



EXAMINING ACADEMICS' PERSPECTIVES ON WEBER'S BUREAUCRACY APPROACH

Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.)*

Res. Asst. Mehmet Can TANYOLU**

ABSTRACT

This study examines the university's bureaucratic structure where the academics are located based on Max Weber's bureaucracy approach. It is aimed to determine how academicians perceive the understanding of bureaucracy in universities and to make it more effective and efficient. In the study, phenomenological research design, one of the qualitative research methods, was used because the participants had a particular awareness of the perception of bureaucracy but did not have in-depth or detailed knowledge about it. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 27 academics working at universities in different regions of Turkey, and information on the bureaucratic structure of the academicians was obtained. Content analysis, one of the qualitative data analysis techniques, was used to analyze the data. It has been observed that academicians have different opinions on bureaucracy. It has been reached that bureaucratic structures can have positive and negative consequences. As a result, it is thought that the study will contribute to the maintenance or improvement of the functioning of bureaucratic structures.

Keywords: Academics, Bureaucracy, Bureaucratic Structure, Weber.

Jel Codes: D73, L38.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy is the system that ensures that an institution's practices occur orderly with specific rules. The oldest and most widely used definition and features of the concept of bureaucracy belong to the German thinker Max Weber. Weber developed the "ideal bureaucracy" model to maintain order in organizations and prevent possible confusion. The main features of Weberian bureaucratic organizations are that they are hierarchical, divide the work, and are managed according to rules. Hierarchy results in vertical differentiation, while a division of labor requires horizontal differentiation within an organization's structure. The strictness of the rules in bureaucratic organizations can cause the processes to become problematic, that is, the system to be inflexible and the information sharing to not progress correctly. In this situation, organizations can be restructured by using information technologies to serve

* Duzce University, Duzce/Türkiye, E-mail: a_yilmaz81@hotmail.com

** Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara/Türkiye, E-mail: mehmet.tanyolu@hbv.edu.tr

Makale Geçmiři/Article History

Başvuru Tarihi / Date of Application : 27 Şubat / February 2023

Düzeltilme Tarihi / Revision Date : 17 Ağustos / August 2023

Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date : 24 Ağustos / August 2023

society better. Thanks to information technologies, developments in cooperation and information sharing within bureaucratic structures are encouraged, and it is thought that the process can be made more flexible, sensitive, and efficient. Also, in future bureaucratic structures; It is expected to develop new relationships and partnerships, think and act strategically, establish strategic networks with other organizations, manage resources effectively, redefine the boundaries of the system, be managed with transparency, openness, accountability, and responsibility (White, 1999: 164).

According to the research on bureaucracy carried out in educational institutions, it has been determined that there is a bureaucratic structure in schools, but the practices vary from institution to institution (Hoy ve Miskel, 2010; Kilinc et al., 2016; Köybaşı et al., 2017). It is seen that each institution has a unique management style and different bureaucratic features. It can be said that bureaucratic characteristics are not at the same level in every school, and positive and negative results cannot be gathered under the same factors. An ideal management style with a properly functioning bureaucratic structure is needed to carry out academic activities effectively and systematically, especially in universities (Samier, 2005). For this reason, a bureaucratic structure that includes all stakeholders is formed by implementing the decisions taken by the university administration within the framework of specific procedures and rules. Although there are administrative differences in the effect of the free thought environment in universities, it is seen that there is a similarity in terms of the functioning of the bureaucratic structure within a particular order. The general features of the bureaucratic structure in universities are as follows (Coccia, 2009); Division of labor according to competency in sharing administrative duties, the responsibility of academicians to university administrators, the bindingness of laws and regulations, the impartial and consistent behavior of university employees, the determination of positions and promotions of employees based on expertise. The jobs within the bureaucratic structure are determined according to the expertise of the people and their situations. In particular, academicians have an essential role in the functioning of the bureaucratic structure in universities by educating and teaching students. The duties and responsibilities of academicians outside their fields of expertise, the problems they encounter in their environment, and the obstacles in the work progress reveal the importance of bureaucracy.

In this research, it is thought that activating and restructuring the bureaucratic structures in universities will significantly contribute to solving the problems in the field of public administration. Especially with the developments in recent years, it has been confirmed that institutions and organizations cannot be separated from the bureaucracy during the restructuring process, and the search for solutions to make the bureaucratic structures more effective has begun. For this reason, by taking Weber's "Bureaucratic Management Theory" at the center, the views of academics are sought on how the bureaucratic structure in universities can be more effective and productive within its current structure. In this study, the relevant literature was examined, the concept of bureaucracy, its emergence, and its importance were explained, and studies on this subject were included. As the phenomenon of

this research is the perception of the bureaucracy of the participants, the phenomenological research design was used.

2. THE CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY, ITS EMERGENCE, AND IMPORTANCE

The word bureaucracy derives from a combination of Greco-Latin and French roots. While "Burrus" is used in Latin to indicate a dark and sad color, it created the word "bure" in French, which describes a type of fabric put on some public offices' desks. Hence, the term "bureau" was coined to describe the tables covered with cloth and denote the entire office. In the 18th century, a French government minister used the word "bureaucratic" to somewhat cynically refer to all public offices. The bureaucracy consists of two components: "Office" and "Cratos" power. However, the term bureaucracy was coined by Max Weber from the German word "Office," meaning office. The term bureaucracy became a part of daily language after definitions and started to be used in public organizations that make up the state (Fry and Raadschelders, 2014).

