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I.

(1) Public administration may be interpreted as a social system maintained partly by its own order and partly through environmental conditions in a complex and variable world. That environment includes above all three spheres, the general public served by the administration, the specific political institutions providing the bases of power and legitimation, and the administrative personnel with their individual and group interests. As a politico-administrative system, public administration is characterized by the following structures which keep it invariant towards the environment: the programme structure fixing the administrative tasks and thus the premises for proper decisions, the organizational structure which determines the pattern of communicative correlations, the process structure giving shape to the procedure of administrative action, and the personnel structure which constitutes the generalized pattern of action as to the civil servants.

Modern societies with their division of labour, power and competence are predisposed to further differentiation of social systems; within a system, the formation of systems may be repeated where the conditions internal to the overall
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system are again treated as environment and are once more subjected to selection by the delimitations of further systems. Accordingly, programmatic, organizational, procedural, and personal substructures are generated in each case which then form premises of administrative action. Discussing the subject of the intra-administrative organization, a combination of a systemic-abstract and institutional-concrete approach leads us to such problems as the base unit of organization, the division into departments, central units, the organization of directive functions, working groups and many more. Questions like what shall be the criteria for the subdivision of administration, whether projects need specific forms of organization, what function is to be attributed to the establishment of staffs, etc. are raised. However, we must not ignore the fact that characterizing social phenomena as intra-organizational is somewhat relative. From the viewpoint of overall government, departmental demarcations are an internal problem, from that of the individual ministries, they are an inter-organizational matter.

This system-theoretical and - if decision-making is regarded as a main function of public administration - also decision-theoretical approach at the same time marks out a paradigm of scientific work on administrative organization in the Federal Republic of Germany. This is not always made explicit but it becomes obvious in relevant discussions such as on the organization of planning. This is a matter of social, political and economic interrelations, which mean more than turning management know-how and business administration theory to account for public administration. In addition to the importance of the system- and decision-theoretical approach for organizational development, progress can be recorded in the juridical and dogmatic approach to state organization. Administrative law is nowadays not merely
understood as a fence for administrative action to protect society. But irrespective of the problem as to what degree legal forms can be effective for the formulation of inter- and intraorganizational relations, West German jurisprudence is still based on theoretical and methodological premises that make it difficult to cover the formation of organizational structures by juridical terms.

There are differing opinions on the use of politico-economic approaches for the development of organizational structures. These approaches follow two directions: neomarxist and liberal. Neomarxism mainly criticizes the "organized chaos of particular and competitive bureaucracies" which in their opinion are characteristic of the government machinery of the day and correspond to the prevailing capitalist conditions. A more constructive contribution is made by those introducing the model of sovists into the discussion of organizational structures. The economic theory of politics endeavouring to make use of the insight in market processes for inter-organizational relations has so far been applied mainly to the specific problems of interrelationship in the West German federal system. It should also be mentioned that - unlike the system- and decision-theoretical approach - the organizational-behaviourist way of thinking has made little headway in the state sector, either among administrative theorists or in administrative practice. The situation in the Federal Republic of Germany differs in this respect from the situation prevailing in the United States of America and is in accord with conditions in Europe.

Changes in public administration and corresponding research interests attract differing degrees of attention in the practical and theoretical fields. The idea of territorial reform in the Federal Republic of Germany, for instance aroused considerable interest. Scientists dealt with that subject in many forms as consultants, experts, and critics.
By comparison, developments of intra-administrative organization tend to be less significant. On the other hand, work capacities are available in theory and practice to tackle relevant organizational problems. In this context, it must be stressed first of all that in almost every administrative agency some special unit has been created and given competence for organizational matters. Such units range from division for organization in the Federal Ministry of the Interior with its comprehensive responsibilities to the limited possibilities of centralization in a small municipal administration. The prominent position of the unit for organization manifests itself in the fact that the standing orders generally contain specific stipulations on the organization unit head. As an example among the multitude of units for organization, the directorate for organization in the Hamburg senate agency for administration may be pointed out which, as a result of a singular constellation, has been contributing remarkable achievements to the development of organizational structures in recent years.

