

AN APPROACH TO THE MAXIMIZATION
OF OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY IN A
BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION

Ralf Yorque

September 1975

WP-75-119

Working Papers are not intended for distribution outside of IIASA, and are solely for discussion and information purposes. The views expressed are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect those of IIASA.

SYNOPSIS

Many authors have contributed to the understanding of the nature of bureaucracy. In general, however, they can be sorted into two major groups, those who discuss ideal bureaucracies without problems or defects, and those who concentrate on explanations of why and how things go wrong.

That most organizations have symptoms of illness is apparent to even the casual observer. However, it should be obvious that most of these organizations do produce some useful output. Trains and aeroplanes do run more or less on time, the post office eventually delivers most of the mail, automobiles and other mechanical devices manage to run to the limited satisfaction of most consumers.

This paper provides an understanding of why things go right and how they can be made to go even better. According to Parkinson, things go right when an organization has not reached a level of sophistication or maturity sufficient to substitute work with activity throughout all of its levels. Peter would say that things go right because the time delays inherent in

promotion through the hierarchy delay the promotion of competent personnel so that not every person has reached his level of incompetence at any one time. Thus, there are a few competent personnel at every level at any time to ensure that some useful work gets done. According to both theories then, the amount of useful work is inversely proportional to the maturity and degree of stability of the organization. This paper, however, suggests that even mature organizations can become comparatively efficient when management is made incapable of interfering with the useful output of subordinates.

The theory is postulated that competent workers at the lowest level of a hierarchy know what the overall objectives of the organization are, and proceed to do work to meet these objectives. Competent managers, therefore, can contribute little to the output, but being competent can and will interfere in such a manner that the worker spends more and more time on reports, meetings, etc. to the detriment of the objectives of the organization. An incompetent manager will be recognized by the workers as such, and thus easily can be kept happy and busy through minimal effort on the

part of the worker, thus leaving the working level free to achieve the objectives of the organization. From this insight comes the proposition that the worst thing an organization possibly can do is promote its competent personnel. They must be kept at the "work" level as opposed to the "activity" level which must be reserved for incompetents.

It is recognized that, in the present climate of beliefs, this is not easy. However, through analysis of various successful organizations and historical practices, it becomes apparent that this approach already has been taken in some organizations, either consciously or unconsciously.

AN APPROACH TO THE MAXIMIZATION OF OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY IN A BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION

Introduction

The general theory of Parkinsonian Optimality¹ defines a Parkinsonian structure as an organization which is so occupied with a variety of internal activities, primarily in the form of meetings, that it has very little if any resources left available to do any "work".² Upon examining most bureaucratic³ systems in government or in large corporate entities it will be seen that in the upper echelons this is very often the case but, surprisingly enough, a certain amount of "work" does get done.

-
- 1 Zelman, M., Towards a General Theory of Parkinsonian Optimality, Ottawa, 1973,
 - 2 "Work" in this context is defined as a service or the making of a product for someone outside the organization under study.
 - 3 Bureaucracy is used in the sense described by Downs who defines a bureau as:-
 - (a) It is large
 - (b) A majority of its members are full time workers who depend upon their employment for most of their income
 - (c) The initial hiring of personnel, their promotion within the bureau and their retention therein are based, at least partly, upon some type of assessment of the way they have performed or can be expected to perform their organizational roles

This approach to the maximization of operational efficiency in a bureaucratic organization will explain this apparent anomaly and suggest some criteria and guidelines for the selection of senior executives as well as working level subordinates to ensure that "work" continues to be done.

Continuation of footnote from p. 1

- (d) The major portion of its output is not directly or indirectly evaluated in any markets external to the organization by means of voluntary quid pro quo transactions.

Downs, Anthony, Inside Bureaucracy. (Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1967)

Analysis

It can be demonstrated by probability theory that if a superior wishes to convey general instructions (as opposed to orders) to a subordinate, and we define this in terms of a relevant message of length \underline{n} in a speech⁴ of length \underline{N} , and if we assume some percentage of loss uniformly across the entire speech, then the probability of receipt of a correct message decreases as $\frac{N}{n}$ increases.