When the concept of bureaucracy is examined from a historical perspective, it is seen that Hegel (1952) is based on the "rational state" understanding. *The rational state* ensures that good laws are enforced to maximize the welfare of individuals. A state developed with good laws and freedom of property are the primary conditions of prosperity. Therefore, personal and public interests must be carefully organized to guarantee happiness and rights. Hegel (1952) argued that a formalized and rule-based administrative system should exist. He wanted the public administration to be objective, the rules to be clearly defined, and the bureaucracy to be organized hierarchically.

Regarding the recruitment of public officials, he stated that the appointment should be open to everyone and that the objective factor in the appointment should be knowledge and ability. Similarly, Wilson (1887) wanted to know what the state should do with scientific research-based public administration and how it could do it most efficiently with his "management study" article. According to him, there is a robust structural similarity between all governments, uniform, valuable and efficient when it comes to administrative functions. According to Wilson (1887: 212), public administration favors a hierarchical organization of the bureaucracy during the detailed and systematic execution of public law.

Weber's ideal bureaucratic approach consists of hierarchically structured, professional, impersonal, and disciplined employees with specific competencies (Weber, 1980: 825-27). Bureaucrats are appointed to administrative positions not because of their ancestry but because of their abilities (merit). Training of public employees is essential, and bureaucrats need to be specialized professionals. According to Ringer (2004: 182-84), public officials are "individual officials (not professional bodies), placed in a fixed office hierarchy based on qualifications that can be determined by examinations and confirmed by diplomas. They see their job as a full-time career and receive a salary for their duties".

Weber (1919) states that the political and administrative spheres must be strictly separated to ensure the state's efficient and rational functioning and to control the influence of the public official.

Weber (1992)'s bureaucracy approach has the following features: *Hierarchical structure and chain of command*; There is a structuring arising from the subordinate-superior relationship between employees in the workplace. Managers have the authority to control all work of subordinates. On the other hand, associates are responsible for fulfilling the duties assigned by the managers. *Rules and regulations*; The management system is completely established with rules, and employees are obliged to comply with these rules. When the rules are violated, the penal sanctions found in the institution's regulation are applied. *Work sharing*; A division of labor is made in line with the experience and abilities of the employees. The division of labor reveals the job performance and competencies of the employees, and in this way, it is ensured that the employees work in the most suitable positions. *Determination of professional subordinate-superior relationship*; There should be a distance between managers and employees, and employees should be treated equally. Employees should be treated professionally, without discrimination, in promotion and promotion processes. *Official reports*; It is the reporting of all bureaucratic work. Reporting allows retrospective control of the work done. The primary purpose here is to prevent and eliminate work-related irregularities. It ensures that the employees fully fulfill their responsibilities to perform their jobs best and contain work disruption.

3. DATA, METHODOLOGY AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Coccia (2009) examined bureaucratization in universities and found that academics spend most of their time on administrative matters (preparing grant applications, managing grants/projects, reporting, patents, etc.) and that administrative bureaucratization is seen due to the increase in the number of administrative staff over time compared to the number of academics. Administrative bureaucratization occurs when administrative positions and activities grow faster than productive activities and personnel are involved in productive activities. He also stated that research units with high bureaucratization have lower scientific performance. Administrative and academic bureaucratization results from government regulations and demands from society; Universities are constantly interacting with the outside world and are under increasing government pressure to meet external expectations. Especially environmental changes cause administrative changes and lead to bureaucratization. Public resources support universities, and market financing is necessary to finance researchers' activities.

In their study, Roth and Sonnert (2011) explored the conflict between the anti-bureaucratic perspective and gender equality concerns stemming from the universalist ethics of science. As a result of the study, they showed how non-bureaucratic organizational structures perpetuate gender inequalities for both female scientists and non-scientists. Langer et al. (2017), in their research on the effect of bureaucratic and entrepreneurial environments on job satisfaction, found that job satisfaction has a direct negative relationship with a centralized work environment. Even outside the school, bureaucratic

management does not affect employees because they live in such an environment. In other words, employees may be affected if they renew in such an environment. Abu et al. (2021), in a study on bureaucratic management practices in schools, found that the bureaucratic management practice affects the welfare of the employees but does not affect the employees' need for autonomy, competence, and relationship. Bureaucratic management has been criticized for overemphasizing rules and minimizing employee freedom and independence.

In his meta-analysis study, Wagner (2021), inspired by Weber's bureaucratic ideal type, revealed an important interrelationship between structural dimensions and supported the ongoing research on dimensional structures and the bureaucratic, structural model. Today, developing new structural sizes and relevant theoretical models is vital to provide meaningful advice for managers when faced with structural deficiencies. Existing models are limited for diagnosing and solving structural problems. Therefore, managers need dimensional organizational structure models that reflect the organizational structures they manage. In his study, Langer (2022) evaluated Max Weber as an important figure in Public Administration, how Weber's propositions produced results, and the relationship between formal and material rationality based on changing administrative models. This study has reached guiding results for the future of Public Administration in the United States. Terjesen (2022) states that university bureaucratic practices reduce innovation and autonomy. It is emphasized that the bureaucratization of companies and higher education institutions causes the loss of individual initiative and innovation. In this study, successful case studies of the implementation of anti-bureaucratic policies in universities are described.