Beside activities within individual administrative units, there has always been organizational action going beyond the limits of the respective institutions. These deal with partly continuous and partly temporary tasks. Permanent work in the field of intra-administrative organizational development is for instance done by the Kommunale Gemeinschaftsstelle für Verwaltungsvereinfachung (KGSv) (Joint Centre for the Rationalization of Local Administration) in Cologne which is maintained by the communities. As a temporary form of activity, the Projektgruppe zur Reform der Struktur von Bundesregierung und Bundesverwaltung (Project Group for Government and Administrative Reform) has become generally known which, in the years 1959 to 1975, developed into an organizational experiment itself. Here,
we may link up with science, since that project group gave considerable impetus for discussion in the field of administrative science. Today, administrative organization is the subject of scientific teaching and research at universities and other scientific institutes, however under different aspects; in this connection, special mention is to be made of the Post-Graduate School for Administrative Sciences Speyer and of the German Section of the International Institute for Administrative Sciences because of their specific tasks. Finally, reference must be made to expert reports drawn up by a number of consulting firms on the internal organization in public administration.

(2) Basically, the intra-administrative organization in the Federal Republic of Germany has a hierarchical pyramid-shaped structure. The term "hierarchy" used here does not refer to personnel relations in the public administration. Social differentiation in the modern professional world and social life has permitted a relatively high degree of independence of organization and personnel which is legally manifested in the distinction made between office as a term of organizational law and office as a term of status law. Accordingly, "hierarchy" should not, as is often the case, be seen mainly in terms of personal disciplinary functions. It is rather the specifically organizational form of securing permanency of communicative interrelations without which no social system can survive. The administrative subunits are fitted together by the organizational structure to form a whole of relatively consistent and permanent arrangement. The hierarchical system places the competent parts into various correlations so as to determine superior and sub-orders but also juxtaposed orders. Administrative action with its divisions of labour, power and competence is thus tied to a factual structure of organizational units. This organizational pattern marks out a
decisive feature of modern state bureaucracies as have been explained in their relationality by Max Weber.

If the functionality of the hierarchical form of organization is to be assessed, also in consideration of conditions prevailing in the public administration of a social welfare state, the organizational structure may not be identified with the social system as a whole. In public administration, other structural premises for decision-making must be taken into account as well. One of them is that in a rule of law state law has to be respected both at top and lower levels. Besides, there is no plain congruence between hierarchy and end-means scheme in the sense that the higher levels represent the ends and the lower levels represent the means. Strictly speaking, the hierarchical structure of the administrative organization has proved to be so flexible a pattern of order for steering and coordination of administrative action with its division of labour that the public administration has time and again succeeded in meeting new demands on public action within that framework. Nor did the problem of specialization in the public sector of a technical civilization and scientific age bring about a fundamental change of structure. Even in such Western democracies where there is some dislike of the hierarchical idea, corresponding forms of organization have over and over again been taken as the basis for control and coordination of administrative action.

The fact that intra-administrative organization in the Federal Republic of Germany, too, reveals a clear hierarchy is therefore less astonishing. The following simplified models of a departmental administration on the one hand and a local authority on the other hand indicate this.
It is remarkable, however, how uniformly the hierarchical pyramid structure is observed. For instance, it is a general stipulation for Federal departments that independent bodies, offices, special sections and the like shall not be established outside the divisions and subdivisions. Organizational reality shows that there are relatively few deviations from the pyramid of hierarchical superior, juxtaposed and sub-orders. In this respect, West German administration differs from the organizational set-up in some other countries where a great variety of special offices are subordinate to the top level. It is true that the transparency of the strictly pyramid-shaped structure of organizational sub-units also implies some costs, for example, an international comparison leaves the impression that reorganization is quite difficult since shifts to organizational units not fitting into the scheme of divisions and sections and departments and offices will be hardly considered and there is correspondingly little room for variations, restructuring and dissolution of such units.

