact that it helps understanding the fundamental changes in the administrative systems in the course of time and draws a distinction between traditional and rational-legal forms. This typology is, in fact, the basis for his famous theory of the characteristics of bureaucratic structures.

Marx Weber, in investigation of the characteristics of modern life, analyzes the authority structures and domination system in society and explains three types of administrative apparatus each of which emerged from a specific source of authority. Weber believes that rules and regulation based administration apparatus which Weber called bureaucracy, with its characteristic if being impersonal, distinguishes it from other two systems which are charismatic and traditional systems. Bureaucracy has developed gradually and overtook the other two systems. Weber believes that the waning of the other two systems was inevitable and those systems should accept this and continue their life in the format of the other system and this is what Weber called bureaucratization. That is, bureaucracy as a kind of organization gradually becomes widespread and penetrates into all social institutions. Eventually bureaucratization in the form of rationality will penetrate into all aspects of social life and will lead to rationalization of social life of humans (Manouchehri, 1999).

### **Max Weber and the explanation of emergence of rationality in west**

Rationality and disillusionment are main characteristics of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is rational in nature and is governed by regulations, goals and impersonal objectivity. Weber believes that the world became free of mysteries and secrets and it is now governed by fate and destiny. That is why ultimate values are vanished and from this world and is only present in mystical life and interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, the epistemological basis of Weber is demystification of the world which is originated from the rationalization process in modern life. Weber believes that rationalization of the modern world eliminated the traditional worldview holism values of medieval and humans are no more able to act based on the clear and general cultural values. The attitude of human beings have been rationalized and they must act based on the ethics that they themselves have chosen.

Weber, in the introduction of his book protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism, brings many evidences of the growth of rationality in west and claims that rational organizations, rational rules, rational scientific and educational institutions, rational religion, rational art, music and architecture, and rational parties, government, parliament and elections are present only in western societies. In areas like India, Babylon and Egypt some evidences of great cognitions and observations with great accuracies were found but the mathematic basics of this science was first provided by Greeks. In India, the concept of "proof" was not introduced in geometry. Medicine was highly advanced in India, but it lacked biologic basis and particularly biochemical basis. No civilization except western, owned a rational chemistry.

All political educations of Asia lacked a regular procedure like that of Aristotle and they generally lacked rational concepts. Structures like legal rights were only observed in western societies. Music was popular all over the world but it was only western societies that owned a harmonic music and built music instruments based on complete chords and used semitones and microtone.

This is also true about the rationalization of classic art in Renaissance (rational use of linear and spatial perspective). Printing existed in China, but it was only in west that printing literature existed specific to printing. Higher education institutes existed in China and Islam but a professional and regular rational scientific research did not have the importance it had in western societies. This is also true about a professional bureaucratic who are supporting elements of modern government and economy. Nowhere else in the world can be found in which all aspects of social life including political technical and economic aspects are totally dependent on professional and experienced bureaucratic individuals.

In general, "government", as political institute based on a constitution and rational statute law, with an executive administration under the guidance of rational rules and enjoying professional employees, existed only in western societies and this is also true about the most decisive force of modern life; capitalism. Weber takes a further step to claim that because all of these rationalities emerged repetitively in western societies (even in independent areas of life), it can be concluded that this rationalization is the absolute result of inherited traits. However, rational organization of an institute which is dependent on using chances of a regular market not on irrational chances for jobbery and force policy is not the only characteristic of western capitalism. The modern rational organization of capitalist institute is not possible without two other factors for its growth; rational accounting and separating administration of house from economic institute that is dominant on all economic affairs (Mirzaei ahrnjany, 2006).

It is evident that the new and special form of western capitalism is affected by the evolution of technical facilities and equipments. Nowadays, the rationality of the capitalism is based on the possibility to estimate determinant technical factors. That is, its rationality is dependent on the modern science, particularly natural sciences based on mathematics and accurate and rational examination. Weber states that something may be rational from one perspective but irrational from another perspective. At first the distinguishing features of western rationality and different forms of rationality in west must be recognized and then the emergence manner of it can be explained.

