

النموذج البيروقراطي في المكتبات الجامعية: التطبيق والبدائل

فالح عبدالله الضرمان الغامدي

أستاذ مساعد، كلية التربية، جامعة الملك فيصل - الهفوف - المملكة العربية السعودية

(قُدِّم للنشر في ١٦/٤/١٤١٤هـ وقَبِل للنشر في ٢٦/٧/١٤١٤هـ)

ملخص البحث . يهدف هذا البحث إلى فحص ومناقشة مواصفات النموذج البيروقراطي في الإدارة وما يتعلق بذلك من ميزات وعيوب بالنسبة لإدارة المكتبات الجامعية . ومن خلال استعراض الدراسات السابقة حول هذا الموضوع تبين أن النموذج البيروقراطي لا يحظى بتأييد كبير مما يتطلب من مديري المكتبات البحث عن نماذج تنظيمية أخرى أكثر ملاءمة . ولهذا عرض الباحث خمسة بدائل واقترح أنه يمكن للمكتبة الجامعية الإبقاء على النموذج البيروقراطي ، أو اختيار أحد البدائل الخمسة المقدمة في البحث التي تناسب أهدافها، وأعمالها، وخدماتها . ويعتقد الباحث أن النموذج البيروقراطي قد يكون أفضل من غيره إذا أعطينا اعتبارات أكثر لاحتياجات واهتمامات الموظفين الشخصية، والمشاركة في صنع القرار، والتنظيم للأحداث المستقبلية .

References

- [1] *Webster's New International Dictionary of The English*, (1953) ed. S.V. "Bureaucracy".
- [2] Blau, P. "The Hierarchy of Authority in Organizations", *The American Journal of Sociology*, 74 (Jan., 1976), pp. 180-185.
- [3] Lewis, David W. "An Organizational Paradigm for Effective Academic Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 47 (July, 1986), pp. 337-353.
- [4] Suozzi, Patricia A. and Kerbel, Sandra S. "The Organizational Misfits", *College and Research Libraries*, 54 (Nov. 1992), pp. 153-157.
- [5] Holley, E.D. "Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries", *College and Research Libraries*, 33 (May, 1972), pp. 175-189.
- [6] Spence, Paul. "A Comparative Study of University Library Organizational Structure". *Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Illinois, (1969).
- [7] Wicker, W.W. "The Growth and Development of the Organizational Structure of University Libraries." *Ph.D. Dissertation*. The Florida State University, Tallahassee, (1977).
- [8] Howard, H.A. "Organizational Structure and Innovation in Academic Libraries", *College and Research Libraries*, 42 (Sept., 1981), pp. 425-434.
- [9] Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Translators and Editors). New York: Oxford University Press, (1958).
- [10] Lynch, B.P. "Libraries as Bureaucracies", *Library Trends*, 17 (Winter, 1978), pp. 259-267.
- [11] Runyon, R.E. "Power and Conflict in Academic Libraries", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 3 (Sept., 1977), pp. 200-205.
- [12] Dubin, R. *Human Relations in Administration with Readings*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (1968).
- [13] Hinings, C. "Structural Conditions of Intra Organizational Power". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17 (March, 1974), pp. 22-24.
- [14] Baldrige, J.W. *Academic Governance*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, (1971).
- [15] Kaser, David. "Modernizing the University Library Structure". *College and Research Libraries*, 31 (July, 1970), pp. 227-231.
- [16] Woods, L.B. "Using Historical Perspective to Synthesize a Model of Governance for Libraries in the 1980s," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 6 (July, 1980), pp. 159-168.
- [17] Galbraith, T. "Matrix Organization: How to Combine Functional and Project Forms", *Business Horizons*, 14 (Feb., 1971), pp. 29-40.
- [18] Sayles, Leonard R. "Matrix Management: The Structure with a Future". In: *The Management Process: A Selection of Readings for Libraries*, R.J. Person (Ed.), (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983), pp. 194-214.
- [19] Alghamdi, Faleh A. "The Collegial Model: Its Applications and Implications for Academic Libraries", *Library Administration and Management*, 8, No.(1), (Winter, 1994), pp. 15-20.

However, there are several limitations and disadvantages to the collegial management among them are the following:

“The decision-making process is slow and when the consensual role is used, decisions on important issues may not be reached; it induces power rivalries among the group; rewards cannot be dispensed for outstanding performance; it contributes to the fragmentation of the profession by addressing the needs and problems of academic librarians only; it may impose inappropriate evaluation criteria which are designed for teaching faculty; since the decisions are made by the group, no one can be held responsible for such decisions; time-consuming; and sometimes it fails to deal adequately with the problems of conflicts” [19,p.19].