Beside the basic hierarchical pattern of intra-administrative organization, Germany has a tradition of non-hierarchical forms of organization. These have actually contributed to the formation of a consolidated administrative organization. Historically, they fulfilled the most varied functions ranging from consultancy, legal control, public involvement and the safeguarding of group interests to expert decision-making. In recent times, several theoretical and practical movements could be registered in the Federal Republic of Germany aiming in one way or the other at restructuring public administration along non-hierarchical lines. But the authors have not always been entirely clear as to what was to be achieved in this context. One may have had humane working conditions in mind, another may have thought of the political power of ranks and files, and
a third one may have been considering the intelligence of the administrative machinery.

Although it is thus better to discuss non-hierarchical structures of intra-administrative organization in connection with concrete organizational developments, it must be stressed beforehand that there is a multitude of collegiate bodies in the public administration, even if we consider that the establishment of an extensive and multi-stage administrative jurisdiction has decreased the importance of intra-administrative legal protection against acts of public authority. Organizational units with a collegiate constitution bear different names like committee, advisory board, working group, conference, etc. They may be anchored at different levels of the administrative pyramid, also at its top as for instance cabinets and town boards. They may have decision-making powers or merely advisory functions. They may be composed of politicians, permanent civil servants, honorary members. Their sizes may differ, and their modes of procedure may be formalized to varying degrees sometimes established by specific rules.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, local self-administration is most marked by collegiate features. This does not only apply to its directive organization. Many collegiate bodies representing interest and expert groups have been set up at this level of administration. On the whole, self-governing authorities dealing with social, economic and cultural affairs have collegiate bodies. There are classical fields like elections, examinations and arbitration where collegiate structures can be traced frequently. Scientific advice to political and administrative bodies is also furnished mainly within the scope of collegiate bodies. Today, above all the introduction of non-hierarchical forms of organization into the departmental system
is being discussed. By means of committees, advisory boards, working groups, commissions, staffs, project groups, etc. the government's capacity for information processing and formulation of interests is to be improved. These trends of organizational development must be seen against the background of increased demands on planning and coordination.

II.

(1) The above reference to non-hierarchical forms of organization makes clear that administrative science and administrative practice have favourite subjects. However, such accentuations do not suppress the fact that at any time reasonable solutions must be found for the classical problems of intra-administrative structuring. If we proceed on the basic pattern of hierarchical pyramid-shaped superior, juxtaposed and suborders with the inclusion of certain collegiate substructures, the problem of what viewpoints should be relied on for horizontal and vertical differentiations still has to be solved. However, before dealing on these lines with intra-organizational structures, it must be realized that the divisions of labour, power and competence between the individual administration authorities, i.e. inter-organizational correlations, already mark out the skeleton of potential intra-administrative configurations.

Part of that skeleton is determined by the mere general structure of state and administration. The political levels of Federal and Land authorities as well as local governments with their extensive responsibilities, the execution of Federal laws by the Laender, the principle of the unity of administration, reservations as to the
establishment of special authorities - these are only some of the premises with which intra-administrative organization must also be brought into line. Besides, there is a multitude of further inter-organizational distributions of competence. For example, the subject of intra-organizational structuring of a ministry can only be decided after its demarcation as against the rest of the government. What matters beyond this is whether a shift of tasks from the ministerial authority to subministerial administrative agencies is taken into consideration to relieve the political level. Such preconditions also include more quantitative aspects like the satisfactory operating size of an administrative authority.

Internal differentiation of administrative organization is often rendered particularly difficult by the problem of how to subdivide the horizontal dimension. Four principles of structuring can be traced in administrative practice: Firstly, the various external functions to be fulfilled by the administration in the material fields of policy of its social environment are made the guiding principle for the formation of organizational subunits at the horizontal level. Secondly, tasks may be attributed according to the areas to be administered, i.e. in accordance with the territorial principle. Thirdly, addressees, target groups, etc. serve as the point of orientation for the horizontal order in accordance with the clientèle principle. Fourthly, it is necessary to ensure that administrative action can be divided up into performance and activity steps according to intre-administrative aspects. Correspondingly, intra-administrative organization may be structured on the basis of internal functions.

In the public administration of the Federal Republic of Germany, the above principles of structuring are, as a rule, not applied separately and exclusively but in a mixture as
is the case. This may be illustrated by the example of the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs: The divisions are on the one hand organized as to external functions like labour market policy, labour legislation and protection of labour, social insurance and codification of social law, health and medical care.

