www.turkishstudies.net/economy

Turkish Studies - Economics, Finance, Politics

eISSN: 2667-5625

INTERNATIONAL BALKAN UNIVERSITY
Sponsored by IBU

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Analysis of the Problems Faced in the Turkish Bureaucracy

Türk Kamu Bürokrasisiide Karşılaşılan Sorunların Analizi

Emine Erden Kaya[*] - Merve Suna Özel Özcan[**] - Fatma Gül Gedikkaya[**]

Abstract: Organizations are structures formed by the cooperation of different parts. The smallest problem encountered within an organization is that it can reveal the consequences of entropy, which can break the functioning and do. Just like in bureaucracies. Max Weber is focused on the problems of organizing like other classical organization theorists. Weber proved the principles of bureaucratic structures by moving from efficiency. However, this ideal type of conceptualization has not been a standard feature for every country and every era. The Turkish bureaucracy system, which has a unique structure and inheritance has faced different problems over time. These issues are examined through a distinction between organizational and functional problems. This article aims to subject these problems to a current review from a different point of view. For this, firstly the concept of bureaucracy and Weberian Bureaucracy Theory will be examined. Then, the features and most important problems of the Turkish Bureaucracy system will be focused on. In the study, organizational problems such as centralism, organizational growth, confidentiality and closeness in administration, and conservatism in administration will be analyzed first. Secondly, functional problems such as prescriptiveness and avoiding responsibility, politicization and nepotism in the administration, corruption and bribery, and following up processes with intermediaries will be examined and the study will be concluded. In the study, the literature on the subject was searched and evaluated, and the obtained data were analyzed with a comparative method. Consequently, from the past to the present, problems of the Turkish bureaucracy system, also known as bureau-pathology that solved the least and many problems require suitable and lasting solutions immediately for a more efficient bureaucratic structure.

[*] Sorumlu Yazar: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Amasya Üniversitesi, Merzifon İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Corresponding Author: Assistant Professor, Amasya University, Merzifon Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

ORCİD 0000-0002-1225-2382

emine.kaya @amasya.edu.tr

[**] Doç. Dr., Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, İktisadi İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Associate Professor, Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Relations

ORCİD 0000-0001-9027-3990

mervesuna@kku.edu.tr

[**] Doç. Dr., İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İktisadi İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Associate Professor, Istanbul Gelişim University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

ORCİD 0000-0003-4451-6271

fggedikkaya@gelisim.edu.tr

Cite as/ Atıf: Erden Kaya, E., Özel Özcan, M.S. & Gedikkaya, F.G. (2023). Analysis of the problems faced in the Turkish bureaucracy. *Turkish Studies - Economy*, *18*(4), 1521-1536. https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.71742

Received/Geliş: 14 August/Ağustos 2023

Accepted/Kabul: 28 December/Aralık 2023

Published/Yayın: 30 December/Aralık 2023

Checked by plagiarism software

© Yazar(lar)/Author(s) | CC BY-NC 4.0

Structured Abstract: In contemporary societies, both in the public and private sectors, bureaucracy serves as a prevalent tool for establishing functional management and organizational structures. However, over time, bureaucracy has encountered issues and faced criticism. This article aims to delineate the problems within the Turkish public bureaucracy, categorizing them into organizational and procedural realms. Assessing the Turkish public bureaucracy through the lens of the Weberian bureaucratic model will shed light on the challenges it confronts. Bureaucracy plays a pivotal role in upholding organizational stability and order by offering efficient rules, procedures, and hierarchical frameworks. Nevertheless, the adverse repercussions of overly bureaucratic systems have been inevitable. This article will first provide a concise overview of the main features and objectives of bureaucracy. Through a screening evaluation method, the study identifies and communicates these problems, emphasizing the general and most prevalent issues. Therefore, all problems do not have a claim that covers them. Within this framework of reference, firstly, the concept of bureaucracy and the Weberian bureaucracy theory will be included in the study as the type of organization. Then the organizational and functional problems in the Weberian bureaucracy axis will be examined by including the general characteristics of Turkish public bureaucracy. In this context, we will discuss under the title Organizational problems of bureaucracy: Centralization, organizational growth, confidentiality and closeness in administration, and conservatism in administration. Under the functıonal problems of bureaucracy will be discussed: Prescriptiveness and avoiding responsibility, politicization and nepotism in administration, corruption and bribery, following up processes with intermediaries. The main function of bureaucracy is to standardize decision-making processes, effectively manage resources and ensure the stability of organizations. However, over time, it can cause problems due to the overexpansion of bureaucracy, slower decision-making processes, reduced flexibility and complexity of work. These problems can be felt not only at the institutional level, but also in the daily lives of citizens and businesses. Because of this importance, it is necessary to better understand the observed problems of the Turkish public bureaucracy.

This study delves into the issues within the Turkish public bureaucracy through a comprehensive literature review. By exploring the Weberian bureaucracy model within this context, the attempt is to elucidate the potential problems that arise when evaluating the Turkish public bureaucracy through this framework. Max Weber, the German sociologist, formulated the Weberian Bureaucracy Model as a theoretical construct for comprehending the structure and operations of modern bureaucracies. This model underscores the rationality, efficiency, and formalization of administrative procedures within a bureaucratic setup, encompassing key principles such as hierarchy, division of labor, formal rules, impersonality, career orientation, efficiency, and rationality. Turkey's public bureaucracy has undergone substantial transformations and reforms since its inception as a modern nation-state. Historically influenced by Ottoman administrative practices, characterized by a blend of centralized authority and patronage-based appointments, efforts have been made over time to align the Turkish bureaucracy with the principles outlined in the Weberian model. However, within the Turkish public bureaucracy, there have been instances of excessive adherence to certain Weberian principles or challenges stemming from these very principles.

When the problems of the Turkish public bureaucracy are discussed together with the principles of the Weberian bureaucracy, two points draw attention: Firstly, every problem that arises in the Turkish public administration has emerged as a result of deviation from the characteristics expressed in the Weberian bureaucracy theory. Secondly, the problems arising in the Turkish Public Bureaucracy are intertwined with each other. The fact that favoritism causes incompetence and incompetence can lead to avoidance of responsibility creating an intricate cluster of problems. Similarly, the persistence of the accountability and transparency problem will make it difficult for the public to participate in decision-making processes. The involvement of citizens in decision-making processes and policy development has been limited, which can result in policies that do not fully reflect the needs and preferences of the population.