Conclusions

There is no question that bureaucracy of one sort or another will exist in all types of organizations, including libraries. Bureaucracy cannot be eliminated once and for all.

As we have already seen, the bureaucratic model has its own strengths and weaknesses, and when we examine them, we can find that weaknesses overweigh the strengths. This could explain why the traditional model is losing support in recent times.

The decision on whether to keep the bureaucratic model, modify it, or replace it with another model is mainly the responsibility of each academic library depending on its size, objectives, and services. Of course, the best model is the one that best serves the library's goals and objectives. Therefore, it is important for each academic library to conduct formal investigation and thorough analysis of its functions and operations before adopting a new organizational model or modifying the old traditional structure so as to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in the model and the applicability of the model to the library.

It is concluded that the bureaucratic model may work better if academic libraries give greater attention and consideration to human needs, interests, and values, to a higher degree of autonomy and participation in decision-making on the part of library staff, and to a highly accurate and systematic prediction of future changes.

the particular characteristics of the political model is that it provides opportunity for input into the decision-making process by interested professional and nonprofessional staff as well as various types of user representatives" [16,p.168]. The administrator will be able to exercise a certain amount of power; however, he will be responsible for the execution of staff recommendations. As Woods explains, the political model has some positive points. For example, staff will be able to perform their duties more adequately since they are to a large extent exempted from administrative duties. It allows freedom of input into the decision-making process by various participants [16,p.168].

The Matrix-Type Structure

Another form of organization that might be of interest to academic libraries is the matrix-type structure. In a matrix organization, as explained by Galbraith [17,pp.29-40] and Sayles [18,pp.194-214], an employee is assigned to a project for its limited life or as long as he is needed in that project, and he moves back to his permanent job if he is no longer needed in that project. He can be assigned to another project or work on a part-time basis in two projects at the same time.

The problem with the matrix structure is that it requires multiple roles for employees in the project, and these roles might be ambiguous and frustrating. However, it is more flexible than the hierarchical structure, whereas changes that occur on the course of the project can be easily absorbed. Additionally, it improves communication among participants, and allows frequent testing of their capabilities and skills.

The Collegial Model

Collegial management is mainly associated with academic institutions. It can be characterized by peer evaluation, group-decision making, sharing of responsibilities, and equality of power. The collegial model works better in a changing environment, where external and internal changes occur frequently. The most obvious advantages to the collegial management as described in another paper by this writer include the following:

"It allows all ideas and viewpoints to be freely expressed; decisions tend to be more accurate since they are made by a group of experienced participants; weak administrators can be helped by stronger staff; it disregards status and hierarchical rank and emphasizes equality of power and mutual respect; it improves communications among members of the library staff; it promotes continuing education and professional growth; it creates a feeling of responsibilities; it encourages innovation and creativity; and it leads to a greater acceptance of decisions, to job satisfaction, and to quality services" [19,pp.15-20].

1. Readily identifiable and vocal clientele.
2. Tightly focused goals and objectives.
3. Inter-relatedness of functions.
4. Holistic view of service.
5. High degree of collegiality and flexibility of staff.
6. Close physical proximity to primary user community.
7. Entrepreneurial management style.
8. Ability to develop and personalize services.
9. Identification by primary clientele and staff as part of that academic unit [4,p.514].

The main criticisms of departmental organization is that it is costly to maintain, difficult to administer and control, and inconvenient to users because of the issue of access and dispersal of collections over branches.

Peer-Group Structure

Kaser proposes that the traditional model may well function in parallel with a new peer group structure, and suggests each structure would accomplish the following:

“The peer group structure would be responsible for the determination of standards of service, both institutional and personal and the monitoring of these standards, the drafting of broad policies concerning the service thrust of librarianship at the university, the design of appropriate governance methodology. To the pyramidal structure, on the other hand, would be delegated the responsibility for effecting service, for the creation of procedures necessary for the implementation of policy, for the housekeeping functions attendant upon the successful operation of any large organization, and for the general supervision of supporting staff.

The relationship of the director of libraries to his general assembly would be quite similar to that of a dean to his faculty. Once policy and standard determination were concluded in the peer structure, the decisions would be referred to the pyramidal structure for implementation, and the director of libraries would relinquish his “deanship” and would once again become a director [15,p.229].

The Political Model

Wood reports that the proposed political model for library governance may work better in place of the bureaucratic model and the academic collegium. “One of

sions and responsibilities, it is difficult for them to subject their creativity and serendipity to unrealistic, fixed, and rigid rules and regulations. It is demonstratable that, as a result of excessive bureaucracy, academic libraries are losing some people who may have a good potential for initiating changes and developing services, especially in recent times, where drastic changes in organization and services are being seen in academic libraries.