4. METHOD

4.1. Purpose and Importance of the Research

The research aims to determine how academicians perceive the university's understanding of bureaucracy and make it more effective and efficient. The objective is to examine the bureaucratic structure of the institution where academicians work, identify the bureaucratic problems they encounter, reveal their causes, and offer solutions. The research is vital in revealing the bureaucratic structure in the institution where the academicians work and their perspectives on Weber's bureaucracy approach and improving the bureaucratic structure in the institutions. It is necessary to determine the university's bureaucratic structure, evaluate the positive and negative aspects that all stakeholders reflect on, eliminate the deficiencies, and ensure more effective management.

4.2. Data Collection Method of the Research

The interview method, one of the data collection methods, was used in the research. The guidance of the researcher is vital since the participants will be interviewed on a subject they do not have in-depth knowledge of. For this reason, primary data were obtained from academicians with the semi-structured

interview technique. Interview questions were sent to the academicians online, and positive feedback was provided. The researchers created the interview questions depending on the relevant literature. By taking the expert opinions of two academicians who are experts on this subject, an arrangement was made to make the questions more understandable and explanatory. It was checked whether the answers from the interviews matched each other and whether the participant gave contradictory answers to the answers provided on the same subject. In addition, the reliability of the data was increased by making purposeful sampling. The collected data were dumped and examined to whether they overlapped with previous studies. Berg and Lune (2015: 381) state that summative content analysis is done by using the words or expressions in the data obtained in the research, and it should be expanded by focusing on the prominent themes and hidden meanings in the data. For this reason, a summative content analysis was carried out in the research.

4.3. Sample of the Research

While the research universe consists of academicians in Turkey, the sample consists of 27 academicians working at universities in various cities. The academics in the research were determined by maximum diversity sampling, one of the purposive sampling methods. The maximum diversity of individuals in the sample reveals common understandings shaped by different experiences and unique perspectives arising from differences (Patton, 1990). For this reason, the academicians' universities and working areas have been determined to be diverse. Since the Covid-19 epidemic was still active at the time of the research, limitations were encountered in reaching academics, interviewing, and allowing them to allocate time. The data obtained online within the framework of the specified sample were evaluated. Descriptive information about the academicians participating in the research is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Information of Academics

Participant	Gender	Age	City	Title	Field of study	Work experience (Years)
K1	Male	42	Düzce	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	14
K2	Male	42	Düzce	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	12
K3	Male	44	Karabük	Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	21
K4	Male	36	Siirt	Instructor	Social and Humanities	4
K5	Female	42	Nevşehir	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Social and Humanities	2
K6	Male	33	Batman	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	8
K7	Female	37	İstanbul	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	11
K8	Male	43	Sinop	Instructor	Social and Humanities	13
K9	Male	59	Hatay	Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	32
K10	Male	33	Şanlıurfa	Instructor	Social and Humanities	6
K11	Male	37	Karabük	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Social and Humanities	7
K12	Male	34	Siirt	Instructor	Science and Engineering	3
K13	Male	43	Sinop	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	20

K14	Male	45	Sinop	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Social and Humanities	15
K15	Male	45	Bolu	Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	23
K16	Female	42	Bursa	Prof. Dr.	Fine Arts	12
K17	Female	45	İstanbul	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	Social and Humanities	13
K18	Male	44	Sakarya	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	20
K19	Male	47	İstanbul	Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	22
K20	Male	55	Mersin	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	30
K21	Male	38	Denizli	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	10
K22	Male	39	Kayseri	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	14
K23	Male	41	Balıkesir	Instructor	Aeronautics and Space	5
K24	Male	31	Sivas	Instructor	Science and Engineering	6
K25	Female	42	İzmir	Assist. Prof. Dr.	Health Sciences	15
K26	Male	34	Van	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	Social and Humanities	10
K27	Male	63	Ankara	Prof. Dr.	Science and Engineering	27

5. RESULTS

In this section, the themes created based on the interview questions used in collecting the primary data of the research and the participant views on these themes are included. A total of 8 themes were created in the research. These; The definition of the concept of bureaucracy by academics, the bureaucratic structure in the university, the division of labor and specialization among academicians, the attitude of the management in solving problems of the academicians, the strategy of the university administration, the effect of the bureaucratic structure in the university on the commitment to the institution, the impact of the bureaucratic structure in the university on trust and mistrust among the academicians, and finally, the problems arising from the bureaucratic structure. What needs to be done to prevent it? Below, under these themes, the perspectives of academics on Weber's bureaucracy approach are evaluated through the institution they work.

Table 2. Participant Views on The Definition of The Concept of Bureaucracy

Participant	Definition of the Concept of Bureaucracy
K1	It creates an obstacle and complicates things.
K2	Excessive influence of the administration in the conduct of state affairs.
K3	Delaying the workflow and prolonging the resolution process of the works.
K4	Functioning and organizational structure in the subordinate relationship.
K5	An ideal organizational structure with clear rules and procedures.
K6	Situations must be complied with and implemented in the performance of state affairs.
K7	Mandatory form of the workflow required in a unit.
K8	An ordered structure/formation with clearly defined rules.
K9	Chain of formalities.
K10	Influence of administration in the conduct of state affairs.
K11	It is a political structure that narrows from the lower to the upper part of society.
K12	A hierarchy of powers ties public institutions' progress to a discipline.
K13	It is making things difficult.
K14	Reasonable management style.
K15	Experiences create the coercive systemic mechanism.
K16	Formal work, systematic peeing.