This study examines the problems of Turkish public bureaucracy under organizational and functional subheadings. Unlike other articles, while making this review, it is emphasized that the problems are related to each other by establishing a relationship with the principles of the Weberian bureaucracy model. Weber revealed the ideal type of bureaucracy with principles such as the hierarchy of authority, strict division of labour, a written and inflexible management system, written rules and impersonality. Deviations from these principles have created organizational and functional problems. For example, strict enforcement of hierarchy has resulted in centralization and organizational growth. Deteriorations in the principles of acting by the rules, cause paperwork, formalism, intimacy, secrecy in management, inefficiency, incompetence, corruption, bribery and nepotism. Moreover, deviations from some principles may cause another problem to arise. For

example, as organizations grow, nepotism increases, which can lead to corruption and bribery. Although the Turkish bureaucracy, whose general characteristics and problems are tried to be explained, has undergone various structural and functional changes over time, it continues to have these features and problems today.

Keywords: Public Administration, Weberian Bureaucracy, Turkish Public Bureaucracy, Organizational Problems, Functional Problems.

Öz: Örgütler, farklı parçaların bir arada çalışması ile oluşan yapılardır. Bir örgüt içerisinde karşılaşılan en ufak bir sorun, işleyişi ve yapıyı bozabilecek entropiye varacak sonuçlar ortaya çıkabilir. Bu durum bir örgütlenme modeli olan bürokrasiler açısında da söz konusudur. Max Weber'in diğer klasik örgüt teorisyenleri gibi örgütlenmelerin sorunlarına odaklanan arayışı, verimlilik noktasından hareket ile bürokratik yapıların ilkelerinin ortaya konmasını sağlamıştır. Ancak ortaya konan bu ideal tip kavramsallaştırması, her ülke ve dönem için genel geçer özellik taşımamaktadır. Bu çerçevede Türk bürokrasi sistemi de kendisine has yapısı ve geçmişten aldığı miras ile zamanla farklı sorunlarla karşılaşmıştır. Bu sorunların genellikle, örgütsel ve işlevsel sorunlar şeklinde bir ayrıma tabi tutularak incelendiği görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı; bu sorunları farklı bir bakış açısından güncel bir incelemeye tabi tutmaktır. Bunun için ilk olarak çalışmada, bürokrasi kavramı ve Weberyen Bürokrasi Kuramıyla giriş yapılacaktır. Daha sonra Türk Bürokrasi sisteminin özelliklerine ve en önemli sorunlarına odaklanılacaktır. Merkeziyetçilik, örgütsel büyüme, yönetimde gizlilik ve dışa kapalılık, yönetimde tutuculuk gibi örgütsel sorunların yanı sıra, kuralcılık ve sorumluluktan kaçma, yönetimde siyasallaşma ve kayırmacılık, yolsuzluk ve rüşvet, aracılar yoluyla işlemleri yürütme gibi işlevsel sorunlar incelenerek çalışma sonlandırılacaktır. Çalışmada konuyla ilgili literatür taraması ve değerlendirmesi yapılmış, elde edilen veriler karşılaştırmalı yöntemle analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmanın ulaştığı sonuç, geçmişten günümüze Türk bürokrasi sisteminin büropatolojiler olarak da bilenen bu sorunların çok azının çözüme ulaştırıldığı ve ivedilikle birçok sorunun, daha verimli bir bürokratik yapı için, nitelikli ve kalıcı çözümlere ihtiyaç duyduğudur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu Yönetimi, Weberyen Bürokrasi Kuramı, Türk Kamu Bürokrasisi, Örgütsel Sorunlar, İşlevsel Sorunlar

Introduction

Bureaucracy constitutes the functional area of political units as an important organ not only in the present but also in the past. Although the concept belongs to the modern period, the system executives of the ancient empires appear as part of the bureaucracy. Every political unit creates a legal order simultaneously and this order works through the bureaucracy. The first systematic study of the modern bureaucracy, which is seen as an organizational system and considered a rational final form, was made by German scientist Max Weber. Weber did not directly propose a theory in his work or even define bureaucracy. However, just like other classical organisational theorists who came to the fore at that time, Weber also created this system from efficiency. Therefore, he identified the characteristics that will ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the organizations he examined as a part of establishing a society (Öztaş, 2013, p. 133).

Weber frequently imagined a machine in analyzing a bureaucratic organization. For him, just like a machine, bureaucracy is a system whose energies are standardized. According to Weber, a member of the bureaucracy is a cogwheel in a constantly in-motion mechanism that gives the way to follow from the ground (Weber, 2014, pp. 16-17). Weber predicted that the more rational, the more successful this system, free of human emotions, hierarchical and rigid. However, over time this system lost its perfection. The words bureaucracy and bureaucrats have become a concept that usually means embellishment due to the prevalence of the stationery mentality in the world (Mises, 2000, p. 19). Generally, as a technical term, bureaucracy evokes imaginations in the minds of those who use the term, such as avoiding responsibility, slow execution of things, arbitrary decisions, and even administrative pressure (Gültepe, 2009, p. 19).

With the effect of technological developments, the rapid change and transformation process experienced in every field today has also affected public organizations closely. For this reason, the concepts of transparency and accountability adopted in the administration and every transaction made by public organizations have become more questioned by the society, which is the customer of public organizations. Due to a number of problems in the execution, both the failure to perform the services offered on time, and the works and transactions carried out in violation of the procedure. The effect of the reactions against the people is felt more and more every day. Especially corruption in public bureaucracy, slow and poor quality of services. Dissatisfaction of citizens with the state and bureaucracy, negative image of the state in the eyes of the citizens, the inability to use resources effectively, efficiently and rationally, waste and losses caused by the state, etc. issues remain at the top of our country's agenda (Akçakaya, 2016, p.671). This situation has revealed the problem of examining the situation of Turkish public bureaucracy within the scope of our study.