Decisions in a bureaucratic library sometimes do not respond accurately and effectively to problem situations. This might be attributed to the fact that decisions are made by the library director, who cannot be assumed to have expertise in all library areas. That is, his knowledge and experience in all library operations are presumably not enough to allow him make sound decisions for all problems. When a decision is made and happens to be a poor one, the whole organization will be carried and affected by it.

Further changes in a bureaucratic organization are unpredictable and once they occur, it is difficult to accommodate them into the organizational structure. This is of vital importance to academic libraries because many changes in the academic community (e.g., new programs of study, new technologies, increasing complexity of subject fields, use of AV equipment and collection) are taking place.

Bureaucracy with its impersonal aspect in a library enhances the tendency of librarians, especially staff and managers, to prove their importance, protect their interests, and enhance their status in the library. It is possible that the bureaucratic library directors may put their personal goals over the library's goals, and they may use their authority and power against employees for personal disputes or conflicts.

Alternatives

Because of the negative consequences of bureaucracy and its principles, many researchers and theorists have been searching for alternative models that might be more appropriate for library organization. Five models which have been proposed by other researchers, will be identified here only briefly to give a general idea about each model. These models include a departmental model, a political model, a peer-group structure, a matrix type structure and a collegial model.

The Departmental Model

Suozi and Kerbel point out that the concept of departmental libraries is not new, but needs examination. They think that this model will be more effective in this age of databases, communication networks and scholarly communication. They identify several characteristics of the proposed model as follows:

Weaknesses

There are several weaknesses and limitations associated with the bureaucratic model some of which are the following:

Bureaucratic managers tend to centralize power and decision-making in their hands. In a bureaucratic management duties are constructed and assigned to employees by managers who take full authority and assume full responsibility leaving no decisions to employees on matters specifically related to their work. This is, in fact, a negative leadership under which librarians are insecure, uncertain, and afraid of the leader's authority.

The bureaucratic management can not be accepted by the majority of people, especially with extreme and negative managerial style. Frustration, low morale, and conflict develop easily in bureaucratic situations. "Employees tend to work at "half-esteem" because their drives and creativity are not realized [13,p.36].

Baldrige provides several weaknesses associated with the bureaucratic model. He is speaking of the university structure in general, but the following weaknesses can be, to some extent, applied to university libraries:

The bureaucratic model tells us much about "authority," that is, legitimate, formalized power, but not much about the other types of power based on nonlegitimate threat, the force of mass movements, expertise, and appeals to motion and sentiment.

The bureaucratic paradigm explains much about the formal structure but very little about the processes that give dynamism to the structure.

The bureaucratic paradigm deals with the formal structure at any one point in time, but does not explain how the organization changes over time.

The bureaucratic model does not deal extensively with the crucial tasks of policy formulation. It explains how policies may be carried out in the most efficient fashion after they are set, but it says little about the processes by which policies are established in the first place. It does not deal with political issues, such as the struggles of groups within the university who want to force policy decisions toward their special interests [14,pp.4-5].

Bureaucracy can be an inhibiting factor for open-minded and intelligent people to work in academic libraries. When they believe in democracy, and sharing deci-

period of time. Also, decision can be made more accurately with proper feedback and communication. It depends on the personality of the manager or director and how much authority he is willing to share with his staff. However, it cannot be generalized that all library managers are interested in applying rigid rules and extensive authority. Some of them can be actually democratic, although they are working in a bureaucratic environment.

In the bureaucratic model, managers are able to dispense rewards to employees who do outstanding work. The power and authority which they have allow them to allocate special funds and allow some flexibility in rules and procedures, where necessary, for the purpose of increasing employee morale and motivation, both psychologically and financially. When a manager in a bureaucratic organization is flexible and positively direct with his employees, he will be effective in getting productivity improved in many situations, and he can develop effective human relations.

To those who consider rigid rules and regulations as a hindering factor toward flexibility and expansion of activities, Lynch points out that rules and regulations are needed for several purposes: (1) to reduce the influence of the external environment, (2) to assist librarians to carry out their duties, (3) to maintain the library itself, (4) to facilitate the process of hiring staff, and (5) to control turnover of staff [10].

With the bureaucratic model, libraries can achieve specific goals within an acceptable time, and budget can be planned, spent, and accounted for clearly and specifically. The traditional model can even apply some automation technologies to effect publicly visible changes without conceptual changes, and they also provide stability and continuity, qualities with high value to most administrators and many librarians [11].