K17	Institutionalization of the state and public services, their execution following the law and regulations by separating them from individuality and arbitrariness.
K18	A set of prohibitive rules.
K19	Hierarchical order.
K20	It is making things difficult.
K21	Prolongation and impossibility of the work to be done.
K22	The working process of the jobs.
K23	The slow progress of things.
K24	Operational processes.
K25	Loss of time while providing a set of rules and business control in an institution.
K26	The system that operates.
K27	It is the procedures and principles in realizing administrative activities and evokes unnecessary paperwork.

When Table 2, which includes the definitions of the concept of bureaucracy by the academicians participating in the research, it is seen that bureaucracy is generally defined as the set of rules and procedures followed for the progress of work. Since the academicians have two perspectives on the concept of bureaucracy, positive and negative, it has been determined that they are divided among the participants. While academics who are against bureaucracy see bureaucracy as a necessity and an obstacle to functioning, other academics define the concept of bureaucracy as a regular system that must be followed and implemented within an institution. According to the academics who defend the necessity of bureaucracy, it is thought that since it is a system that does not allow employees to stand out as "persons" and uses an impartial official common language, it ensures that employees are recruited and promoted according to their competence to do the job correctly, not according to their characteristics.

5.1. Perceived Bureaucratic Structure at the University

When the views of the academicians on the bureaucratic structure in the universities they work in were examined, the bureaucratic structure of 10 participants; expressed that it has democratic, supportive, facilitating, and fair features. K2, *"There is a supportive and democratic form of government."* K16, *"The university has a democratic bureaucratic structure that is supportive most of the time."* On the other hand, the negative thoughts of the other academicians (15 people) interviewed about the bureaucratic structure in universities and the current structure was evaluated as autocratic and obstructive. Opinions in this context; K9, *"Especially for the last ten years, it has been obstructive and autocratic."* K10 said, *"Although it is hindering, there is a structure based on bilateral relations."* In the research, it is seen that there are academicians who find the bureaucratic structure in the university both supportive and autocratic. K8, *"In terms of academic staff, it is supportive in academic studies and autocratic in administrative decisions and studies."* K17, *"Although it is partially supportive, the administrative positions are increasingly autocratic, that is, they are appointed to administrative positions, and the representation in academic appointments and decisions is weakened."*

5. 2. Division of Labor and Specialization among Academics

It is seen that the division of labor and specialization is given importance within the scope of the supportive bureaucratic structure among the academicians, that everyone has a sense of duty, that the rules and procedures are stretched when necessary, and that the managers determine positive strategies. K5, *"The division of labor and specialization is determined by considering the employees' competencies."* Rather than giving orders, and the employee is expected to own the job himself". K8, *"Work division and assignment are tried to be made according to the experience about the work to be done, the evaluation of the structure of the work to be done as suitability for individual work or suitability for group work."* Other academics (14 people) interviewed stated that division of labor and specialization does not occur following the procedure in their environment; therefore, they cause problems to be interrupted or not be concluded correctly. In addition, it is claimed that bilateral relations and the purpose of interest are essential in the division of labor among academicians, that more workload is imposed on certain people, and that superiors have dictatorial approaches to their subordinates. K1, *"In the division of labor, it is generally checked whether there is a financial return due to work. If it is a money-making business, it is not shared with others. At the same time, if it is a non-monetary business, it is passed directly to low-level people"*. K3, *"Division of labor and specialization is determined by proximity to management."* K6, *"The responsibility of the work is generally placed on the friends who do more work."* K10, *"Hierarchically, those at the top oppress those at the bottom, and when there is opposition from the bottom, they become partially democratized."* K13, *"The division of labor is determined according to the proximity to the management."* K16 said, *"I don't think there is a multi-program division of labor. It is generally determined according to personal wishes"*.

5. 3. The attitude of Management in Problem Solving of Academics

It is known that the university's bureaucratic structure is very effective in the relations between the stakeholders. For this reason, the attitude of the management is also essential in solving the problems that arise in the institution where the academicians work. The study's academics (14 people) stated that the administration supported solving the issues and encouraged the establishment of positive relationships that gave confidence. K4 said, *"So far, there has been a supportive attitude. Errors are explained, and the margin of error is tried to be minimized"*. K6, *"He or she exhibits a problem-solving attitude."* K8, *"There is a supportive and contributing attitude to solve the problem."* K16, *"They listen to me and try to find solutions to my problems."* According to an academician, it has been stated that the bureaucratic process is generally effective in solving problems. Still, some people in the administration also affect the process with the decisions they take individually. K17, *"Although bureaucratic mechanisms operate on certain issues, the initiatives of people in administrative positions can also be decisive."* Other academics (10 people), on the other hand, are disturbed by the management's attitude and criticize their approach in the face of the problems in the universities they work at. K1, *"If you are close with the management, you will be supported, but if you are not, you may be treated as the source*

of the problem." K3, "Management does not help much in problem-solving, or it may drive the process uphill. That's why I try to solve problems with my efforts and external support". K5 said, "There is a profit-oriented understanding. It is acted according to the cost-benefit evaluation". K7, "In the face of problems, it is not solution-oriented, but directed to a higher unit." K10, "There is a humanitarian approach administratively, but the autocratic and obstructive attitude of those influential within the department persists." K15, "The basis of the problem is generally the lack of merit in management." K20, "The attitude of the management is negative, and it is far from solving the problem. It is assumed that there is no problem". K26 said, "The necessary support is not provided during the working process, especially due to the current economic situation. The work that needs to be done can be successful if people show dedication. For example, it is a great shame for a teacher to buy a pencil with his own money to use the blackboard while teaching. The organization's resources are in the hands of the managers, and the managers do not use it to create the infrastructure for operation".