On the other hand, there is also some clientele-related orientation, since one division handles the problems of foreign employees as well as of German employees in foreign countries. Also, territorial differentiation can be discerned in a division for international social affairs. Aspects of structuring according to internal functions are to be found in the central division responsible for staff affairs, budgeting and financing organization and data processing and also in the general division for general policy and planning. Comparable horizontal structures can also be traced in the Länder ministries. A distribution of tasks developed by the Kommunale Gemeinschaftsstelle für Verwaltungsvereinfachung (Joint Centre for the Rationalization of Local Administration) is typical for the local governments; eight major groups of tasks i.e. general administrative functions, finance, law as well as safety and order, educational and cultural matters, social affairs and health, building, public services and finally economic affairs and transport, are attributed to the individual offices and departments.

Although we must thus proceed on the general principle that usually a mixture of structural principles is applied, some trends towards certain modes of horizontal organization can be made out. For instance, there are preferences for making greater allowance in administrative science and administrative practice for aspects of internal functions. Not only universal functions like organization, personnel matters and electronic data processing are joined together in central divisions general and specialized offices. Mainly
with a view to planning and coordinating administrative action, respective units of organization have been strengthened and newly established. It is true, however, that a number of far-reaching ideas - as for instance that of a cabinet office for policy planning and organization at the level of the Federal Government - were not successful beyond the proposal stage. The territorial principle plays a comparatively less important role in intra-administrative organization. It must be kept in mind in this context that the general governmental and administrative structure not only at the Federal, Laender and community levels but also in the county and district administration is organized along territorial lines. In the individual administrations, these then become less significant - with some exceptions, like a division for road construction divided up according to regions or if international relations are concerned as is the case in the Federal Foreign Office or in the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation.

The correspondence between horizontal differentiations and addressees or target groups of administrative action is not always very well defined. Delimitations against structuring according to external functions in the material fields of policy are rather blurred. For instance, the differentiation of a ministry for food, agriculture and forestry can rely on the substantiality of agricultural policy compared with other fields of administration; however, there are at least elements of an orientation according to target groups, for example when the economic, social or educational policy for farmers is used as a basis for organization. At any rate there is a growing tendency to delimit horizontal organization in accordance with the material policy functions fulfilled by political institutions and administrative authorities rather than to apply the clientèle principle. The suggestions submitted by the Project Group for Government and Administrative Reform on departmental delineation
as referred to when forming governments in 1969 and 1972 - assumed societal problem fields as decisive for horizontal differentiations at government level as can be seen from the concentration of social-policy and structural-policy-related tasks within newly established ministries. For comparable developments as regards the internal structure of ministries, the reorganization of the Federal Ministry of Transport may be cited; instead of the original differentiation according to modes of transport, the present horizontal structure is not least determined by the political tasks of public expenditure on traffic and transport and communications and structural policy of traffic and transport manifested in relevant subdivisions within a division for general transport policy.

(2) If we turn from the horizontal differentiation of intra-administrative organization to problems of vertical structuring, it must be asked first of all which organizational unit is to be regarded as basic component of the pyramid-shaped administrative structure. This question about the base unit is - as can be seen from historical and international comparisons - not only answered differently by the individual administrative authorities but even remains unsettled in some cases. However, the Federal Republic of Germany offers a relatively distinct picture. That is of significance mainly in the organizational structure of departmental administration. For instance, it is stipulated in the standing orders that the section is the fundamental unit of the organizational structure of any ministry and that each job in a ministry must be attributed to a section. That formulation reveals how it is unsatisfactory to simply equate the hierarchical structure of the administration with factual instructional correlations or personnel order systems. Actually, this is a structural pattern which does not only permit steering
from above but at the same time allows information processing, formulation of interests and the development of powers from below. In our case, the base units sustain the political and administrative every-day business and are not merely confined to the economic provision of administrative instruments. As a result, it happens that the strong position of the section is criticized from the viewpoint of integrated planning and coordination.