In this context, the Turkish bureaucratic system has also been associated with different historical backgrounds and operational differences. Our study will examine these under the headings of organizational and functional problems. In the study, these problems are identified and conveyed by adopting a method like screening evaluation, with perspectives focusing on the general and most pronounced problems. Therefore, all problems do not have a claim that covers them. Within this framework of reference, firstly, the concept of bureaucracy and the Weberian bureaucracy theory will be included in the study as the type of organization. Then the organizational and functional problems in the Weberian bureaucracy axis will be examined by including the general characteristics of Turkish public bureaucracy.

Defining Bureaucracy as an Organization

When bureaucracy is examined as a concept, it is seen that it is too comprehensive and multidimensional to be explained with a single definition. There is a consensus that the word bureaucracy was first used in 1745 by the French physiocratic economist Vincent de Gournay, who introduced the slogan "Let them go, let them pass." The concept is formed from the union of the "Bureau" circle, which comes from the Latin "Burrus" root, and "Crate" means "power". In this sense, the concept refers to a management system in which employees in offices have power or at least exercise necessary powers (Tortop, İşbir, et al., 2012, p. 401). Modern Western-style bureaucracies emerged over the need to delegate the king's powers to their representatives as government relations of centralized autocratic regimes became too complex. However, the concept of bureaucracy has been widely used pejoratively. With this negation, the concept has been used as "the organization whose efficient work is prevented by paperwork (excessive bureaucracy)" (Shafritz, Russell, Borick, 2013, p. 226).

In this context, we will limit the word bureaucracy, which is used with many different meanings and mainly in administration and politics, to four definitions in our study. First, it is a derogative interpretation used to describe the abuse of official authority, which includes the more pejorative meaning of bureaucracy, which we have generally stated. Therefore, bureaucracy refers to harmful behaviours and processes such as inefficiency, prescriptiveness, red tape, shirking responsibility and excessive devotion to authority. These negative behaviours are described as "bureaucracy disease." Second, the word bureaucracy is used as a synonym for public administration. In this sense, bureaucracy is an organization managed/formed by modern governments to carry out various administrative duties/works in state administration. Third, bureaucracy is a form of government in which authority is mainly in the hands of officials who are appointed through appointment. Finally, bureaucracy is defined as a form of organization with specific features. This definition emerged with Weber in the early 1900s and became the dominant understanding of bureaucracy (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 214-215).

It creates a unique form of organization in the context of bureaucracy's focus on issues such as division of labour and written procedures/rules of authority hierarchy. In this sense, this situation, which forms a rational form that appears as the Weberian Bureaucratic Model, has been modelled as the "ideal type" and has determined the features that bureaucratic organizations should have (Öztaş, 2015, p. 142). Hence, as we see, more aspects and attributes can be added to these definitions. Within the scope of this study, however, we aim to remain faithful to the essence and continue with the Weberian approach.

Weberian Bureaucracy Theory

The industrial revolution and capitalism enabled classical organizational theorists to examine the organizational structures of the division of labour and the workload and reveal new solutions in line with the needs. In this context, it is evident that organizations are not the product of the modern period. Even though the division of labour and the need to act together seems different in the modern period compared to the earliest periods of history, it continues with the same purpose. Therefore, while Weber was developing his theory of bureaucracy, he made examinations of ancient civilizations and empires. It is seen that the bureaucratic administrative system put forward by Weber is based on the Roman Empire to a great extent. Weber acted because the empire owed its power and authority mainly to its bureaucracy and military organization. In this respect, especially after establishing the Roman Empire, the legion system is seen as an essential and remarkable organization. Here, systematic progress and discipline play an essential role in continuing the existing structure. The corruption of the Roman bureaucracy was influential in the empire's collapse. Therefore, it can be said that the reason for the collapse of the bureaucracy is that financial and economic policies affect the bureaucracy negatively (Özer, 2013, p. 48). In short, although the concept of bureaucracy is old in terms of its field of application, it appears in the modern period in terms of conceptualization.

It was developed by Weber as a model, as a guide to empirical research and the study of existing structures. The starting point of this theory has been the quest to end the inefficiency of traditional bureaucracies. According to Weber, old management styles cannot meet the needs of modern organizations, so rationalization is required to fight inefficiency. On the other hand, bureaucracy is one of the essential tools to establish rationality both at the organizational and state level. For Weber, organizations, which are unstable in the long run, have efficiency and effectiveness problems since the old forms of government depend on individuals (Öztaş, 2015, pp. 144-146).

The elements of ideal-type bureaucracy, which forms the basis of Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy, are listed as follows (Weber, 2011, pp. 57-59):

- Specialization: “fixed and official jurisdictions”
- Hierarchy: “a strictly regulated system of superiors and subordinates”
- Management based on written rules
- Technical rules and norms
- Impersonality
- Written rules: administrative activities, decisions and rules are formulated and recorded in writing, even where conversations are the rule or mandatory.

The ideal type of bureaucracy based on legal-rational authority and rationalization has the characteristics of being based on technical knowledge, a high degree of efficiency, controlling human behaviour, and directing them to act rationally. According to Weber, the features that distinguish the ideal type of bureaucracy from other management styles are continuity, strict discipline and reliability (Weber, 1952, p. 24).

Another issue regarding bureaucracy is the relationship between the imperative commander (who has power) and the commanded (ruled). According to Weber, there are three pure types of legitimate sovereignty (authority) in this context, who believe that the main reason for obedience is "belief in legitimacy." These are Traditional, Charismatic, and Legal Authority. In the Traditional Authority, the subject of obedience is a matter of personal loyalty to the chief, sanctioned and constrained by tradition. Obedience is a matter of course due to traditions, conventions, beliefs, and value systems. In Charismatic Authority, there is obedience due to personal trust in one's inspiration, heroism, and exemplary qualities. The legitimacy basis of this authority is extraordinary personal characteristics. However, the most rational of these is the Legal Authority. Since Traditional and Charismatic Authority is personal and arbitrary, rationality is not easy. Weber stated that the most appropriate type of authority for the bureaucratic organization is legal-rational authority. In the Legal Authority, obedience is legally established, and directed towards impersonal order. According to Weber, formal legality, conformity to orders, and authority require obedience to the practitioner who has the authority, that is, the administrator. This type of authority is essential in modern bureaucratic organizations (Öztaş, 2015, pp. 148-150). The legitimate ground of obedience in the legal authority type is on the axis of authority orders determined according to legal and rational criteria. The main point here is the legal foundations of the rationale.