## CONCLUSION

Weber mentions rationality in analysis without any bias labeling it good or bad. Weber in his speech "Science as a vocation" mentions that science which is the reproduction of the interaction of thinking and nature can only respond to our technical domination on life and cannot help us in organizing our lives. He added that the important point to notice in the understanding of the policy is the bureaucratization itself the characteristic feature of which is "ignoring love and hatred" and generally human emotions.

Weber writes:

*No one can be a determinant factor in his own social life, but we are bound to a set of factors and tools that are at the service of bureaucratic structures. The modern human is economically, politically and culturally trapped in an iron cage.*

Stromberg, an interpreter of western social thought, in writing about Weber, states that Weber's main interest as a historical sociologist was to understand how western society was developed with capitalism and rational economic and its powerful government. According to Weber, rational economy is a functional organization that is oriented to the prices of the money that originates from the competition of human interests in market and there is a non-human factor (money) that determines the relations of individuals. A rational capitalist institute comprises two elements; disciplined employee and regular investment.

In fact, Weber believes that the simple principle that life can be rationalized with respect to a great variety of ultimate attitudes and in terms of different perspectives, must be taken into account in any research on rationality. Rationality is a historical concept that consists of many contradictions and this is our duty to search for the intellectual origin from which the idea of work as duty is originated. The works of Weber on bureaucracy were highly misunderstood and misinterpreted. He was accused of being the proponent of bureaucracy and fond of machine like operation of bureaucracy. He was also accused of accepting the belief that bureaucracy was in higher level of rationality in relation to normal human rationality and thus believes that human should be surrendered to the dictated rationality of bureaucracy. In one word, he is not only accused of accepting the belief that capitalism, supports mass production, system of market and bureaucracy but also accepting and spreading the consequences of these systems.

Udi was among the first individuals who questioned Weber's claim that bureaucratic organizations are rational. Udi investigated the bureaucratic characteristics of 150 organizations in 150 non-industrial societies and separated the bureaucratic characteristics of the organization that included hierarchical authority structure and professional administrative staff from the rational characteristics that included specified and limited goals and distribution of remunerations based on the product of the work. Though there was a positive relationship between the two groups of characteristics, Udi found no relationship between the two variables; bureaucratic organizations did not turn out to be more rational than other organizations.

The work of Weber reveals that he does not believe in historical rules. He considers the emergence of modern capitalism the result of the historical combination of events. Weber believes that modern rationality stipulates that those who don't act based on the rational principles of capitalism will be put aside from the market and the workers who do not work according to the rational commands and characteristics will be left jobless. To Weber, the evident issue is growth of rationalism in west. His area of interest and thinking was about legal, political and economic systems, because he sought cases for investigating and spreading his believes through comparative study of cultures and historical periods.

Weber's level of analysis in presenting the bureaucracy is ecologic and environmental level, but regarding the fact that bureaucracy is a kind of structure and organization with specific characteristics, entrance of this concept in the area of management and organization and its compatibility with classic perspectives of

management in the period of their prevalence, puts it in the middle level of analysis that is in organization and structure level. The bureaucratic model of Weber is an analytic instrument for description of empirical world, though his analysis of the organizations was not empirical. Weber's bureaucratic model helps to investigate the bureaucratic aspects of organizations.

**Conflict of interest**

The authors declare no conflict of interest

**REFERENCES**

- Amiri M, 2005. Designing and explaining the conceptual model of basic infrastructures and philosophical fundamentals of management theories. PhD thesis, University of Tehran, Iran.
- Manouchehri A, 1999. Max Weber and the question of modernity. Islamic culture publication.
- Mirzaei Ahrnjany H, 2006. The philosophical fundamentals of organization theory. SAMT publication.
- Mouzelis N, 1967. Organisation and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Qolipour A, 2001. Sociology of organizations: sociological approach to organization and management. SAMT publication
- Scott WR, 1995. Institutions and Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott WR, Ruef M, Mendel PJ, Caronna CA, 2000. Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.