There is some sort of participation allowed within the bureaucratic model with the use of advisory committees. These committees can reduce tension among staff in bureaucratically organized libraries and facilitate the practice of some sort of participatory management. That is, committees act as a bridge or center for communication of ideas, problems, and issues between library personnel and their managers and give recommendations that reflect the problems and needs of both the librarians and their libraries.

Finally, bureaucracy is rational because the evaluation of staff is based on their performance and technical competencies, not on personal attributes or relationship. "Their performance is judged by superiors not in terms of who they are, but in terms of what they do [12,p.168].

directives and orders and implement decisions, and report directly to their immediate superiors.

3. Technical competencies for hiring and selection of staff

From a technical point of view, the bureaucratic management can maintain the highest level of efficiency for the organization, since the staff are selected and hired based on their knowledge and skills for performing a specialized task.

4. Presence of rigid rules, regulations, and procedural specifications

These personnel policies are essential in a bureaucracy for the conduct of official duties and the performance of operations, and can serve as a standard for uniformity and coordination of different tasks and duties. These rules and regulations define the responsibility of each member of the organization, and the relationship among them, and control the activities of the employees, which cannot be changed or expanded without permission from superiors.

5. Impersonality

This principle, according to Max Weber, dictates that the ideal official conduct his office in a spirit of formalistic impersonality without hatred, or passion, and without affection. Also it calls for promotions to be granted based on seniority and achievement or both [9,p.25]. The purpose is to maintain social distance between superiors and subordinates, and loyalty be given to the organization, not one person to another.

Strengths

There are many contributions that can be facilitated and, to a large extent, accomplished by adopting the bureaucratic model in our libraries. The following strengths of the traditional model will illustrate its applicability and feasibility in academic libraries.

The bureaucratic management works better in non-democratic societies, since people are accustomed to an authoritarian role and living with many authorities such as parents, teachers, and government bureaucrats. Blau indicates that people "... derive security and satisfaction from working within strong authority structures. Since this is their role expectation of their management, they respond well when he acts his expected role" [2,p.355].

It permits quick-decision making, because only one person is responsible for taking such a decision. When fewer people are involved in the decision-making process, the library administration will be able to achieve administrative goals in a shorter

The development of organizational structure of academic libraries was studied by Wicker to determine the applicability of the four stages of development identified by Chandler to the organizational growth in academic libraries. These stages include: (1) initial expansion and accumulation of resources; (2) rationalization of the use of resources; (3) expansion into lines and markets to allow continual use of resources; and (4) development of new structures to allow continued mobilization of resources. He found that the organizational development of American University libraries followed Chandler's four-stage cycle, and organizational structures in university libraries followed managerial strategy and were greatly influenced by the organizational structure of the parent university [7].

Another study was conducted by Howard to assess the rate of innovation in academic libraries in relation to the organizational structure variables of complexity, centralization, formalization and stratification. He found that there was a positive relationship between the variable complexity and the rate of innovation and negative relationship between the rate of innovation and centralization, formalization, and stratification [8].

Characteristics of the Bureaucratic Model

Bureaucracy as a type of organization was conceptualized by Max Weber, who was a theorist and widely known as the father of organization theory. The main concern of Max Weber was to develop a pure form of organization for large-scale enterprises. He was searching for an ideal bureaucratic structure based on legitimate authority. He proposed several characteristics which he thought of as essential elements in an ideal bureaucracy [9].

These characteristics can be explained as follows:

1. Clear-cut division of labor

This organizational principle requires clear definition of authority and responsibility and demands an employment of specialized experts to fill a particular position and makes each individual expert responsible for the position he is holding to perform his duties effectively.

2. Hierarchy of authority

In the hierarchical structure offices and positions are organized in a hierarchical order resulting in a chain of command. Every official in the hierarchy is accountable to his superior, who maintains authority over his subordinates by issuing directives and orders concerning work operations. Subordinates have the duty to obey these

organizations. As yet, no organizational structure has proved to be best for academic libraries. The experience with the traditional model has led to the claim that the bureaucratic model is no longer appropriate for libraries. As Lewis points out, academic libraries" ... are encumbered by record systems and by financial and organizational structures which discourage innovation and make it difficult for them to manage uncertainty." [3,p.349].

It seems that since academic libraries are growing rapidly, and in turn, their operations and services have become overlapping and more complicated, the bureaucratic model will have to be replaced by a more appropriate model or, at least, adapted in one form or another. Suozzi and Kerbel report that "librarians have been warned that their traditional organizational structure will need to change if they are to survive and be effective in a future environment of remote users, electronic access, and rapid technological change" [4,p.153].

Brief Review of the Literature

There is no question that large organizations will develop a bureaucracy of one form or another. It can be found in business, among a group of people, educational institutions and even in organized sports. At any rate, bureaucracy was first introduced in large organizations where a great number of people with different backgrounds, perceptions, and social attitudes were employed. Like any other organizations, libraries have been bureaucratically organized, especially in the past. Holley reports that "in the traditional departmentally organized library, the chief librarian often operated in a parentalistic thought not autocratic style, and his library tended very much to bear the stamp of his own personality" [5,p.176]. The collections and services in academic libraries before World War II were limited in quality and quantity so that one chief librarian was able to direct his library under the principles of bureaucracy. But with later expansion of academic libraries, new services were initiated and an increase in information was so immense that new positions were designed and some participation was allowed.

Paul Spence studied Weber's theory of bureaucracy to see if it applied to American university libraries. Max Weber had theorized that as organizations grow in size, there is also an increase in organizational complexity, in the occupational specialities and professionalization of the staff, in the percentage of personnel in the administrative positions, in the average span of control at each level of the administrative hierarchy, in the writing rules and regulations governing operations, in the impersonality governing decision-making, and in the career stability of employees. Sixty two American University Libraries, which were member's of the ACL, were studied. Spence's findings did not support Weber's theory on organization [6].

administrative apparatus operating with impersonal detachment from people. There are elaborate rules, detailed controls, a rigid hierarchy, and highly specialized functions operated by experts" [2,p.180].

The trend towards bureaucratization has accelerated during the last century due to the expansion of nations and the growing number of large-scale organizations. Libraries are among these organizations which have been affected so greatly by the classical principles of management. It is expected that those who are working under these principles would demand a shift to a more efficient model that would allow more autonomy and flexibility.

Dissatisfaction of the majority of academic librarians with the traditional model is being shown in actions and attitudes. There is a tremendous amount of pressure on academic libraries to take new directions towards improvement in both the technical and human aspects of library work. Staff have shown their interest in sharing decisions with their administrators and demand a higher degree of autonomy. Others aspire toward equality with teaching faculty in the university and perceive the bureaucratic model as a setback to their needs and to the efficiency and effectiveness in library services and operations.

Another kind of pressure stems from the external environment. Many changes to which the academic library has not fully responded so effectively are taking place outside the library. Such changes include new campuses, new study programs, new students, new projects, and new technologies. These changes will certainly influence the practice of library administration and the quality and quantity of activities and functions. The real question is whether academic libraries will be more effective in their performance and more responsive to internal and external changes and problems with the bureaucratic structure, and, if not, what are the alternatives available for replacing such a structure?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to review and discuss the bureaucratic structure regarding its characteristics, and general strength and weaknesses. The researcher will give his own assessment of the model and present other organizational models that might have possible applications to academic libraries.

The Problem

Despite the attempts of many researchers and theorists to provide organizations with different organizational models, bureaucracy is still a popular practice in many

The Bureaucratic Model in Academic Libraries: Application and Alternatives

Faleh A. Alghamdi

*Assistant Professor, College of Education, King Faisal University,
Al-Hofuf, Saudi Arabia*

(Received 16/4/1414; accepted for publication 26/7/1414 A.H.)

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to review and discuss the characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages of the bureaucratic model for library governance. The research review reveals that the bureaucratic model is losing support in many organizations because of its numerous weaknesses and limitations, which makes it necessary for library administrators to search for a more acceptable organizational structure. The researcher presents briefly five alternatives to the bureaucratic model, and he suggests that an academic library may keep the bureaucratic model or choose one of the five alternative models according to the objectives of the library and the quality and quantity of its functions and services. He thinks that the bureaucratic model may work better if more considerations are given to human needs of library staff, to more involvement of staff in decision-making, and to systematic prediction of future changes.

Introduction

Bureaucracy in its broader term was a common practice in the remote past among families, societies, and nations. Its existence in simple forms can be traced back thousands of years ago in Rome, Egypt, China and Mesopotamia. Most people have negative reaction to the word “bureaucracy” and conceive of it as a system of inefficiency and ineffectiveness.

Bureaucracy can be defined as “a system of administration marked by constant striving for increased functions and power, by lack of initiatives and flexibility, by indifference to human needs or public opinion, and by a tendency to defer decisions to superiors to impede action with “red tape” [1,p.289]. In fact this is not a real scientific definition. Rather, it reflects the common negative meaning of the word “bureaucracy” by the general public. Blau defines bureaucracy as “a large, complex