The base unit may not be identified with the organizational position in the sense of working place and working capacity of an employee, as an abstraction of the individual person. For instance, the section head as chief administrator has under him associate administrators as well as working staff. Task structure and organization plans, however, do not go into such detail as to define these scopes of activities but only refer to the base unit as fundamental component of the organizational structure. Thus, there is some free space within the base unit for intra-structural dispositions. The organizational demands on the administrative subunits are tailored to the base unit as such. It is stipulated for instance that, according to their size, some correspondence must be established between delineable fields of problems and organizational units, that it must be possible to develop task-oriented initiatives, to secure continuous fulfilment of the attributed tasks, flexible reactions to working peaks, mutual internal substitution and so on. This, however, makes the internal structure of the base unit a problem. This becomes apparent from the mere fact that the sections have very differing numbers of staff. "Three-officer-sections" operate differently from "twelve-officer-sections".

For various reasons - as for instance intra-structural organization as discussed above - but mostly to make the administrative structure correspond as far as possible to
the boundaries of the social problem fields concerned, the question is thus being raised whether uniformity of type is adequate to the base unit. Distinctions as for instance between small and large sections, sections and group sections are under discussion. On the one hand, some people fear the mushrooming of widely differing forms of organization. They feel that the prevailing basic models like sections or offices offer sufficient free space for organizational measures to meet the various needs. Others refer to the growing complexity of public tasks and the necessity of tailoring the basic organization to suit the considerable interlocking of problem fields so that the need for coordination between the base units is not excessive. Where one organizational unit is charged with correspondingly wider subjects, greater differentiation of the internal structure, improved possibilities of representation towards the exterior, more efficient work planning and better flexibility of staff commissioning and not least the introduction of cooperative forms of working are expected on account of the larger size.

The range of problems entailed by group sections leads us to questions of direction level. In group sections the section heads move away from case work to leadership functions. If we look at the positional order, the vertical range of an authority may extend from the head of the authority to junior assistants with gradual differences between local authorities, lower Laender administrations, a ministry, etc. If we direct our attention to the various organizational levels, we must note — in particular since the implementation of the territorial reform in the Federal Republic of Germany — that the authorities are usually of such size that the great number of their base units cannot simply have one head. An intermediate-level direction must be established in the form of divisions,
groups, departments, etc. That intermediate level may in turn be differentiated into superdivisions, divisions and subdivisions. A great variety of functions must be fulfilled in the fields of steering, planning, decision-making, coordination and integration and in particular of maintaining interrelations between base units and top.

The position of intermediate-level direction in the intradiministrative organization is relatively firm. The existing problems of transmission to the top level are only to a limited extent problems of the administrative structure; they are often more procedural matters. For instance, regulations pertaining to the Federal ministries say that they have to be divided up into divisions, the divisions into sections. Independent bodies, offices, special sections and the like shall not be set up outside the divisions. Also, service regulations for Land authorities stipulate for instance that the heads of division shall assist the head of authority within the framework of their range of tasks with information and proposals. The heads of division have a right of decision as far as it is not reserved for the head of the authority. They coordinate day-to-day business within their division and make certain that all relevant tasks are fulfilled correctly in a procedural and material respect. The head of division is in charge of the staff in his division. In spite of such regulations, independent special bodies or channels for giving impulses, transmitting information, coordination, instructions and so on sometimes develop alongside the structure of intermediate-level direction. In this respect, the institution of special planning bodies raises particular problems. Only where planning is anchored in the divisional structure is intermediate-level direction as such not affected. The question as to the sense of horizontal differentiation may, at most, be posed in terms of internal functions.
A classical problem of the vertical structure of administration in Germany is how to subdivide intermediate-level direction into superdivisions and divisions or into divisions and subdivisions. As early as in the thirties, experts proposed the dissolution of subdivisions. Up till today, it is doubted whether they are justified. There are even those who interpret the subdivisions as means of personnel policy, i.e., with a view to creating possibilities of promotion. Regulations for the Federal ministries say that subdivisions shall only be formed where factually necessary and where they cover at least five sections. In the Länder administrations, there are many opponents to the establishment of more than one intermediate level between base and top. It will not be possible to find a generally applicable solution to the problem of how to subdivide intermediate-level direction. Aspects like the operational size of an administrative authority, the delineation of the base units, horizontal differentiation possibilities and many more are of importance. Horizontal structuring of base units may appear appropriate from the viewpoint that relevant coordination requirements can no longer be satisfied at the level of heads of divisions. However, it is not admissible simply to deduce from the span of control, from the number of subunits of the same horizontal level the degree of organizational, vertical differentiation. Even disregarding multi-line and extra-line forms of coordination and direction, the nature of the respective tasks must be allowed for. Communication losses and susceptibility to disturbance inherent in long vertical official channels have to be weighed against the need for control and coordination closer to the work to be done.