In short, the bureaucracy model theorized by Weber has features such as the division of labour based on functional specialization, the hierarchy of authority, promotion and seniority system, a system of procedures to be followed in the performance of jobs, impersonality, and appointment of experts to positions. Weber argued that bureaucracy is the most suitable and technically superior organization type for large-scale and complex organizations of modern societies, and has advantages such as rationality, predictability, punctuality, continuity, discipline and reliability (Baransel, 1979, p. 13). Weber's bureaucracy, which he theorized, is too necessary to be taken only on specific rules. Weber stated that such an organization would be superior, indispensable on many points, primarily providing rationality and technically the best form of organization, and would show a tendency to grow (Öztaş, 2015, p. 155). In this sense, bureaucracy was equated with the level of development of societies and the level of bureaucratic organization in the capitalist system, especially in the 20th century, and in this context, bureaucracy served as a lever for societies (Özer, 2013, p. 46). Bureaucracy, as a structure that responds to the needs of the 20th century within the rapidly changing world system and subsystems, has problems in terms of efficiency and effectiveness in keeping up with the rapid global transformations of the 21st century.

Turkish Bureaucracy and Its Characteristics

During the Ottoman Empire Period, the first thing that comes to mind regarding bureaucracy is executing decisions in a particular order. The most crucial point here is a practical philosophy of state justice summarized with the formula of "the circle of justice" within the bureaucracy. As a matter of fact, in the Ottoman state system, this order had been operating since the period of Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror (1451-1481) as the state affairs were under the direct control of the Sultan. Therefore, the orders formulated by the bureaucracy always came out as Sultan's orders (İnalcık, 2014, p. 31). On the other hand, in the formation of the bureaucracy, the Ottoman Empire officially recognized voluntary or formed social organizations and followed a policy of integrating these groups into the system. According to Karpat, this practice gave the Ottoman state a monolithic appearance (Karpat, 2006, p. 125).

Although the Turkish bureaucratic administrative system does not resemble the Ottoman administrative system of the 14th and 15th centuries, however, when its many features are examined, it can be concluded that they passed from the past to the present. Today, it can be said that it is a continuation of the 18th-century Ottoman administrative system with the main lines of the Turkish bureaucratic administrative system, which took its elemental form in the 1930s. Of course, the

continuation and functioning of the political culture have an important place here. In this sense, although there has been a transition from the empire to the Republic, the administrative traditions and political culture mostly migrated to the Republic similarly (Durgun, 2002, p. 86). In this way, with the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic, there was only a change in the political regime. In the transfer of a legacy, administration traditions, institutions, and political culture continued to exist in the new regime (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 239).

On the other hand, Heper pointed out that the structure of the Ottoman-Turkish State was shaped around the tradition of the "historical bureaucratic empire." As a result, the bureaucracy gained autonomy within the political system, and the upper echelons of the bureaucracy became the focal point of the political struggles that would determine the country's fate (Heper, 1973, p. 32). Again, according to Heper; it is impossible to explain the Ottoman-Turkish bureaucratic development with its conceptual categories of legal-rational bureaucracy. Because Weber tried to explain the bureaucracy at the point of efficiency and inefficiency by considering the two main currents from the underlying religion to the secular and from "essential rationality" to "formal rationality." In this conceptualization, he constantly asserts that it is assumed that the bureaucracy with formal rationality will implement the decisions of political powers that have come to power by the laws. The inherently rational bureaucracy discusses the decisions of political powers in terms of political norms. In this respect, the bureaucracy remained far from formal rationality due to the underdevelopment of the norm differentiation in the Ottoman-Turkish political-bureaucratic institutionalization and the formation of the secular development in the form of a soft-ideological secular development (Heper, 1973, p. 39).

In the context of Weber's analysis, it is accepted that the Ottoman bureaucracy displayed patrimonial (traditional) characteristics until the mid-19th century. During this period, civil servants were seen as footmen of the Sultan. In the last years of their reign, although this character of the Ottoman bureaucracy seems to be developing in line with the legal-rational management type, a legal-rational administrative structure had not been fully realized (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 242). The new republic administration, which took over these legacies and was established under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, aimed to create a legal-rational public bureaucracy model within the nation-state (Çevik, 2004, p. 100). However, Turkey is Atatürk's westernization; despite modernization and development efforts, changes in behaviour and understanding of the form have not been much bureaucratic during the period.

From the 1970s to the 2000s, the ruling bureaucrats, who were generally politicized and utterly dependent on politicians, always believed that they knew what to do for society and the country is better than society’s consciousness. Thus, public administration and public policies have been shaped according to the managers' point of view. In short, in light of the thoughts put forward by Weber, the Turkish bureaucracy is characterized as a structure that maintains its patrimonial-legal characteristics despite the efforts to establish rational-legal procedures and methods (Çevik, 2004, pp. 101-102).

In the Ottoman-Turkish tradition, bureaucracy and bureaucrats are at the forefront of their political functions rather than administrative functions. This situation is not seen in modern democratic countries because the public bureaucracy's powers are given to them by representative political bodies by the constitution. Therefore, the source of authority is a democracy, not bureaucracy. Administrative purposes and programs are determined by the law and government decisions. Since the absolute authority is owned by representative political bodies, the right to supervise the exercise of the power in question, and reorganize or revoke the power, also belongs to these organs. Since everything is tried to be handled by bureaucracy and bureaucrats, it spreads to all areas of political life and takes place in them; the political functions and activities of the Turkish public bureaucracy disrupted the administrative functions, which are the main tasks of modern

bureaucracies, and increased significantly (Durgun, 2002, p. 100). The Turkish public bureaucracy is faced with organizational and functional problems with deviations from bureaucratic principles, with its problems arising from being under a heavy burden with laws, rules, regulations and procedures, some of which date back to the Ottoman period (Bent, 1969, p. 53).

Organizational and Functional Problems of the Turkish Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is the process of restructuring within the system that has developed as a form of organization. In this restructuring process, the most striking issue is the adhocratic organization which can be defined as a low degree of formalism and centralism, with a lot of expertise and little control. The new situations brought about by technological developments caused the problem of not controlling the managers. Özer points out that the employees' characteristics, feelings, interests, and motives started to be considered in the organizations' analyses during the restructuring process. Therefore, it is essential to consider information systems and technology separately and together with social issues (culture, strategy, education) in organizational restructuring (Özer, 2013, p. 50).