5. 4. University Management Strategy

Academics, the university administration usually resort to the strategy; transparency, accountability, effective informal relations, democratic attitudes, appropriate use of authority, power sharing, oppressive and coercive, merit or incompetence, unethical behavior, etc. were evaluated accordingly. Most academicians (17 people) expressed their satisfaction with the management strategies, stating that the institution they are in is accountable, transparent, effective informal relations, on-site authority is used, and power sharing is ensured. K2, "Accountability is at the forefront in the management strategy of the university." K4, "Transparency in management is vital." K8, "A strategy where there are effective informal relations, where authority is used together with a democratic attitude and where merit is significant is dominant." K10 said, "Our Rector is very competent and attaches importance to merit, but although it seems very difficult to overthrow the current system, it is going well for now." K18, "There is a democratic attitude and appropriate use of authority in the management strategy at the university."

On the other hand, other academics (9 people) stated that the management strategies are oppressive and coercive and that incompetence and unethical behaviors are observed. K1 says, "It has the appearance of transparency, but the culture of allegiance predominates. Those who are not close to them are excluded, let alone die". K5, "With effective informal relations and communication, placing "obedient" and "observing orders" at key points and spying are common." K9, "Repressive and coercive attitudes dominate along with the unnecessary use of authority in the university." K13, "Incompetence in management is the biggest strategic mistake." K26 said, "The strategy followed by the management is to carry out the operation without providing the necessary conditions. As a result, let the process take place. The rest is not important". One of the academicians finds the management strategies of the university both positive and negative. K17 said, "I did not have one-on-one problems with the university administration, but I think the management strategy is both positive and negative. In some cases,

academic merit still works. However, the rectorate unit's powers are extensive and not elected. Due to the current regulations in Turkey, there may be a situation of arbitrariness that goes beyond merit, independent of individuals. Generally, the decisions taken are shared, but since I do not have an administrative duty, I do not know the details of the decision-making process".

5. 5. The Effect of Bureaucratic Structure on Organizational Loyalty

In the research, the university's bureaucratic structure's effect on the commitment to the institution was stated by the academicians; productivity, motivation, and willingness to continue or leave the institution. Most academicians (21 people) state that the bureaucratic structure reduces productivity, motivation, and creativity, creates a desire to leave the institution, or requires it to continue. K1 said, *"Although the idea of leaving is sometimes dominant, the foresight that the places I will go will not be different connects us to our institution. Bureaucratic obstacles have never positively affected me".* K5, *"I do not think the university's organizational structure fulfills the bureaucracy's requirements. Productivity might increase if it was a process that suited Weber's ideal bureaucracy. There would be fewer problems. When problems arise, people could have more control over what to do, but since it prevents personal characteristics from coming to the fore, creativity is also rasped and causes uniformity. It is a situation that should not happen in terms of our profession".* K10 said, *"Except for the Rector, the rest of them do not have much motivation. Because as long as you do what they say and your bilateral relations are strong, you can stay in the institution; otherwise, there is no motivation, and you even want to escape as soon as possible".* K21, *"The bureaucratic structure in the university causes a lack of motivation and a decrease in the sense of belonging."* K27 said, *"The intensity of bureaucratic work negatively affects my productivity and motivation. That's why I want to retire".*

On the other hand, there are opinions of the participants (6 people) that the university's bureaucratic structure encourages the academicians to work and produce more within the institution. K2 said, *"The bureaucratic structure positively affects my commitment to the institution. I am productive and highly motivated".* K6, *"As long as those in the management solve bureaucratic works and problems, it positively affects my commitment to the institution."* K8 said, *"Supporting/encouraging the bureaucratic structure increases the sense of belonging to the institution, institutional development, and change. Academic encouragement and support within the department and democratic participation increased my belonging and commitment to the department I was in before university".*

5. 6. The Effect of Bureaucratic Structure on Trust and Distrust Among Academicians

It has been determined that this theme has positive and negative effects, which are evaluated within the scope of the influence of the bureaucratic structure in the university on trust and mistrust among academicians. The majority of the academicians (18 people) stated that the bureaucratic structure caused a decrease in loyalty to the institution and formed distrust and conflict within the institution. K1, *"It can be said that official relations between academics stemming from the bureaucratic structure are*

at the forefront and that there is a controlling and harsh approach. If a bureaucratic approach is displayed, it may mean that the other person is distant and reduces trust in each other". K3, "The fact that there is only a relationship based on rules and hierarchy among academics reduces the trust of colleagues in each other." K10 said, "It depends on the morality and merit of those in the bureaucratic structure. But since many people resort to this kind of work, motivation inevitably decreases. Confidence is shaken".