Basically, there are four main groups of losses in the message content. First of all, since the subordinate cannot possibly maintain 100% attention during a lengthy discourse, automatically he will lose some part of the total content and thus there is a probability of losing part of the message. Secondly, if the discourse is long enough there is a reasonable probability that, even if all the bits of information survive, they will be so mixed up that a part of the message content will be lost.

4 Speech in this context will include written communications although it is recognized that the probability of message loss is less with written communication than with oral. On the other hand, it may be argued that a written communication is more likely to be misunderstood because of the absence of body language and instantaneous feedback.

Thirdly, the recipient may make an error in deciding which part of the speech is the message. Fourthly, since many words have multiple meanings, some contradictory, the recipient of the message may impute a false meaning to the message.

This paper does not include a detailed mathematical analysis of the probability of a message getting through from one level in the hierarchy to the next level down. However, it can be demonstrated that the probability of a useful instruction from the chief executive of an organization arriving at the working level is virtually nil.⁵ Since senior personnel then see that the organization does not function in accordance with their wishes, reports will be demanded, meetings will be set up and more activities (as opposed to "work") will be generated.

5 See "The cumulative effects of authority leakage" Downs - op. cit - pp. 134-136, also G. Tullock - "The Politics of Bureaucracy"; pp. 142-193 (Washington D.C. Public Affairs Press 1965)

This would be expected to result in lower operational efficiencies⁶ and -finally - complete chaos.

And yet, surprisingly enough, this does not happen, and therefore we must ask ourselves what autogenous healing mechanisms exist in large bureaucratic organizations to arrest or possibly reverse this apparently inevitable slide into chaos.

Perhaps the best explanation is in accordance with McGregor's Theory Y⁷ that people are essentially honest and reliable and want to do a good job. Thus at the working level the staff are highly output oriented and will do their best to do a good job as they see their job to be. Since most large organizations have an apparently inherent objective stated in the name of the

6 Operational efficiency has been defined as:-
$$\frac{\text{Number of man hours available for "work" in the organization}}{\text{Total number of man hours available for all purposes in the organization}}$$

7 McGregor, Douglas, The Human Side of Enterprise (NY, McGraw-Hill, 1960). McGregor's theory Y is based on the need for mutual realization of both individual and organizational goals.

organization, the staff at the working level do not have too much difficulty in developing a realization or appreciation of their mission within their organization. For example, the employee of a large telephone company would see his function as maintaining and/or improving telephone communications no matter what broad national policy issues are being publicly debated by the president of his company. Similarly, the employee of a railroad company presumably has developed a general idea that the function of the organization which employs him is to run a railroad and therefore he will do whatever he can to contribute to such an objective.⁸

It easily can be observed that in most large organizations the staff at the working level look on company policies, administrative regulations and such like as being constraints on their operations and very often will do their utmost to bend the regulations when they interfere with

8 In this context, it becomes very interesting to consider the implication of a corporate name change which very often today does not reflect any kind of function for the organization. The current business literature has many examples of corporate name changes which try to give an identity to the diversity of an organization rather than illustrating its particular function.

the efficient carrying out of operations.⁹

If this is really the nature of the large bureaucratic organization one then should look for optimum tactics and policies to maximize this potential efficiency at the working level. Since the habit of bending or bypassing administrative regulations, policy guidelines, etc. is already well ingrained at the working level, one immediate solution presents itself. At the present time, one of the difficulties encountered in the process of bending regulations to suit operational needs is that the staff at the working level must be careful about being found out at some time in the future since top management, even when having very little real authority to control operations, still may have the power to punish.¹⁰

9 See The Law of Counter Control - Downs - op. cit - p. 147. This law states that "The greater the effort made by a sovereign or top level official to control the behavior of subordinate officials, the greater the efforts made by those subordinates to evade or counteract such control".