On the other hand, the shortcomings of the bureaucracy in this area become the essential elements that make the organization complex and cumbersome if we understand it as a machine. Therefore, the problem of bureaucracy in Turkey is evaluated in two ways as organizational and functional (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 248). On this axis, from the organizational aspect, while features such as division of labour, authority, hierarchy and official jurisdiction are understandable in terms of functionality, the whole of the procedures and rules regarding working, decision making and finalizing the works in an institution comes to the fore (Tortop, et al., 2012, p. 473). In this context, in the rest of the study, the main problems of the Turkish public bureaucracy will be dealt with on a functional and organizational basis, and the difficulties and problems encountered will be examined.

Organizational Problems of Bureaucracy

Centralization

Centralization means the concentration of authority at the highest level of the administrative system. In a centralized management system, lower levels cannot act on their initiative. They have to direct most of their problems to a higher level (centre) to make a decision. The lower levels act only as implementing institutions (Marume and Jubenkanda, 2016, p. 106). Centralization is one of the most prominent features of the Turkish public administration system and one of the most important problems (Aydın, 2004, p. 24). Eryılmaz defines centralism as using public resources and authority by capital organizations. Centralism occurs in two ways. The first is geographic centralism; the second is organizational centralism. In geographical centralism, the central government vests little power to the provincial organizations and local governments to make decisions and implement them, while organizational centralism is the concentration of decision-making and implementation authority in an institution (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 248).

Consecutive actions such as reporting the decisions taken from the centre to the provinces and putting them into practice cause a waste of time and resources. In the context of increased workload, this situation increases bureaucracy, especially paperwork. This system does not give many initiatives to the officials and causes the civil servants to be weak and unwilling in terms of knowledge and experience. In addition, in this case, the central government or administration dealing with routine and unimportant work in the provinces prevents it from engaging in basic and national-level business. (Aydın, 2004, p. 25). Therefore, in the Weberian sense, centralization simultaneously leads to a decrease in the search for efficiency and productivity. Centralization simultaneously leads to a decline in the search for efficiency and productivity in the Weberian sense. Although bureaucracy was described as the most efficient form of administration when it was designed, over time, bureaucracy became synonymous with inefficiency and paperwork (Mouzelis, 2001, p. 68).

The last situation regarding centralization is that it causes centre-periphery problems to be experienced. For a long time in the academic environment and politics, it has been discussed that these problems can be eliminated with a new structuring in management. In other words, it has been one of the factors that caused problems in the participation of the masses of people in politics, who were pushed to the position of an edge against the bureaucracy, which assumed a central role in the republic's history. In this context, Eryılmaz states that within the framework of political liberalization/liberalization, the restraint of the bureaucracy in these areas after 1946 created a new dimension in the social structure (Eryılmaz, 2013, p. 155).

Organizational Growth

The emergence of bureaucratic authority is parallel with the development of the state (Eryılmaz, 2013, p. 89). Therefore, bureaucracy can be seen as one of the essential building blocks of the state. Bureaucracies have also changed with the emergence of nation-states and strong central structures in Europe after the 18th century. The most crucial point here is that central states and bureaucracies came into being as structures that feed each other. For this reason, from the primitive period organizations to the modern period, bureaucracies as developing dynamic structures have found the opportunity to continue their existence dynamically within the system.

According to the Constitution, the state must be organized according to the services it will provide to the public and the requirements of the service. Turkey, in terms of central administrative structure and according to their geographical situation of economic conditions and public services is divided into provinces; provinces are further divided into sections. Thus, the service organizations to be determined will fulfil their duties to public personnel. Unfortunately, despite the explicit provisions of the constitution, the expansion of bureaucracy in Turkey and reaching the size of the complex bureaucratic procedures in the country are closely related to the reputation fondness of people and influence, which increases their authority of work by considering their interests (Gökçe and Şahin, 2002, p. 12). Parkinson (1958, p. 6) explains this situation with the principle that will later be referred to as Parkinson's Law: “An officer wants to increase his subordinates, not his opponents”. The increase in employees will lead to an increase in levels within the organization.

Public administration is constantly growing and expanding in Turkey. It is observed that the number of ministries, general directorates, and other organizational units is increasing, their functions become uncertain, and as a result, they have problems in coordination with each other (Gökçe and Şahin, 2002, p. 12). The trend of growth is often inherent in public bureaucracy. Each public institution works to increase the existing organizational structure, budget possibilities, number of personnel, social facilities, and service tools and compete with other institutions in these areas rather than improve service quality (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 249). The crucial problem here is the emergence of "cadres" that are far from efficient and effectiveness, considering the desire of bureaucrats to expand their organizations and the aims of expanding the areas of activity of politicians (Gökçe and Şahin, 2002, p. 13). Since the establishment of the Republic in Turkey, the bureaucracy has been growing "quantitatively," while it could not develop "qualitatively." The precaution for this is; to focus on issues such as preventing centralization, devolution of authority, local governments, and increasing efficiency with in-service training (Çevikbaş, 2014, p. 94).

Organizational growth simultaneously brings about an increase in personnel. Therefore, rather than the decentralization of the system or the delegation of authority, the bureaucracy's tendency to spread constantly and the continuation of its way with new formations reveals the result of the Parkinson law that the work volume decreases, but the civil servant constantly increases (Fişek, 1972, p. 16).

Tablo 1: Data on Public Sector Employment, 2022.

Types of institutions	Civil Servant
General budget administrations	3.277.495
Higher education institutes, universities and high-tech institutes	309.106
Other special budget administrations	97.253
Regulatory and supervisory agencies	7.187
Social security institutions	42.880
Revolving funds and caution funds	242.061
Other public institutions	7.164
State-owned enterprises covered by decree law no.233 (including subsidiaries)	95.134
Organizations in the privatization portfolio	266
State banks	66.286
Public enterprises with special laws	3.7045
Special provincial administrations	11.463
Municipalities, affiliates and local administration units	188.756
Municipality economic enterprises	538.950
Total	4.921.046

Source: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, 2022. https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kamu-istihdami/

However, as Parkinson pointed out, the lack of a link between the volume of work and the increasing number of civil servants can be explained by the expansionist nature of bureaucracies. As a matter of fact, according to the data of the Presidency of the Turkish Presidency of Strategy and Budget, while the total number of public personnel was 2,100,335 in 2010, this number increased to 2,873,760 in 2015. In 2020, the total number of public personnel increased to 4,791,571. As of 2022, the total number of public personnel has increased to 4,921,046 (See Table 1).