The authority top itself is in the Federal Republic of Germany mostly organized according to the monocentric principle which means that there is one head who is linked
with the subordinate organizational units by correlations of instructions and substitution orders. It has already been mentioned above that there are also cases where collegiate structures have been set up at the top of the administrative pyramid. For instance, in some Länder the communities are governed by collegiate boards, and also in other respects the German municipal constitution shows interesting illustrative models of how the scope of administrative direction can be structured. Departmental administration is by tradition directed in a form known also in other countries: the minister as political head on the one hand and the permanent secretary as head of the apparatus on the other. The latter directs day-to-day affairs in the ministry, acts as deputy to the minister, has to coordinate and ensure the fulfilment of tasks by the divisions and is considered the representative of the administrative machinery. Today, this constellation has changed in as much as several state secretaries have been appointed in the larger ministries. Besides, the institution of parliamentary state secretaries has brought about another modification in the directive organization of the ministries. However, that enlargement did not lead to a general development of collegiate organizational structures at the top of administrative authorities. Accordingly, the Project Group for Government and Administrative Reform reporting to the Federal Minister of the Interior suggested that the various top officials form a functional unit and a cooperative departmental direction with joint support unit.

(3) Beside the basic order of horizontal and vertical differentiations there are a number of already classical forms of organization for inter-administrative structuring, some of which have already been referred to. These include staffs to prepare decision-making and give advice to the administration top, supervisory units to administer admini-
stration, committees to coordinate administrative activities, working groups to care for administrative projects, and many more. Such forms of organization were formerly applied and are still being applied in the German administration in a great many variants. However, every age has its particular preferences in this regard. This becomes apparent from the discussion on staffs, for instance. When in the mid-sixties a lack of medium and long-term planning became obvious in the ministries, it was proposed to have these tasks fulfilled by planning staffs and coordination groups institutionalized maybe in such a way that below the state secretary a planning office should be set up which should be independent of divisions, represented by its head in the conference of division heads and collect the required information from the planning groups within the divisions.

That concept did not succeed generally, although planning staffs can be found in some administrations. The known reservations regarding the staff conception were brought up, i.e. difficulties of personnel recruiting, modes of working and ways of communication, responsibilities, attribution of success, etc. It is true that in particular the political heads of administrative authorities have support units at their disposal for information and advice. The organizational unit of personal secretary has been extended considerably. Within and around the minister's office there are various functions as for instance that of a press officer. Further-reaching concepts relate, as has already been said above, to a central office to assist a cooperative direction. But basically, the planning tasks have been anchored in the line.

For the internal differentiation of the function of medium and longer-term planning concepts, various potential solutions have been considered. In some cases, specific divisions
for planning have been established, sometimes for general policy planning. In other cases, separate planning organizations were established within the scope of central service units. Such central units do not only provide technical services like keeping up car pools, typing, copyprinting etc. but also fulfill important internal tasks like budgeting, organization and personnel affairs and do, by tradition, not form part of the directive top level. From the proper nature of these central and universal functions, however, results a close correlation with the authority top. It is characteristic of West German conditions, though, that these do not surpass departmental boundaries. If one leaves aside such cases as the Hamburg Senate Office for Administrative Service - which is an exception resulting from constitutional conditions - comprising offices for organizational matters and personnel affairs, extra-departmental centralization is practicable only to a limited extent, mainly because of the organizational powers and sovereignty in personnel matters held by the individual departmental ministers. As a result, it is quite difficult to attract wider and longer lasting attention to the relevant administrative problems.