10 It is interesting to note that, with the advent of collective bargaining in most organizations, management generally has lost the effective power to punish for incompetence but has retained the power to punish for formal insubordination.

Thus, if one takes care to appoint obvious incompetents at the very top of an organization, the staff at the working level will have some confidence that their "misdeeds" will not be found out and thus they will be able to go ahead with their operations of providing a service to someone without any worries about repercussions from above.¹¹

However, it must be remembered that in most real life organizations the formal chief executive in reality has very little or no influence on day to day operations at

11 In this context some of the recent events in the U.S. Department of Justice may be cited as an example. To quote: "The loyalty that was envinced was to neither a man nor an Administration but to an Institution....But the Department of Justice is an uncommon institution, a peculiar mix of legal responsibilities and political discretion which "derives its strength", as one thirty year veteran puts it "from the fact that it is an agency which has never really been managed". It has survived the best and the worst of leaders."

The Undoing of the Justice Department, After the Saturday Night Massacre:- Sandford J. Ungar - Atlantic Monthly, January 1974, p. 30.

the working level¹² and the real problem lies in providing some protection from interference by middle and upper middle management.

This then opens up the entire problem of staffing an organization in such a way that its "work" type of activities can be carried out efficiently while its hierarchical superstructure is inherently powerless to interfere with the work output. At the present time, the most popular and accepted methods of staff selection in large organizations are:

- 1) Competitive examinations
- 2) Evaluation by supervisors¹³

12 See Tullock - op. cit., and Downs - op. cit., for excellent discussions regarding diminishing control in large bureaucracies and the impact of competing personal objectives on chains of authority.

13 Selection by nepotism, while recognized as a fact of life, will not be discussed here because prevailing social attitudes frown on this type of personnel selection. Nevertheless, it may be useful to reintroduce a form of intellectual nepotism to ensure that the most senior executives are "obviously" suited to their positions. It must be remembered that while competents who are promoted from the working level carry a certain amount of goodwill and trust with them to delay their demonstration of incompetence or irrelevance, the converse is also true. An obvious nepotistic appointment starts with a fund of mistrust which will may overshadow any possible competence.

However the basic problem remains that the only valid examination for competence in a new position is the actual performance of the duties of that position. Thus, any competitive examination is an exercise in clairvoyance based on an analogy to a future reality. Except in the comparatively rare situation of the formal confirmation of an existing position, the same argument applies to evaluation by supervisors.

Therefore, it can be said that successful candidates for promotion have not necessarily satisfied the requirements of their new positions but, instead, have exhibited an ability to satisfy the criteria for the analogous, or shadow position posited by the selection method. Thus, at the very least, successful candidates must be "practical psychologists" with an ability to out-guess the evaluators and simulate the desired behavior which, in all probability, is not correlated to anything outside the evaluation situation. Traditionally, this desired behavior has been labelled "competence" and it is the thesis of this paper that a redefinition of this term may achieve the organization objective of

operational efficiency.¹⁴

Since we seek operational efficiency at the working level it becomes evident that efficient workers never should be promoted and this then suggests a basic principle, namely:-

Promotion should only be based on demonstrated incompetence.¹⁵

It is appreciated that this approach obviates the problems associated with the normal operation of the classic Peter Principle which states that in a bureaucracy man will rise to his level of incompetence.¹⁶ In the opinion of the

14 I am indebted for this insight to Prof. K. Wilson of Queen's University who kindly reviewed an early draft of this paper.