In short, in situations where the limits of growth are not clear, works and levels bring a cumulative heap along with other bureaucratic problems. This situation may produce contradictory results with the principles of bureaucracy in the Weberian sense in terms of the progress of work and division of labour.

Confidentiality and closeness in administration

Confidentiality refers to the non-disclosure of information, documents, and other data in public administration. The main reasons for confidentiality can be listed as the nature of the political regime, state security, diplomacy, protection of private life, the tendency to increase the authority of its administrators, the idea of ensuring efficiency and impartiality in administration, bad public administration practices and the tendency of civil servants to protect themselves from the risk of supervision (Sobacı, 2005, p. 163).

The Turkish public bureaucracy has traditionally been organized based on "confidentiality" and "official secret" structure and functioning. The crucial reason for confidentiality in administration is that administrators and civil servants want to protect themselves against public criticism. However, this situation allowed the civil servants to use this structure for their self-interests. The fact that the limits and scope of confidentiality were not defined in the laws made the director or staff of the institution take into consideration what should be confidential and what should be open. This situation paved the way for hiding corruption within the institution and made the citizens vulnerable and powerless against bureaucracy. Many documents or files were not given to the citizens for confidentiality reasons. For all these reasons, Turkey, for many years, has attracted the longing for more transparent management. One of the essential tools of transparent management

is the right to information. The right to obtain information is an indispensable element of democratic governments to prevent the use of information for unlawful purposes and arbitrariness and ensure "calling to account" through democratic means (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 250).

It has also been accepted in the Turkish public administration that an accountable and transparent administration should be implemented to solve the problem of confidentiality and non-transparency in administration. Various laws enacted to deal with these issues. the Law on Access to Information, which entered into force in 2003, Law No. 5018 on Public Financial Management and Control, and Law No. 5176 on the establishment of the Public Servants Ethics Committee are the results of this effort.

Conservatism in Administration

Conservatism in public administration means that managers and civil servants refrain from evaluating their performances and habits against new conditions and strictly adhere to the old structures and practices (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 251). This can be seen as bureaucracies traditionally seeking stability. However, bureaucracies should keep up with the conditions of the period simultaneously with stability, so they should act based on efficiency by dynamic and fast mobilization. In this respect, the excesses of the bureaucratic structure in terms of confidentiality and conservatism may slow down the mobilization within the organization and cause the flow to be blocked.

The bureaucratic structure in our country is closed to change within itself and tries to prevent change or attempts to change from outside by using all kinds of methods. For this reason, it is seen that political governments either change senior public officials and elect leaders in line with their political views or try to convince the existing ones in various ways to remove these obstacles and implement their agendas. If such a path is not followed, the desired results cannot be achieved since senior managers do not show the necessary sensitivity to the reform efforts to improve management and simplify bureaucratic procedures. In general, to prevent conservatism, continuous improvement, renewal, reform, and reorganization studies are used. However, due to these limited studies, efficiency cannot be achieved. Because reform work is a process that requires continuity, and its interruption does not bring results. Since every innovation loses its meaning due to constant change and development, it is inevitable to carry out ongoing reform studies (Çevikbaş, 2014, p. 96). Bureaucracies' need to constantly renew themselves can lead to a vicious circle at the last point. In this respect, organizational problems of bureaucracies may cause problems to grow and continue as a result of equivalent and mutual interaction with functional problems.

Functional Problems of Bureaucracy

Prescriptiveness and Avoiding Responsibility

Prescriptivism, one of the most critical functional problems of the public bureaucracy in Turkey, is usually a result of the detailed regulation of laws and the lack of initiative of the administrators in the face of events and problems, or it is the product of suspicion towards the citizen. The fact that the rules are detailed and the staff are not given discretion is, in one aspect, the legislative body's desire to operate the bureaucracy in line with its own will. On the other hand, it occurs due to the tendency of senior managers to subject lower-level employees to their own will and keep them under their control. In addition, prescriptiveness is one of the most frequently used methods by bureaucrats or civil servants to protect themselves from the risk of supervision (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 252). Here, the problem of domination or lack of initiative is one of the most important reasons leading to the blockage of the system that is expected to progress effectively and consistently. Because this problem simultaneously draws in more rules and details.

The structure of excessive prescriptivism and avoidance of responsibility within the Turkish public bureaucracy, on the other hand, leads to bureaucratism as a pathological result of the

bureaucracy. This situation degrades bureaucratic values over time. For example, there are delays in processes, the system runs late, and decisions are taken late due to excessive fragmentation of tasks. Again, many reasons, such as the desire to conclude the problems as a form of all contact and the inability to understand the bureaucratic style that developed in this process, are among the reasons for this degeneration process (Tortop, et al., 2012, p. 475).

Centralism, which was evaluated within the organizational problems of the public bureaucracy, meant that subordinates could not take initiative. In a management approach where subordinates cannot take the initiative and are not authorized, bureaucrats' avoidance of responsibility can occur in public bureaucracies as a normal functional problem. Because, by stating that the employees do not fall within their jurisdiction, they can claim that they act by the rules.

Politicization and Nepotism in Administration

Public administration is seen as the executive tool of political power and tries to dominate the bureaucracy to carry out political power policies effectively and efficiently. Continuous control of the bureaucracy by the political power, trying to break its power in the administration and bring it to a state that serves the purposes of the government, causes the bureaucracy to be exposed to continuous political influence. This situation leads to the politicization of public administration issues in Turkey. One of the most important indicators of the administration's politicization is "the widespread use of political appointments in every regime shift". These developments cause reactions in all segments of society. These political appointments are never limited to high administrators but go down to technical practitioners and lower levels (Yılmaz and Kılavuz, 2002, p. 19).