Frequently, the wide-spread organizational form of committee is then used for such universal functions, in this case the interdepartmental committee. Public administration in the Federal Republic of Germany is marked by a multitude of inter-organizational and intra-organizational committees and working groups. They serve to complement the administrative structure mainly in the view of coordination. Such committees may be set up at all levels of hierarchy. As the standing orders usually do not contain detailed stipulations for their institutionalization, the occasions and foundations for the establishment of such bodies may vary greatly. Committees are often set up when - apart from the mentioned central functions - highly complex political fields as for example environmental protection have to be dealt with. The
situation is similar as regards such fields where the limits of competence between the various administrations are only poorly defined. As a general rule, the members of a committee are representatives of their respective administrations and must adhere to their instructions. Accordingly, a committee's capacity for coordination is often limited. In a number of cases working groups have been formed where the civil servants from different organizational units cooperate in project groups and teams without being obliged to act under instructions.

Committees, working committees, teams, working groups, etc. have mainly been established to satisfy the needs of coordination and integration in medium and longer-term planning. This applies both to inter-organizational and intra-organizational correlations. At government level in some Länder, a sort of coordination organization between state chancelleries and ministries have been founded. The chief characteristic of such partnerships is beside the information process by data sheets - a particular organizational unit, i.e. a working committee made up of the responsible for planning and coordination from the individual ministries. Some organizations have also established comparable internal bodies. Reflections have been made on how these can be better bound up with the directive system. It has been suggested a division for programme analysis and programme evaluation comprising a coordination group responsible for advice on decision-making and evaluation should be indirectly attributed to the ministry top. Under a director for planning it would establish contacts with internal and external agencies and deal in particular with the ministry's budgeting, organization and personnel divisions. Thus, problems of program development have ensued a diversity of reorganizations within and outside the line and have brought about even more organizational models.
III.

(1) Planning and coordination are characteristic of one of the two basic trends of reform policy which have governed the development of administrative organizations and beyond that even discussion on organization in general in the Federal Republic of Germany in recent years. While this trend aims at strengthening the intelligence of public administration, the other one is oriented to the improvement of intra-organizational democracy. Let us turn to those reorganization efforts that attend to the receptivity and processing capacity of the administrative machinery; it has already become obvious how much the integration of administrative actions has become the basic issue in the view of organizations with such an extensive division of labour and competence. The prevailing structures of government and administration have not been an obstacle to particular policies. With the term "negative coordination" some critics wanted to express that the organizational pre-conditions for a comprehensive and well-planned fulfilment of state functions based on a future oriented concept still had to be created on account of changed social and economic conditions.

The necessity of political planning was stressed and the application of modern management conceptions demanded. The Project Group of Government and Administrative Reform reporting to the Federal Minister of the Interior and similar institutions did not least symbolize the intent to conceive the structural bases for governmental and administrative action in compliance with the overall policy. Institutionalizing planning activities at all levels of the state was considered a good point of departure. But, furthermore, it was a matter of overcoming the dualism of task and resource planning through the development of inte-
grated planning such as programme budgeting or development planning. The organizational structures were revised in the perspective of comprehensive programme development. Also, it was intended, where possible, to overcome particular developments in the politico-administrative system. Project groups and project management were to allow problem solving between several subsystems in accordance with general objectives and at the same time to ensure positive coordination. To improve interaction at the level of overall systems, the idea of matrix organization was raised which is to permit cooperation of units with internal and external functions. With the aid of programme organization concepts, development and implementation of programmes and the organizational structure were to be completely harmonized. The "dynamic" administration model aiming at continuous adaptation to programmatic structures went even further.

Meanwhile, experience could be gathered from organizational reforms following the idea of conceptional integration. The initial expectations have given way to a certain reserve. In particular, it proved unfeasible to separate planning organization from the organization of task routine performance.