15 This has been defined as the Retep Principle and will be referred to in this way from now on in this paper. It should be noted that "incompetence" is used here in an objective sense. i.e. incompetent to carry out the function defined by organizational need. This capability or lack of capability then is relabelled "competence" in a subjective sense for staffing purposes. See supra pp. 9 and 10

16 See Peter, Laurence J., and Hull, Raymond, -
The Peter Principle: Why Things Always Go Wrong
(New York, Bantam Books Inc. 1969)

author of this paper, the Peter Principle presupposes a quasi-passive system of management where people who are competent in a particular function automatically will be promoted until they reach their level of incompetence. The Retep Principle however, states that, for an efficient organization, competent people never will be promoted, while the only basis for promotion will be demonstrated incompetence. Thus, only the obviously incompetent clerks will be promoted to the officer or management level, the most obviously incompetent officer will be made a section head, the most obviously incompetent section head a division chief, etc.

Such an approach would lead to some immediate and direct benefits. The analysis leading to the Parkinsonian Optimality theory¹⁷ clearly demonstrates that middle management has very little if any time for intelligently directing the work of subordinates at the working level. Earlier in this paper it was pointed out that the probability of receiving a valid instruction at the

17 op. cit.

working level is very close to zero.¹⁸ However, when a competent member of the working level staff is promoted, for example to section head, he carries with him a certain amount of respect from his previous colleagues. They will assume that, although most of the people in middle management are incompetent, their erstwhile colleague, on the basis of his past demonstrated competence, must be different. Thus the working level staff will begin by accepting the instructions and advice of the new manager in the honest belief that the real quality of management now has changed.¹⁹

It will not be until some distance along the "unlearning curve" that it generally will be recognized that whatever his previous merits, their erstwhile colleague is, possibly not by his own fault, as irrelevant, if not as incompetent as his current colleagues.

18 supra p. 4

19 As an irreverent aside one might compare this to an old definition of marriage as "A triumph of hope over experience."

This entire problem can be avoided by promoting obvious incompetents who do not carry with them any capital of good will and understanding. They, therefore, will be ignored by their erstwhile colleagues from the first day of their appointment thus causing no interference with working level operations.

Two main arguments may be advanced against this basic proposition. First of all, one may argue that all one needs to do is appoint a competent and energetic chief executive who promptly will re-direct the entire organization to ensure that it does precisely what needs to be done in the most efficient manner possible. Simple logic of course indicates that this argument will not stand up. If a competent chief executive is introduced to an organization he, presumably, would start off by doing some thinking about the organization and probably would demand a variety of reports about the objectives of the organization, its current status, etc. from his immediate subordinates. Since these high level reports are basically aggregations of sub-section reports, the first and most immediate impact will be a demand for new kinds of data from the working level and this will bite into

the available amount of time to carry out "work". When these suitably distorted aggregations finally arrive on the chief executive's desk, presumably he will issue some orders and, as a competent chief executive, will want to ensure that his orders are being carried out. Thus the arrival of randomized instructions²⁰ from above with the requirement of further reports will confuse the working level even more and thus turn an existing stable situation into a completely chaotic one.

20 It can be demonstrated that if there is a message content loss between any two levels in the hierarchy of an organization, say between a superior and several subordinates, there is a high probability that the perceived message received by each subordinate will be different. Continuing this process down the line to the bottom of the middle management layer, there is then a high probability of every manager at this level having a different idea of his information requirements from the working level and his instructions to that level. Since, in general, the working level officer receives operational direction from his direct superior but also functional direction from other managers (such as accounting, administration, capital asset utilization, etc.) he must try and develop a rational interpretation of this mass of instructions to translate them into action. As previously stated, the probability of getting a true message at the working level approaches zero and thus, as a corollary, the probability of multiple messages having a random distribution approaches 100%.

The other criticism against the Retep Principle is that, whether the chief executive is competent or incompetent, he will not accept the idea of not having any control over his organization. This again can be countered by a very simple analogy from nature. It has long been observed that migratory birds of some species fly in a V formation in their annual migrations and it has always been argued that there is a natural structure of leadership with a senior, more mature, or wiser bird taking the lead and showing his flock where they ought to be going. With the advent of modern photographic methods however, many flights of migratory birds were recorded and soon it became evident that the only distinguishing characteristic of the bird flying at the apex of the V formation was that he or she liked flying at the apex of the V formation. Major changes of direction seemed to be originated by a group decision which caused the entire formation to veer to the right or left, sometimes leaving the "leader" to continue on his own in the previous direction. When the leader peers over one shoulder and sees that there is nobody following, he then will turn sharply and fly as fast as possible until he gets back to the point of the formation when, once again, he will proceed to fly merrily along.