K26 said, *"The current system in the university does not encourage academicians to work in partnership by trusting each other. On the contrary, it pushes the academicians to look for the deficiencies of other academicians to protect themselves". K27, "Bureaucratic rules are applied with discrimination among employees. For this reason, insecurity occurs in the working environment".* The perception of equality brought by objectivity, which affects internal relations, and the confidence brought by the order were mentioned by academics (5 people) who think that the bureaucratic structure has a positive effect. K12, *"The bureaucratic structure did not create a negative situation regarding the trust among academicians; on the contrary, it had a positive effect because it eliminated uncertainty thanks to order and hierarchy."* K17, *"The transparency and functioning of the bureaucratic structure, of course, positively affects the trust among academicians."* In addition, there are opinions (4 people) that the bureaucratic structure does not affect trust and distrust among academicians. K8 said, *"The effect of the university's bureaucratic structure on the trust between academicians varies according to the circumstances. I don't think it has a direct effect. The character and behavior of academics determine trust".* K14, *"I do not think that the bureaucratic structure is very effective on trust among academicians."*

5.7. What to Do to Prevent the Problems Caused by the Bureaucratic Structure

In organizations with bureaucratic structures, there are behaviors that managers and other employees should do to prevent problems when bureaucracy gives negative results. The most appropriate behavior to avoid problems (acceptance, striving for change, alienation, etc.) varies according to the institution and the person. Most academicians (24 people) in the study stated that it is necessary to strive for change to prevent problems arising from the bureaucratic structure. K1, *"Bureaucratic approaches that make things difficult should be abandoned, and an easier way of doing this should be suggested by evaluating the situation. In this context, new roadmaps should be created".* K2 said, *"It is necessary to strive for change to prevent problems arising from the bureaucratic structure. The source of the problem should be determined, necessary arrangements should be made, and more flexible behaviors should be displayed instead of strict rules".* K9, *"I think strict bureaucracy practices should be reduced within the institution, provided that they do not go against the law."* K14, *"Changing the functioning mechanism of the bureaucratic structure; A work package and project-based, performance and result-oriented working method may be preferred. The remote working method can be used instead of time and place restrictions. Thus, the feeling of bureaucratic stuck can be avoided".*

K17, "Bureaucratic institutions should be free from impersonality and favoritism, recruitment and promotion with merit, equal treatment of citizens (or students, employees) in public service should be ensured. In this sense, managers should care about auditing and feedback". K20 said, "Change is necessary to prevent bureaucratic problems, and my advice to managers is as follows: Unit employees; accept their existence, seek ways to enable them to highlight the talents each of them, being like an orchestra conductor, look for ways to create a team spirit, etc.". K24, "A fair distribution of work should be done, academic concerns and scientific ethics should be given importance while distributing work." K25 said, "The productivity and motivation of employees should be increased by minimizing bureaucratic work. An atmosphere of trust should be created among the employees by eliminating the privilege". K26 said, "My advice to the managers is to realize that the bureaucratic structure can change at any time. The privileges given should be used for the process, not for impulsive interests. Duty and responsibility in the system do not make a person valuable or worthless. Effective and fulfilling that task makes a person successful".

One of the academicians stated that the problems arising from the bureaucratic structure could not be prevented and, therefore, should be accepted. K6 said, "It is not possible to change the university's bureaucratic structure as long as the same administrators are present. It should be accepted to avoid standing out in the environment and not be excluded". According to the other two academicians, it was stated that the most appropriate solution was to move away from the institution, considering that the problems arising from the bureaucratic structure could not be changed within the institution. Still, it would not be possible to accept them either. K5 said, "As the negative consequences of bureaucracy, it makes it difficult for the organization operating in a volatile and uncertain external environment to adapt to the environment, and the hierarchical structure and strict reporting culture slows things down. If the employee cannot adapt to this structure, it would be appropriate to leave." K15, "Problems arising from the bureaucratic structure cannot be prevented since one is not open to change. It is inevitable to move away from the institution".

6. CONCLUSION

Since universities are the application centers of scientific thought, they need to be adapted to the conditions of the age so that academicians and researchers can carry out successful studies. For this reason, it is vital to ensure the continuity of the correct functioning of the academic units and the management mechanism in universities or to ensure the necessary change. It is thought that this research can be used as an essential resource in making the strengths offered by the bureaucratic structure effective and eliminating the blockages that may arise, together with the opinions of academics about the effective bureaucratic structure in universities. Within the framework of the data obtained from the participants in the research; It is foreseen that the bureaucratic structure in universities is closely related to the strategies of the administrators and that the administrators can achieve positive results for the

institution and its stakeholders by valuing innovative practices, stretching strict rules, transparency and merit-based decisions.

According to the research findings, academicians define the concept of bureaucracy as a set of rules and procedures followed for the progress of work. Since the academicians have two perspectives on the concept of bureaucracy, positive and negative, it has been determined that they are divided among the participants. While academics who are against bureaucracy see bureaucracy as a necessity and an obstacle to functioning, other academics define the concept of bureaucracy as a regular system that must be followed and implemented within an institution. According to the academics who defend the necessity of bureaucracy, it is thought that since it is a system that does not allow employees to stand out as "persons" and uses an impartial official standard language, it ensures that employees are recruited and promoted according to their competence to do the job correctly, not according to their characteristics. Ten academicians interviewed; about the university's bureaucratic structure; while they describe it as democratic, facilitating, supportive and fair, 15 people see the current structure as autocratic and obstructive. In the study, it was determined that there were academicians (2 people) who found the bureaucratic structure in the university both supportive and autocratic. While these academics stated that their academic studies were supported, they also stated that administrative rules pressured them and that administrators should share their opinions on the decisions taken instead of taking control. In this case, it is noted that the academicians are not satisfied with the implementation process and results of the decisions taken not with them but despite them. They state that the division of labor and specialization is vital among the academicians, that everyone fulfills their duties, that the rules and procedures are stretched when necessary, and that the administrators determine positive strategies.