Besides, the costs of an interlocking of government and administrative action became apparent. Since decisions can, as a general rule, only be taken when all units participating in the process of problem solving agree, the capacity of such inter-administrative organizations to regulate conflicts was often exhausted. Strategies of conflict reduction were thought to be a way out, however, the resulting development of policy was less purposive and methodical than incremental. As a result of that experience a careful revision in the leading ideas of future organizational policy seems to develop. When considering the benefits of both necessary differentiations and indispensable integrations, growing
importance is again being attached to the former aspects. Concepts of reducing the interlocking in the federative system or efforts to reorganize a ministry with a view to minimizing overlapping of tasks to reduce the need for coordination are indicative of this.

(2) The other basic reform trend to be mentioned is that of intra-organizational democratization. Here, differing political motives manifest themselves: ideas of soviet-based democracy, radical democracy, anti-bureaucratic ideas, and so on. It may happen that, for well-founded reasons, internal democracy is demanded for associations, parties, etc., but then such ideas are transferred without any more ado to institutions of State administration. By comparison, public administration in the Federal Republic of Germany complies in many fundamental respects with the organizational model to the effect that democratic legislation matches autocratic administration, that execution is the very purpose of administration - and above all in a democracy execution of the will of the people expressed in laws - and that administration, thus dependent, becomes a tool of democracy. It is true, however, that this model only suits part of the steering problems of the politico-administrative system. There is a great variety of direct possibilities of access to administrative action for individuals or organized groups. Also the members of governmental and public institutions bring their influence to bear.

The manner in which civil servants articulate their interests depends on various facts, not least on the strategy used by the relevant trade union. Under intra-organizational aspects, two spheres of influence must be distinguished: that of directive codetermination and that of participation and codetermination in social, personnel and organizational matters of the administration. Directive codeter-
mination, i.e. codetermination in public matters themselves, has been discussed and partially even been introduced, mainly in such institutions which possess a certain degree of self-administration or for which a certain partial autonomy can be formed. These include savings banks, hospitals, theatres, schools, universities - also as concerns their administrative and technical personnel - and others, in particular public enterprises including the public utilities of the communities. From the organizational viewpoint it must be stressed in this connection that the relevant concepts do not commence with the direct unity of action of intra-administrative ranks and files but that an "institutional" solution is wanted. The aim is to have the members of administration represented in some way in the decision-making bodies. The main issue is "third-part representation" or codetermination with equal representation of staff delegates on the supervisory bodies, such as boards of administration, supervisory boards, works committees, artistic-technical councils, school conferences, academical senates, etc. Besides, direct codetermination in the management boards has been considered in the form of, say, a director for personnel and social matters as member of the collegiate directive body.

While directive codetermination in the public sector raises a lot of further problems - since autonomy is granted for reasons not so much of democratic legitimation as of economic activities in the one case, scientific teaching and research in another, artistic creation in a third case, etc. - participation and codetermination in social, personnel and organizational matters are quite firmly institutionalized. In the Federal, Laender and local authorities, staff representation bodies have been set up on the respective legal bases to attend to the interests of the employees. As the staff delegates on the one hand form independent bodies not subordinate to the directions of the head of authority,
but on the other hand are established within the administration, they may be regarded as an additional hierarchy. It is valid for the above-mentioned cases of codetermination, participation and hearing. Personnel representation bodies are mandatory. There are staff meetings of all members of a public agency. In all public agencies of a certain minimum size, staff delegates are elected. For multi-level administrations, direct staff councils are set up in the intermediate-level authorities; in the top authorities, central staff councils are formed. Under certain circumstances even a general staff council is established. The structure of staff representations reflects the general administrative structure in the respective authority.

The discussion on democracy and internal organization in public institutions and administrative authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany has undoubtedly had one consequence: It has increased and strengthened the awareness of the relevance of organizational forms for public action. Structural models of public administration and administrative decisions are not indifferent to each other. The form of communication always has some effect on the results. This also applies to the intelligence of the government and administrative machinery. In that respect, the administrative structure has not been joined together satisfactorily everywhere. Still, the importance of organizational order patterns is recognized. For example, the standing orders stipulate that the responsible for organization should send his proposals to the respective unit in the ministry through the official channels; should the respective unit give no adequate orders or take only insufficient measures, he is entitled to ask for the state secretary’s decision and give his own view. This manifests the degree of relevance attributed at present to organizational work in the administrative hierarchy.
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