The human analogy to this organizational structure is that the chief executive of an organization which is generally recognized as being efficient and doing a good job of carrying out its responsibilities will assume, as a matter of course, that it is his wise and enlightened leadership that is causing this to happen. Therefore he will not demand excessive reports nor give too many orders. As a general rule one would expect the chief executive of such an organization to take a personal interest in awarding long service pins, gold watches on retirement, personally attending staff parties, encouraging charity drives, etc. Further, one would expect such a chief executive to concern himself with macro policy problems, broad national objectives, etc.

However, there is the problem of co-ordinating the activities of members of the working level. In most organizations this co-ordinating function begets a planning function, then a policy function, then a directing function, then an audit function, etc. This hierarchy then begets a number of committees, i.e. executive committee, management committee, co-ordinating committee, policy committee, etc. Thus we appear to have

demonstrated the need for a Parkinsonian structure which will inevitably lead back to the presently existing type of bureaucracy.

There are a number of theories which attempt to explain why this apparently inevitable process does not occur. Peter's analysis suggests that the introduction of class barriers into a hierarchy greatly retards the growth of organizational incompetence and may in fact postpone it indefinitely.²¹ Since members of the subordinate class are restricted from entry into the higher ranks, they find little opportunity to advance to their level of incompetence.

Tracy²² suggests that in our society women form just such a subordinate class. As a specific, he cites the example of secretaries who cannot be promoted to the management levels no matter how competent they are.

21 "The Peter Principle: Why Things Always Go Wrong - Op. cit. - pp. 62-64

22 Lane Tracy - Postscript to the Peter Principle - Harvard Business Review - Boston - July/August 1972

Although there are ranks within the class of secretaries, i.e. file clerks, typists, stenographers, receptionists, etc. they are not in a truly hierarchical relation to each other. Thus, a promotion for a secretary means a marginal increase in salary, (generally less than the difference between her ex-superior and the newer, more senior superior) considerably more responsibility and work BUT no increase in formal authority. Consequently the authority structure provides no motivation to try and rise in the hierarchy. Tracy²³ describes this relationship between secretaries as a horizontal hierarchy which is defined as "a hierarchy which contains many positions which are all on the same level of authority."

This insight may perhaps explain how working organizations actually satisfy their needs for co-ordination, policy planning, etc. First and foremost, of course, we have the parahierarchy of secretaries who know what really is happening and can transmit real information among working groups under the nominal direction of the

23 op. cit.

executives. Then there are administrative assistants, filing clerks, etc. who have tremendous ranges of knowledge about the operations of the organization. When one considers the very large proportion of women in these activities, and the demonstrated capabilities of most women in running complex households, this explanation becomes overwhelmingly attractive. The verification of this hypothesis however must be left to other researchers.²⁴

The real difficulty in implementing the more rational Retep Principle of organizational structure is, of course, the requirement for an entirely different philosophy and basis of judgement for the personnel community or group in the organization. Basically there are two approaches one might take to solve this problem. First of all, if one assumes that the external directing group,

24 This hypothesis however forces us to re-examine the entire concept of women's liberation and sexual equality. If women are to be allowed to compete freely for the most senior positions, there would be a real danger of women also rising to their level of incompetence and destroying the competent parahierarchy which now maintains most organizations.

such as the board of directors, recognize the validity of this approach they may recruit a very small core of people with similar beliefs who then will make suitable appointments to their own staff with guidelines for "competence" carefully defined so that only incompetents may be promoted.²⁵ In case it is thought that this is completely impossible, it must be remembered that one of the basic precepts of organization is that:

"Rank is a matter of fact,
competence is a matter of opinion."²⁶

There is still the problem of possible discontent at the working level if all promotions are restricted to obvious incompetents. It is suggested that this can easily be solved by making salaries and "perks" at the working level directly output related and allowing, or deliberately creating, very large salary overlaps between the highest working levels and management. Thus, the outstanding producers at the working level well might have a higher salary, better furniture,

25 See supra p. 10

26 Part of dogma developed by Systems Analysis Group, Treasury Board, 1969.

more freedom, etc. than their nominal superior in the management level. This already is the case with some professionals in large organizations as well as sales personnel on commission and so the principle is well established. It only remains to broaden the utilization of this approach across the entire organization.

An alternative tactic would be to place very heavy emphasis on personal suitability in the subjective sense on all candidates for promotion to middle management with a very low emphasis on technical or operational competence. Thus one might require that everybody at middle management level must have a good understanding of the classics and an appreciation of history. For many years it was believed that this was the preferred method of producing broad minded managers as opposed to the much more narrow specialists.²⁷ Considering the

27 This might help explain the observed fact that new industries achieve quite remarkable effectiveness while often appearing to be inefficient. As the industry matures, it develops and promotes experts, becomes less effective and appears more efficient. This has been discussed brilliantly by C. Northcote Parkinson in his books "The Law and the Profits" (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company 1960) and "Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration" (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957)

normal cycle in managerial philosophy it should not be too difficult once again to introduce these kind of concepts within large organizations.

Another method which has historical backing in many organizations is to promote only by seniority. If this system is followed rigorously, the competent colleagues of the person promoted can have no valid enforceable objections and will not fall into the trap previously mentioned of assuming that management is becoming more competent. There may be some occasional loss when the most competent employee is also the most senior but, as he knows that he is being promoted on seniority only, he will have a tendency to regard his promotion as a reward for past services and a sort of pre-retirement bonus. In most cases, therefore, the promoted employee will prefer to relax in the new position and enjoy the honestly earned reward rather than interfere.

"Promotion by seniority", in almost all cases, can support the Retep principle if it is coupled with "pay by competence." Thus, if the most senior employee is also the most competent but is not due to retire soon,

he may refuse the promotion and accept greater pay instead. The promotion then going to the next senior and so on until the least competent is promoted.

The use of this method throughout the hierarchy could of course result in a rapid turnover of personnel at the most senior levels because of age. If this is considered to be a serious disadvantage for cosmetic reasons,²⁸ it may be combined with the previously suggested method of insisting that middle and higher level managers be schooled in the classics, philosophy, political science or other rigorous academic discipline.²⁹

There is still one possible major problem to be faced in the application of the Retep Principle. Inevitably and by accident an incompetent will be promoted to his level of competence. This can occur because many top flight managers are actually very poor at dealing with routine operations.

28 For practical efficiency reasons, it would obviously be an advantage, since a senior executive who retires before he can possibly become familiar with his job is most unlikely to interfere in operations.

29 I am indebted for the thought on the efficiency of the seniority system to my colleague J. MacLeod who kindly pointed out a number of the advantages of the system.

Obviously this danger must be guarded against by the personnel group, but failures do occur since latent capabilities are not always recognized. The solution to this problem is, of necessity, drastic since the "accidental competent" (A.C.) could seriously endanger the entire organization.