On the other hand, some academics (14 people) stated that the division of labor and specialization did not occur following the procedure in their environment and therefore caused the work to be disrupted or not concluded correctly. In addition, it is claimed that bilateral relations and the purpose of interest are essential in the division of labor among academicians, that more workload is imposed on certain people, and that superiors have dictatorial approaches to their subordinates. According to the opinions of the academicians, it was stated that the attitudes of the administrators were not equal due to different reasons. The importance of how it is perceived by individuals rather than the existence of injustices in the organization is mentioned (Khattak et al., 2019; Kniffin et al., 2019). Accordingly, managers are the people who affect the formation of this perception, and it can be said that an unfair approach will cause undesirable results for the institution and its stakeholders.

Academics, the university administration usually resort to the strategy; transparency, accountability, effective informal relations, democratic attitudes, appropriate authority, power sharing, oppressive and coercive, merit or incompetence, unethical behavior, etc. were evaluated accordingly. Most academicians (17 people) expressed their satisfaction with the management strategies by stating that the institution they are in is accountable, transparent, effective informal relations, on-site authority

is used, and ensures power sharing. On the other hand, other academicians (9 people) stated that management strategies are oppressive and coercive, and incompetence and unethical behaviors are observed. It is thought that this situation arises from the unnecessary use of authority and discrimination against those close to the administration. It has been determined that the wrong strategies of the managers in the institution negatively affect the relations between the academicians and cause communication problems. In the research, it is believed that the managers, who produce creative solutions that foresee the actions to be taken and how to solve the issues that arise within the institution, are decisive in creating the appropriate environment. Top-tier theory (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) suggests that background characteristics of managers can lead to organizational outcomes in the form of strategic choices and performance. According to this theory, it can be determined whether rectors can improve the university's financial performance and help its expansion by attracting academics with particular expertise. University administrators focusing on specific criteria can be examined to determine how administrators' concentration of time and effort leads to organizational results and to develop different strategies that create value. The effect of the bureaucratic structure of the university on the commitment to the institution by the academicians; was evaluated in terms of productivity, motivation, and willingness to continue or leave the organization. Twenty-one academics stated that the bureaucratic structure reduces productivity, motivation, and creativity, creates a desire to leave the institution, or requires it to continue.

On the other hand, it is thought that the bureaucratic structure of the six academicians in the university supports more production and active work within the institution. Academics, who stated that creative solutions were developed and mutual communication problems were eliminated in an environment of trust and goodwill in their bilateral relations, stated that their desire to work increased, and they worked in harmony with other people (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). On the contrary, in a structure with an authoritarian management approach that creates problems, oppressive and threatening behaviors are dominant, academics will be blocked and have a sense of worthlessness (Leite et al., 2021).

It has been determined that there are positive and negative effects on the theme, which is evaluated within the scope of the impact of the bureaucratic structure in the university on trust and mistrust among academicians. Eighteen academicians stated that the bureaucratic structure caused a decrease in loyalty to the institution, a lack of confidence, and conflict within the institution. Academics (5 people) who think that the bureaucratic structure has a positive effect mentioned the perception of equality provided by objectivity, which affects internal relations and the trust brought by the order in the institution. In addition, there are opinions (4 people) that the bureaucratic structure does not affect trust and distrust among academicians. In organizations with bureaucratic structures, there are behaviors that managers and other employees should do to prevent problems when bureaucracy gives negative results. The most appropriate behavior to avoid problems (acceptance, striving for change, alienation, etc.) varies according to the institution and the person. While 24 academics in the study stated that it is necessary to

seek change in preventing problems stemming from the bureaucratic structure, one academician stated that the problems arising from the bureaucratic structure could not be controlled and, therefore, should be accepted. According to the other two academics, it was stated that the most appropriate solution was to move away from the institution, considering that the problems arising from the bureaucratic structure could not be changed within the institution. Still, it would not be possible to accept them either. The essential duties of the managers are to work without the bureaucratic structure's interruption, actively reach the determined objectives, and ensure the stakeholders' highest satisfaction. We can say that the bureaucratic structure in the university, which the academics examine in terms of different criteria and variables they observe, is directly proportional to the strategies the administrators apply and develops in parallel. It has also been determined in the literature reviews and the research findings that the managers apply these multidimensional strategies within the institution. In line with the results obtained from this research, it is in question whether the behaviors of academicians affected by the bureaucratic structure of the universities will reflect on society over time and create a perception about the universities that determine the community's future. For this reason, it is recommended that the bureaucratic structure of universities should be flexible, shaped by a common understanding that facilitates the work of academicians, and have a routine operation. Ensuring the continuity of this process and working effectively and efficiently belongs to the top management in universities.