Nepotism, another type of degeneration in administration, emerges in two ways. The first is that factors such as acquaintance, friend, relative, fellow countryman, or political affinity play a primary role in entering public services without consideration of merits and qualifications. In addition, factors such as graduate education and professional solidarity can be added. In areas where nepotism prevails, exams are often just a formality. In some cases where written exams are based on objective principles, an environment suitable for the realization of nepotism can be provided by inviting more candidates than the number to be taken to the oral exams. The second type of nepotism is that factors such as votes, support for the party, or ideological affiliation effectively distribute public services rather than need and availability criteria (Eryılmaz, 2007, pp. 253-254). As a result of the first type of nepotism, the staff in the state offices can be used as an employment area for people who are not qualified. This causes disruption of work and a decrease in service quality. The first type of favouritism, government offices can be used as an employment area for people with no qualifications. This leads to disruption of work and a decrease in service quality. This problem, which is expressed as service nepotism; is an action that is faced in almost all transactions, from granting large-scale tenders to obtaining the license of a small business (Cengiz, 2009: 3). On the other hand, the second type of nepotism causes economic, social, cultural, etc., imbalances between the regions that increases continuously (Gökçe and Şahin, 2002, p. 15).

Nepotism and politicization of the administration are one of the main problems that stand in the way of the efficient functioning of the public bureaucracy. Because the most basic feature that distinguishes good from bad administration from Plato to the present day has been the dominance of the public over private interests. For a corruption-free, efficient and effective public bureaucracy, every public official must look out for the common interest of the society against his private interest.

Corruption and Bribery

Many researchers have avoided defining corruption, mainly because the meaning of unethical behaviour – and corruption underpins it – differs from one culture to another. Unethical behaviour in one culture may be socially acceptable in another. For a definition: corruption in general, includes nepotism, bribery, patronage and other unfair ways adopted by public servants and

the like to obtain certain socially and legally prohibited favours (Dwivedi, 1967, p. 245). Bribery, as the most common type of corruption, is a problem in both bureaucracy and politics. In the Turkish Legal Dictionary (1991, p. 288), bribery is defined as the taking of money or goods or providing any benefit that is not required to be given for a job that a civil servant is legally obliged to do.

Behaviours such as bribery, embezzlement, extortion, abuse of civil service duty, etc., are all problems embodied in the concept of corruption. In Turkey, contrary to the laws, there is a general feeling that bribery was a common practice. However, since it has not been proven, its extent cannot be revealed precisely. On the other hand, excessive prescriptiveness, centralization of authority, insufficient service supply, prohibitionist understanding of the state, deterioration of the social structure, and cumbersome bureaucracy can be listed as the most important factors that feed bribery (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 254). This situation is the most striking in forming pejorative meanings attributed to bureaucracies. The fact that bureaucracies create a perception of civil servants with such problematic and damaging examples, especially at the point of public service, may also jeopardize the credibility of institutions.

Following up Processes with Intermediaries

Intermediaries can be an institution or person. Due to the complexity and prescriptiveness of the bureaucratic structure in Turkey, obtaining services through intermediaries and brokers is a common practice. Laymen who do not know what the processes are and how the process works and who also feel weakness before the public bureaucracy are compelled to refer to intermediaries in the pursuit of their affairs. Notably, members of parliament, local nobles, political party administrators, and former bureaucrats are among the people that citizens use as intermediaries in carrying out their affairs (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 254).

According to the data of the studies, political figures are the leading clusters that mediate between the public and the administration. Some professional groups also play an intermediary role in citizen-government relations. Lawyers can be counted among these groups. This service is both efficient and widespread. In addition, brokers and consultants can mainly deal with such a job. Those who can benefit from the services of these professions try to get the chance to get results faster and in their favour from the administration. The last group of mediation is the public officials themselves. Public officials can also act as intermediaries due to acquaintance relationships, colleagues' requests, political expectations, and sometimes financial expectations (Yılmaz and Kılavuz, 2002, p. 28).In addition, among the reasons for the widespread application of intermediaries in administration; bureaucratic administration tradition, insufficient public information about processes, lack of convenience, the complexity of processes, lack of employment, or indifference of officials in explaining bureaucratic documental processes can be listed (Eryılmaz, 2007, p. 254-255).

The organizational and functional problems of the bureaucracy listed above are problems recognized by Turkish public bureaucracy and are tried to be solved under the name of reform and reorganization. Transparency, decentralization, participation in management, and the establishment of ethical values are seen as solutions to the structural and functional problems of bureaucracy in upper policy texts such as government programs and development plans. The ongoing problems of the Turkish public bureaucracy are also seen in policy texts such as development plans and government programs (Altan, 2010; Lamba, 2015). What stands out in these policy texts is that over the years, some problems have recurred. Therefore, the maneuvers of the public bureaucracy to get rid of these problems were not sufficient and took place in later policy texts.

Conclusion

According to Weber, bureaucracy embodies an organizational structure defined by hierarchy, division of labor, explicit rules, and impersonal interactions, aimed at bolstering efficiency and rational decision-making. Within the realm of the Turkish public bureaucracy, several issues have

emerged, often stemming from a divergence from Weberian principles. Instances include allegations of corruption and nepotism in hiring and promotion practices, contradicting the merit-based progression fundamental to bureaucratic systems. Additionally, concerns have been voiced regarding the lack of transparency and accountability in decision-making processes, running counter to the notion of well-defined rules and regulations.

Weber delineated the ideal bureaucratic model, highlighting principles like hierarchical authority, strict division of labor, an unwaveringly structured management system, documented regulations, and impersonality. Departures from these principles have engendered both organizational and operational challenges. For instance, rigid enforcement of hierarchy has led to centralization and organizational expansion. Erosion in adherence to rule-bound conduct has resulted in excessive paperwork, formalism, favoritism, managerial opacity, inefficiency, incompetence, corruption, bribery, and nepotism. Furthermore, deviations from certain principles often give rise to additional problems. For instance, as organizations expand, nepotism tends to escalate, fostering an environment conducive to corruption and bribery.

The historical continuity of centralism, bureaucratic red tape, administrative secrecy, and nepotism from the Ottoman Empire to the present remains entrenched within the Turkish public bureaucracy. Despite efforts post-2000 to establish a legal foundation for an ethical administrative culture, these persisting issues continue to prevail. This study aims to underscore the structural and operational shortcomings within the Turkish public bureaucracy, aligning them with the fundamental tenets of Weberian bureaucracy. Evidently, each predicament in Turkish public administration appears to stem from a deviation from the core characteristics outlined in Weberian bureaucracy theory. Furthermore, it's evident that deviations from one principle within the Turkish public bureaucracy intricately affect other associated characteristics.