A first approach might be to interest or direct the A.C. into a major policy issue such as the influence of GATT on Women's Rights, etc. If the A.C. is really concerned about efficiency he might study the efficiency of the policy making process. If these solutions do not work, the directors of the organization are left with only two choices. If the A.C. is a good manager but lacks the basic insight to appreciate the Retep Principle, he must be fired "for insubordination" a charge that can be enforced in most bureaucratic organizations.³⁰ However, if he does have the necessary insight, he is a rare bird indeed and must be co-opted into the group

30 supra p. 7

of directors.³¹

There is always the possibility that the A.C. may be a "climber" as described by Downs,³² whose main objectives are the achievement of high position with its concomitant high salary, prestige, etc. As a climber, he therefore will simulate "competence" as defined by the organization and, if successful in this simulation, will be promoted to the highest levels. Since by Downs' definition the climber is concerned only with the organization's objectives to the extent that they parallel his own personal objectives, it is not in the climber's interest to "rock the boat" by attacking the philosophical underpinnings of the

31 It has been suggested by Woodside (Ministry of State for Urban Affairs - Ottawa - Private Communication) that the Peter Principle might be invoked to promote the A.C. to his level of incompetence and thus maintain stability in the organization. This however, brings up the horrifying possibility of the innate top flight manager who is progressively more competent as he moves up the organization. As demonstrated previously, he could destroy the organization if placed in a position of power and thus this alternative solution is not accepted by the author of this paper

32 Inside Bureaucracy - op. cit - pp. 92-96

organization or its personnel policy. Thus, the only real danger lies in the idealist who believes in the general philosophies of management taught in the more common texts and who has enough competence to seriously endanger the organization if allowed his head.

It may be argued that the kind of organizational structure suggested is unstable and could be remedied by a management group change as opposed to a change of chief executives only. This argument however ignores two vital protective mechanisms existing in every organization -

- a) The self justification syndrome requires middle management to defend the status quo since, after all, they were promoted on the basis of this definition of "competence."
- b) Newton's third law which states that "for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction." Thus the competent working level employees will not only bend regulations but will actively build defence mechanisms. Given the relative levels of competence, this puts the middle manager in a "no win" position.

Combining these two mechanisms it becomes evident that even an efficient top management group can do very little more than disrupt the organization and thus reduce operational efficiencies.

Summary

Considering the fact that many large organizations are neither led nor guided by their management and that most relevant work or services delivered outside the organization is carried out by self-motivated individuals at the working level, it becomes important to provide the working level with as much autonomy as possible. This can be achieved by following the Retep Principle which states that:

"Promotion should only be on
demonstrated incompetence"

At the same time, to initiate the changes necessary in managerial structure and eliminate the deleterious effects of partially competent management it is necessary to appoint an obviously incompetent chief executive. This will ensure that the staff at the working level will pay no attention whatsoever to policy guidelines or administrative directives and will get on quietly with carrying out the basic functions of the organization.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Boren, James H., "When in Doubt, Mumble" (New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company 1972)
- Downs, Anthony, "Inside Bureaucracy" (Boston, Little, Brown & Company, 1967)
- Lindblom, G.E. and Braybrooke, David, "A Strategy of Decision" (New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963)
- Lindblom, Charles E., "Bargaining, The Hidden Hand in Government" (Santa Monica, The Rand Corporation, RM-1434-RC, February 1955)
- Jay, Antony, "Management and Machiavelli" (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd., 1970)
- Martin, Thomas L. Jr., "Malice in Blunderland" (New York, McGraw Hill, 1973)
- Parkinson, C. Northcote, "The Law and the Profits" (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957)
- Parkinson, C. Northcote, "Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration" (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957)
- Peter, Laurence J., & Hull, Raymond, "The Peter Principle: Why Things Always Go Wrong" (N.Y., Bantam Books Inc., 1969)
- Tracy, Lane, "Postscript to the Peter Principle" (Boston, Harvard Business Review, July/August 1972)
- Tullock, G., "The Politics of Bureaucracy" (Washington D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1965)
- Ungar, Sandford J., "The Undoing of the Justice Department: After the Saturday Night Massacre" (Boston, Atlantic Monthly, January 1974)
- Wildavsky, Aaron, "The Politics of the Budgetary Process" (Boston, Little Brown & Company, 1964)
- Zelman, M., "Towards a General Theory of Parkinsonian Optimality," (Ottawa, 1973)
publication