REFERENCES

- Abun, D., Calamaan, S. M. T., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M. J. and Sallong, M. (2021) "Bureaucratic Management Style and Workplace Well-Being of the Divine Word Colleges", *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147- 4478): 10: 477 – 489, doi:10.20525/ijrbs.v10i3.1094. hal-03219035.
- Berg, B. L. ve Lune, H. (2015) "Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri", çev ed. Hasan Aydın, İstanbul: Eğitim Yayınları.
- Coccia, M. (2009) "Bureaucratization in Public Research Institutions", *Minerva*, 47:31–50, doi:10.1007/s11024-008-9113-z.
- Fry, B. R. and Raadschelders, J. C. N. (2014) "Mastering Public Administration: from Max Weber to Dwight Waldo", Washington, D.C: CQ Press.
- Hambrick, D. C. and Mason, P. A. (1984) "Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of Its Top Managers", *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2): 193–206.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1952) "The Philosophy of Right", *Great Books of the Western World*, (ed. R. M. Hutchins), 46:1–153, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoy, W. K. and Sweetland, S. R. (2000) "Bureaucracies that Work: Enabling not Coercive", *Journal of School Leadership*, 10: 525-541.

- Hoy, W. K. and Miskel, C. G. (2010) “Eğitim Yönetimi: Teori, Araştırma ve Uygulama [Educational Administration: Theory, research, and practice] (S. Turan, Trans. & Ed.)”, Ankara, Turkey: Nobel. (Original work published 2004).
- Khattak, M. N., Khan, M. B., Fatima, T. and Shah, S. Z. A. (2019) “The underlying mechanism between Perceived Organizational Injustice and Deviant Workplace Behaviors: Moderating Role of Personality Traits”, *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 24(3): 201–211, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.001>.
- Kniffin, K. M., Detert, J. R and Leroy, H. L. (2019) “On Leading and Managing: Synonyms or Separate (and Unequal)?”, *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 6(4): 544–571, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2018.0227>.
- Kilinç, A. Ç., Koşar, S., Er, E. and Öğdem, Z. (2016) “The Relationship Between Bureaucratic School Structures and Teacher Self-Efficacy”, *McGill Journal of Education / Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, 51(1), 615–634. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1037362ar>.
- Köybaşı, F., Uğurlu, C. T. and Bakır, A. A. (2017) “The Factors that Influence Bureaucracy and Professionalism in Schools: A Grounded Theory Study”, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(8): 196-207, www.iiste.org.
- Langer, J., Feenay, M.K., and Lee, S.E. (2019) “Employee Fit and Job Satisfaction in Bureaucratic and Entrepreneurial Work Environments”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(1): 135–155.
- Langer, J. (2022), 'Bureaucracy and the Imaginal Realm: Max Weber, Rationality and the Substantive Basis of Public Administration', *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, p. gvab033, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvab033>.
- Leite, A. B. R., Nobre, A. C. de O., Paz, A. W. C., Soares, L. H. D. N., Bizarria, F. P. de A. and Sousa Silva, A. M. (2021) “Reflections on the Limits and Possibilities of Democratic Management in High Schools in a City in Ceará”, *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 9(12 SE-Articles), 176–192, <https://doi.org/10.31686/ijier.vol9.iss12.3574>.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990) “Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods (169-186)”, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ringer, F. (2004) “Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography”, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roth, W. D. and Sonnert, G. (2011) “The Costs and Benefits of 'Red Tape': Anti-Bureaucratic Structure and Gender Inequity in a Science Research Organization”, *Social Studies of Science*, 41(3): 385–409, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312710391494>.

- Samier, E. (2005) “Toward a Weberian Public Administration: The Infinite Web of History, Values, and Authority in Administrative Mentalities”, *Halduskultuur*, 6 (1): 60-94.
- Terjesen, S. (2022) “Reducing Higher Education Bureaucracy and Reclaiming the Entrepreneurial University”, In: Wennberg, K., Sandström, C. *Questioning the Entrepreneurial State. International Studies in Entrepreneurship*, Springer, 53:111-132. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94273-1_7.
- Wagner III, J. A. (2021) “Dimensional Research on Organization Structure: Meta-Analysis and Conceptual Redirection”, *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2021.63>.
- Weber, M. (1919) “Deutschlands Künftige Staatsform”, Frankfurt am Main: Druck und Verlag der Frankfurter Societäts-Druckerei GmbH.
- Weber, M. (1980) “Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der Verstehenden Soziologie”, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Weber, M. (1992) “Bureaucracy”, (ed. J. M. Shafritz ve A. C. Hyde). *Classics of Organization Theory*, California: Wadsworth Publishing.
- White, L. (1999) “Changing the Whole System in the Public Sector”, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(2): 162-167.
- Wilson, W. (1887) “The Study of Administration”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2): 197–22

KATKI ORANI / CONTRIBUTION RATE	AÇIKLAMA / EXPLANATION	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR / CONTRIBUTORS
Fikir veya Kavram / <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak / <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.) Res. Asst. Prof. Mehmet Can TANYOLU
Tasarım / <i>Design</i>	Yöntemi, ölçeği ve deseni tasarlamak / <i>Designing method, scale and pattern</i>	Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.) Res. Asst. Prof. Mehmet Can TANYOLU
Veri Toplama ve İşleme / <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlenmek ve raporlamak / <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.) Res. Asst. Prof. Mehmet Can TANYOLU
Tartışma ve Yorum / <i>Discussion and Interpretation</i>	Bulguların değerlendirilmesinde ve sonuçlandırılmasında sorumluluk almak / <i>Taking responsibility in evaluating and finalizing the findings</i>	Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.) Res. Asst. Prof. Mehmet Can TANYOLU
Literatür Taraması / <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak / <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Aysun Devrim YEMENİCİ (Ph.D.) Res. Asst. Prof. Mehmet Can TANYOLU

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Teşekkür: -

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Acknowledgement: -