When analyzing the problems within the Turkish public bureaucracy alongside the Weberian principles, two critical points emerge: (a) Every issue within Turkish public administration arises due to a departure from Weberian bureaucracy theory. (b) These issues are interlinked, forming a complex web; for instance, favoritism triggers incompetence, which in turn fosters a culture of evading responsibility. This interdependency creates a cascade of problems. Moreover, persistent accountability and transparency issues hinder public engagement in decision-making processes, limiting citizen involvement in policy development. This limitation can result in policies that inadequately represent the populace's needs and preferences. Overall, it seems that the Turkish public bureaucracy has struggled to fully embody the principles of Weberian bureaucracy, leading to a range of problems and challenges. Further research is needed to more fully understand the specific factors that have contributed to these issues and to identify potential solutions.

References

Akçakaya, M. (2016). Bureaucratic theories and bureaucratic problems in Turkish public administration. *Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, Gazi University, 18*(3), 669-694.

Altan, Y. (2010). Turkish public personnel regime in development plans. *Suleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, 15*(1), 423–439.

Aydın, A. H. (2004). *Fundamental problems in the Turkish public administration system and contemporary approaches.* Gazi Kitabevi.

Baransel, A. (1979). *Evolution of contemporary management thought: Classical and neo-classical management and organizational theories*. Fatih Matbaası.

Bent, F. T. (1969). The Turkish bureaucracy as an agent of change. *Journal of Comparative Administration, 1*(1), 47–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009539976900100104

Cengiz, M. (2009). *Structuring of corruption in public bureaucracy.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences.

Çevik, H. H. (2004). *Türkiye'de kamu yönetimi sorunları*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Çevikbaş, R. (2014). Bureaucracy theory and its administrative function. *Journal of Economics and Management Research, 3*(2), 75-102.

Durgun, Ş. (2002). Bureaucratic politics in Turkish public administration. *Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, Gazi University, 4*(2), 83-102.

Dwivedi, O. P. (1967). Bureaucratic corruption in developing countries. *Asian Survey, 7*(4), 245-253.

Eryılmaz B. (2013) *Bürokrasi ve siyaset bürokratik devletten etkin yönetime*. Alfa Yayınları.

Eryılmaz, B. (2007). *Kamu yönetimi-düşünceler, yapılar, fonksiyonlar*. Erkam Matbaası.

Fişek, K. (1972). Management and humor. *Journal of Public Administration, 5*(3), 14-40.

Gökçe, O. ve Şahin, A. (2002). Problems and solution proposals of Turkish bureaucracy in the 21st century. *Journal of Social and Economic Research, Suleyman Demirel University*, 3, 1-27.

Gültepe, N. (2009). *Mührün gücü-ilk islam devletlerinde ve Osmanlılarda bürokrasi*. Ötüken Yayınları.

Heper, M. (1973). The political role of bureaucracy in Ottoman-Turkish state: Some observations from the perspective of public administration theory. *Journal of Public Administration, 6*(2), 29-40.

İnalcık, H. (2014). *Devlet-i 'aliyye Osmanlı İmparatorluğu üzerine araştırmalar – ıı: Tagayyür ve fesad (1603-1656): bozuluş ve kargaşa dönemi*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

İnalcık, H. (2014). *Studies on the high Ottoman state: Transformation and turmoil (1603-1656): Period of decline and chaos*. Turkey Is Bank Cultural Publications.

Karpat, K. (2006). Osmanlı tarihinin dönemleri: yapısal bir karşılaştırmalı yaklaşım. (Ed. Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman and the World*), (Trans.: M. Armağan, Ö. Baldık, et al.), Ufuk Book.

Lamba, M. (2015). Reflections of the new public administration understanding in Turkey: A qualitative examination through government programs. Suleyman Demirel University *Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, 20*(1), 127–141.

Marume, S.B.M. & Jubenkanda, R. R. (2016). Centralization and decentralization. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science,* 6, 106-110.

Mises, L. V. (2000). *Bürokrasi* (Trans. F. Ergin & A. Yayla). Liberte Y.

Mouzelis, N. (2001). *Örgüt ve bürokrasi* (Trans. H. B. Akın). Çizgi Yayıncılık.

Özer, M.A. (2013). Reconstruction efforts in management against Weber's bureaucracy. *GJEBS, 2*(4), 43-57.

Öztaş, N. (2015). *Yönetim-yönetim ve örgüt kuramları*. Otorite Yayınları.

Parkinson, N. (1958). *Parkinson's law or the pursuit of progress*. John Murray.

Republic of Turkey Presidency Strategy and Budget Directorate (2022). Public Employment. Retrieved from https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kamu-istihdami/ on June 27, 2022.

Shafritz, J.M., Russell, E. W., & Borick, C.P. (2013). *Introducing public administration.* Routledge.

Sobacı, M.Z. (2005). Evaluation of problems in Turkish public administration in the context of new public management. *Liberal Thought, 10*(38-39), 161-174.

Tortop, N. İşbir, E., Aykaç, B. Yayman, H. & Özer, M.A.(2012). *Yönetim bilimi*. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Turkish Legal Dictionary (1991), Türk Hukuk Kurumu.

Weber, M. (1952). The essentials of bureaucratic organization: an ideal type construction. In R. K. Merton, A. P. Gray, B. Hockey, H.C. Selvin (Eds.), *Bureaucracy*. The Free Press Collier Macmillan Limited, 18-27.

Weber, M. (2014). *Bürokrasi ve otorite.* (Trans. B. Akın), Adres Yayınları.

Yılmaz, A. & Kılavuz, R. (2002). Notes on operational problems of Turkish public bureaucracy. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Cukurova University, 3*(2), 17-21.

Beyan ve Açıklamalar (Disclosure Statements)

1. Araştırmacıların katkı oranı beyanı / Contribution rate statement of researchers:

    1. Yazar/First author %40,
    2. Yazar/Second author %30,
    3. Yazar/Third author %30.

2. Yazarlar tarafından herhangi bir çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir (No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors).