

Work Relations from the Perspective of Max Weber and Michel Crozier

Mechri Safi¹, Leila Sidi Moussa²

1- Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University, Mostaganem, faculte of Social Sciences and Humanities Laboratory of Dialogue of Civilizations, Cultural Diversity and the Philosophy of Peace mechri.safi.etu@univ-mosta.dz

2- Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University, Mostaganem, faculte of Social Sciences and Humanities Laboratory of Dialogue of Civilizations, Cultural Diversity and the Philosophy of Peace sidimoussaleila@yahoo.fr

Received:28/04/2023 Accepted:02/06/2023 Published: 07/06/2023

Abstract:

Studying work relations represents as a crucial cognitive subject, which is intended to decipher the relationship network between actors within organization. The purpose of this study is therefore to address work relations concepts, types and objectives relying on two opposing theories, namely Max Weber's ideal-type bureaucracy and Michel Crosier's strategic analysis. Results showed that Max Weber strongly believes that work relations can exist only inside the formal system which is the one to control and limit them while Crozier believes that work relations are no more than a game between two sides based on strategies guaranteed by the resources the actor possesses.

Keywords: Work Relations, collective action, Ideal-Type Bureaucracy, Strategic Analysis, authority.

ملخص :

لا يزال الرهان قائما على أهمية دراسة علاقات العمل، كموضوع معرفي هام يهدف إلى فك رموز الفعل الجماعي داخل المنظمة. وبذلك فإن الغرض من هذه الدراسة، هو محاولة التطرق إلى علاقات العمل مفاهيمها وأنواعها وأهدافها، وعرض وجهتي نظر مختلفة لنفس الموضوع انطلاقا من البيروقراطية المثالية لماكس فيبر والتحليل الاستراتيجي لميشال كروزيه. أين أظهرت النتائج أن

ماكس فيبر يؤمن بقوة بأن علاقات العمل لا يمكن أن تخرج على النظام الرسمي وهو النظام الذي يتحكم فيها ويحد منها، بينما يعتقد كروزيه أن علاقات العمل ليست أكثر من لعبة بين أطراف فاعلة توظف استراتيجيات تضمنها لهم الموارد التي يمتلكونها.

كلمات دالة

علاقات العمل ، الفعل الجماعي ، البيروقراطية المثالية ، التحليل الاستراتيجي ، السلطة

1- Introduction

According to the various alternative definitions proposed by a growing number of scholars interested in the study of organization, particularly sociologists as (Weber, 1979 ; Fayol, 1949; Crozier 1964) and many others, organization is defined as an environment for the study of social relations. In other words, it refers to the work relationships that develop between a group of actors who organize with one another within the organizational environment to achieve goals. Thus, in order to comprehend the organizational climate of any organization, we must approach the actor and observe the nature of the relationship between them and their leader, mentor, or peers, taking into account that what is expected from these relationships are cooperation, solidarity, and harmony. Work relations, which include peer coworker relationships, supervisor-subordinate relationships, and workplace friendships, are all interpersonal relationships that arise as people interact while carrying out their tasks.

We cannot, however, ignore the tension and conflict that may arise from time to time within the organization. This is related mainly to the several factors that intervene to shape the social life of the actors who are in constant contact with each other, particularly the cultural and strategic ones that appear to be difficult to change. Surprisingly, a large number of researchers (Weber ,1947; Crozeir ,1964; Sias 1964) and many others approached the subject of work relations from various perspectives and angles, especially with regards to relational issues.

Max Weber (1864-1920) was one of the first sociologists to study social action and ended up giving a new interpretation to the way the relationships within the organization and the interactions between the various members, who form it are regulated through his objective and rational considerations controlled by the rule of law (Weber, 1947). In so doing, he relies on the characteristics of the ideal-type bureaucracy, which aims to arrange work relations by emphasizing written procedures, hierarchy, and the division of labour.

Michel Crozier (1922-2013) from another perspective clarified that through strategic analysis that work relations within the organization seem as a "game" between two parties, one of whom is looking to control these relations through law and rules, i.e. formal rules, while the other has goals and works hard to defend them through the strategies he has. This is primarily what motivates us to bring this topic into light in order to decipher the origins of two opposing perspectives on work relations.

2- Organization and Work Relation

“Work relations” has always been considered as a subject of interest for scholars in various domains such as management, economy law and sociology of organization. Despite differences in interpretation and lack of consensus on its definition, work relation is a widely disseminated concept. It is used as human relations, industrial relations, production relations and professional relations. The terms refer all together to the socio-professional relations which would result in great consequences to organizational functioning since it contributes in providing the organization with harmonious atmosphere, collaborative environment, supporting knowledge, facilitating communication between workers and motivates them towards job performance and productivity. Yet, one cannot ignore the fact that work relation may also create an atmosphere of tension and conflict.

Before delving into the details of work relations, it is worthwhile to give different definitions to organization. This is

primarily due to the fact that it is considered as the environment which holds these relations starting from various definitions which are given to the word organization depending on the angle the researchers take. Some consider it as a machine to reach specific goals, others see it as a small society that contains a social structure and culture. (Scott & F.Davis, 2016, p. 27) According to Barnard, “Organization is that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, purposeful.” (Chester I, 1938, p. 4).

“Organizations are assemblages of interacting human beings and they are the largest assemblages in our society that have anything resembling a central coordinative system.” (Scott & F.Davis, 2016, p. 28). Ezana tried to gather the different definitions of organization in a simple and a clear one stating that organization is “a socially designed unit or collectivity that engages in activities to accomplish a goal or set of imperatives, has an identifiable boundary, and is linked to the external society.” (Ezana, p. 48). All these early definitions point to the existence of interaction between participants who coordinate under certain structure within work relations links them to reach specific and explicit planned goals.

What can be observed is that it is quite impossible to form an organization without interaction. The latter creates various types of relations in one way or another known as “work relations”. Relations are considered as the essence of living and the ones that maintain balance and order the chaos (M.Sias, 2008, p. 2). Face to face communication in work place or through mediated technology lead inherently to the creation of close relationships. (M.Horan, M.Chory, S.Craw, & Jones, 2021, p. 3) Work relations embody all the interpersonal relations that result from the individuals engagement when performing their jobs (M.Sias, 2008, p. 3). Building strong and stable relations at work is considered as one of the main interests of the individual (Ehrhardt, 2014, p. 47) taking into consideration the fact that the individual spends a long time at work in the process of socialization and formation of their identity which is supposed to be engraved by the inevitable work relationships.

2-1- Definition of Work relations:

Work relations are defined as the “Interpersonal relationships that individuals participate in as they go about doing their jobs performing their organizational roles” (M.Horan, M.Chory, S.Craw, & Jones, 2021, p. 3). They are defined as “two or more entities interacting in a patterned way over time.” The two entities may refer to two people, roles, groups.... The interactions in the relationships can be described via various terms such as the structure, function, quality and outcomes. (D. Heaphy, Byron, A. Balinger, Hoffer Gitell, Leana, & M.Sluss, 2018, pp. 1-2). “Relationships are mechanisms through which colleagues and staff are mobilized, support is garnered and work is performed.” (Clydesdale, 2020, pp. 48-49). “Workplace relationships function as decision making, influence-sharing, and instrumental and emotional support systems”. (M.Sias, 2005, p. 377) Thus, they are relations that refer not only to one group within the same organization, but rather the process of interaction of workers between their colleagues and between them and their superiors.

2-2- Types of Work Relations:

Work relations are not limited only to the leader/ subordinate relation but also refer to co-workers relation, mentor relation, friendship relation, social relations, customer relations and even romantic relationships. (M.Sias, 2008) Despite their importance, a few constructs have emerged as topics of interest for organizational researchers. These constructs may be classified into dyadic influences and network influences. (Ehrhardt, 2014). Dyadic influence refers to the relation between two parts and network influence refers to the social network structure and friendship structure.

2-2-1- Supervision

Supervision refers to the relationship that exists between the leader and the subordinate. It is the one that has garnered most the scholars’ attention. (Ehrhardt, 2014, p. 31). According to Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX) leaders create relationships of various quality with their subordinates through the role development

process. The quality of this kind of relationship depends on factors as mutual trust, respect, obligation, contributions, loyalty, affect, and professional respect. The high level of these attributes results in high quality LMXs. (M.Horan, M.Chory, S.Craw, & Jones, 2021, p. 7). This kind of relation is based mainly on support, encouragement, trust, self- disclosure and a more opened communication. Thus the leader and the subordinate rely on each other. (M.Sias, 2005, p. 377) .What can be noticed is that the relationship at this level requires positive organizational values in order to reach a good quality. In the absence of these values or of the features mentioned above, the relationship is supposed to be limited and unbalanced.

2-2-2- Co-workers

Co- Workers Refers to the relation results from the interaction between the employees. Co-workers share knowledge, expertise and information. The co- worker support is stronger than the support of a supervisor to a leader .It is an effective instrument to reduce the level of burnout. (Ehrhardt, 2014, p. 35).While co-workers relationship refers to the relation between the employees who belong to different positions, peer- relations refer to “equivalent status”. Peer relations are defined as “relationships between co-workers with no formal authority over one another. These relationships represent the bulk of workplace relationships, as employees typically have only one supervisor but several peer co-workers” (M.Sias, 2005, p. 379) . They “support the “personal or professional growth” of the peers” (M.Horan, M.Chory, S.Craw, & Jones, 2021, p. 8)

Three primary types for peer-relation have been identified. First, information peer relationships which are characterized by significantly low level of trust, honesty, self-disclosure. Communication is based on limited, work-related content. Second, collegial peer relationships are based on moderate levels of trust, self-disclosure, emotional support and friendship. Third, special peers tend to take on the more personalistic characteristics of friendship since they are characterized by high level of emotional support, trust, self-

disclosure intimacy and limitless breadth of content. (M.Sias, 2005, pp. 379-380) .

2-2-3- Mentors

A mentor is a more senior, experienced person who can provide a variety of benefits to a less experienced employee. This is related to both career development functions like guidance, assistance, and coaching, as well as psychosocial functions like personal support. (Ehrhardt, 2014, p. 36) . “Relationships with mentors enable young adults to successfully enter the adult world and the world of work by simultaneously assisting in career growth and the establishment of separate identities”. (E.kram & A. Isabella, 1985, p. 110). What can be deduced from the previous definitions is that the basic role of the mentor is to guide and sponsor the employee to overcome the challenges they face at work. It is an added value that is reflected in the reduction of time and effort in any organization.

2-3- The Importance of Work Relations

Work relationships are fundamental to reach the goal of the organization. They provide the organization with a conducive work climate since they explain the way employees manage their careers, coordinate with each other, and make their work enjoyable to the point that they do not leave it. Also they explain the way teams succeed to reach the planned goals whilst others underperform and how organizations develop and others fail. (D. Heaphy, Byron, A. Balinger, Hoffer Gitell, Leana, & M.Sluss, 2018, p. 1). It is through work relationships that the individuals feel meaningfulness and psychological safety. Thus, it is the role of the manager to provide the organization with intimate and harmonious teamwork so as to achieve goals and feel that these goals are shared.

Work relations contribute to reduce miscommunication and encourage employee performance. (Harrati, 2020, p. 128). Also, they facilitate the way to get the information. They are considered as the best asset that the managers can possess in order to enhance productivity. (Clydesdale, 2020, p. 49). To sum up, work relations are

considered as the key factor that increase open communication, staff morale, job satisfaction and reduce turnover, collaboration, emotional and instrumental support so that the organization reaches its goals.

3- The concept of Work Relation from the perception of Max Weber and Michel Crozier

What has been discussed in this article about work relations, their types, and objectives is merely a counterpart to the efforts of a large number of researchers within a paradigm of different theories and schools. They all agreed, despite the changes caused by rapid developments, on the possibility of founding relations within the organization. Work relations may take many other directions in addition to the vertical one. Thus, it is a network of relationships that, despite this convention, is confronted with radically different perspectives on the possibility of controlling it in order to achieve the organization's goals. At this point, we approach, to name a few, the logic of Max Weber and Michel Crozier in their interpretations of the same phenomenon.

3-1- Max Weber

Max Weber (1864-1920), was a contemporary to Frederick Taylor and Henry Fayol. He was the first to use and describe the term bureaucracy known as the Bureaucratic Theory of management or Max Weber theory. (Kumar, 2016, p. 213). He believed strongly that efficiency is gained from the implementation of bureaucracy in organization which came to predominate over earlier forms of organization. (Donalson, 2010, p. 33).According to him, such a structure was inevitable in large organizations that contain a great number of employees in order to perform the tasks of the organizations. (Kumar, 2016, p. 213)

Bureaucracy refers to a particular type of administrative structure that based on the rational-legal mode of authority. Weber writes: "Bureaucracy develops the more perfectly, the more it is 'dehumanized,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from

official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation". (Weber, 1978, pp. 214-216). Weber insisted that dehumanization is a key feature of bureaucracy since it works on routinizing and mechanizing almost every aspect of human life and putting an end to every possible spontaneous action. "Bureaucratic administration fundamentally means the exercise of domination based on knowledge. This is the trait that makes it specifically rational." (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019, p. 13). According to Weber "authority" is the possibility of a group to accept submission to the orders of a certain side, the latter has the right to exercise authority, and thus the group is willing to accept it as long as it is legitimate.

To this point Weber sheds light on a basic element in bureaucracy that is of domination that is related to rational-legal mode authority and insisted that the latter had to be built on knowledge rather than on the traditional way. Rationality is highly important in the sociology of Weber sine rational action aims at controlling and limiting uncertainty in order to respond to unstable environment and manage complexity. (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019, p. 12) From the rational system perspective, "organizations are instruments designed to attain specified goals. Rationality refers to the extent to which a series of actions is organized in such a way as to lead to predetermined goals with maximum efficiency. Thus, rationality refers not to the selection of goals but to their implementation". (Scott & F.Davis, 2016, p. 35)

"The bureaucracy presented by Weber is an ideal-type in the sense that it is a scheme composed of theorized features with which reality may be compared." (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019, p. 13). He viewed bureaucracy as the ideal and most basic type of organization. The idea we are dealing with may be best summarized by the following definition. "Bureaucracy is an organizational structure that is characterized by many rules, standardized processes, procedures and requirements, number of desks, meticulous division of labour and responsibility, clear hierarchies and professional, almost impersonal interactions between employees". (Gadwal, 2023, p. 92)

3-1-1- The Three Types of Power:

In his famous typology, Weber distinguishes three types of authority basing on the beliefs by which legitimacy is attributed to an authority relation. These are:

- Traditional authority—based on the widely held conviction that ancient traditions are sacred and that individuals in positions of authority over them are legitimate.
- Rational-legal authority, which is based on the notion that normative rule patterns are "legal" and that people who are given power under them have the right to give orders.
- Charismatic authority, which is based on adoration of a particular and extraordinary person's sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character as well as the normative patterns or order that person has revealed or ordained.(Weber, 1968, p.213.301).

What can be concluded is that traditional authority is legitimated by respect. Under this kind of authority relationships are consolidated by cultural beliefs. Legal authority is based on the legitimacy of the law and submission is not to people, but to relationships governed by rules and laws. The charismatic authority is based on the actor's legitimacy, and the relationship in it is one of inspiration of a leader and submission to followers. According to Weber, these followers do not recognize traditional authority, but rather reject even the laws that are not issued by their leader.

Each authority type has a unique administrative structure that goes with it. The foundation for the more formal, impersonal, and bureaucratic structures—of which the contemporary bureaucracy is the most highly developed—is rational-legal authority. Weber's fundamental theory of the traits of bureaucratic structures is based on the dichotomy between conventional and rational-legal forms. (Scott &F.Davis,2016,p.48).

When discussing the significance of legal authority, it is argued that rationallegal must serve as the foundation for a bureaucracy becau

se it: (1) establishes a framework for continuity of administration. 2) is rational, in that the person who holds the administrative office was chosen on the basis of capacity to perform the tasks. (3) gives the leader a legal means of exerting authority. (4) Carefully defines and confines all authority to the tasks required to complete the organization's task. (Visitchaichan, 2004, p. 133)

3-1-2- Characteristics of Bureaucracy:

According to Max Weber (1947), the ideal-type of bureaucracy can control work relationships within any specific organization only if we do not deviate from its basic characteristics. These are the principles that lead to its success. The absence of one of its characteristics may result in the failure of the organization's bureaucratic implementation. They are as follows:

- 1) Each member's division of labor, authority, and responsibilities must be clearly defined and legitimized as official duties to ensure clear distribution of functions.
- 2) Offices or positions must be arranged in a hierarchical order of authority, resulting in a chain of command and high centralization of administrative services and management positions.
- 3) Technical qualifications, formal examinations, or education should be the basis for selecting all organizational members, and promotion and selection should rely solely on technical skills.
- 4) Officials should be appointed rather than elected.
- 5) Career officials should receive fixed salaries based on their internal administrative hierarchy and the significance of their duties.
- 6) Administrative officials must not have any ownership in the units they administer.
- 7) Administrators should be subject to strict, impersonal rules, discipline, and controls that are uniformly applied in all cases regarding their official duties. (Visitchaichan, 2004, p. 132)

The absence of rationality in work performance which was devoted by the relations inside the organizations prompted Weber to present the ideal-type of bureaucracy that was basically a mental

imaginary based on his observations in reality. He tried to choose the most suitable ones and put them together to design the idea-type. As a result, it is clear to us that work relations, based on Max Weber's characteristics of bureaucracy, are relations characterized by formality and specialization, with the goal of rationalizing the behavior of workers within the organization through rules, laws, written procedures, and centralization in decision-making.

3-2- Michel Crozier

Michel Crozier (1922-2013) is a French prominent in sociology. His seminal book "The Bureaucratic Phenomenon," published in 1963, is widely regarded as a critique of Max Weber's ideal-type of bureaucracy. The latter was seen as a model that would best help to solve work relationship problems caused by the industrial revolution at the time. Yet, bounded formal rules intensity which failed to adapt to rapid developments made Crozier strongly believe that bureaucracy leads to the inertia of relations as well as it kills the creativity of the actors within it.

Cozier emphasizes the idea that the organization enables as much as it limits the freedom of the individual actor in the system. What is noticeable in the work of Michel Crozier is that he does not limit his research to the formal dimension but also to the informal one. He strongly believes that the fundamental characteristics of bureaucracy create preserve bureaucratic circles and would result in the increasing of the bureaucratization process, the inevitable presence of zones of uncertainty and obstructing performance when it comes to adaptability and organizational change. (Rouillard, 2005, p. 125). Crozier believes that the characteristics of bureaucracy result in inertia, which leads to negative reactions from the actors within the organization, resulting in more bureaucracy and formal rules. He refers to this dichotomy as "vicious circles".

In his other book "Strategic Analysis" Michel Crozier presents another vision of work relations and authority between the actor and

the organization, starting with the theory's fundamental premises as follow:

1- Men never accept to be considered as a means to an end that the administration determines. As a result, each actor has his or her own set of goals and strategies for achieving them. (Plan, 2008, p. 84)

2- All actors in the organization have relative freedom. The actor will use power games to increase his influence and extend his responsibility by utilizing the relative margin of maneuver that he always has within an organization.

3- The actors are rational, but their rationality is constrained by the time and resources available to them. (Aim, 2006, p. 73)

3-2-1- Power

The issues of control and power have always been the main interest of scholars because of its high importance in increasing the performance of workers and achieving the planned goals in an appropriate organizational climate. Yet, the focus was on improving technical rationality or providing workers with only economic incentives. (Crozier, 1964, p. 149) Crozier's then-distinctive way of thinking about bureaucracies stressed that dynamic relation between the individuals which is of a political nature and thus it is a relation of power. (Rouillard, 2005, p. 127).

Regarding this, Crozier states that “the behaviour and attitudes of people and groups within an organization cannot be explained without reference to the power relationship existing among them.” (Crozier, 1964, p. 107) . Crozier and Friedberg claim that ‘It is a balance of power from which one can get more out of than the other, but in which one is also never completely at the mercy of the other’ (Heiland, 2022, p. 78). The concept of "power" must be viewed as an essential component of group action that cannot be taken for granted. The worker is free to offer help to his or her fellows whenever he wants which may put them in a dependent position. (Dubois, p. 8) In this sense authority, for Michel Crozier, imposes the control of one

side to the other determined by the required resources and not the position of actor within the organization. The resources are:

- 1) Specific expertise knowledge.
- 2) A position that provides a privileged contact with the organization's environment.
- 3) Control over the channels through which information and communication are exchanged.
- 4) The definition and existence of formal organizational rules. (Heiland, 2022, p. 78)

The first resource allows the actor to move more freely in the zone of uncertainty, while the second provides him with more protection. The third is considered an authority as soon as he monopolizes the information. Finally, whenever the actor is familiar with the law, he uses it in defending his interests or to gain other interests. Through these sources of power, the individual actor gains a unique position within the organizational hierarchy. "This parallel power structure, which completes, modifies and even nullified the formal plan, is in fact the real chart of the organization" (Crozier & Friedberg, 1980, p. 44)

3-2-2- The Zone of Uncertainty

“An actor's agency is based on the size of a zone of uncertainty which he can control through his behaviour towards his opponents' (Heiland, 2022, p. 78). “The margin of liberty enjoyed by people in relation to others they depend on, is the source of their power within organizations”. (J.Matejko, 1983, p. 449) .The actor gains this power mainly from the zones of uncertainty. Friedberg (1992) believes that "formal rules create their own problems, that is to say their own uncertainties that arise from the difficulties raised by the daily implementation and application of their requirements.” (Dubois, p. 8). This observation is perfectly illustrated by Michel Crozier's demonstration of the "vicious bureaucratic circle" the more an organization attempts to solve concrete problems, the more it tries to reduce unpredictable zones of uncertainty by multiplying centralized

and formal rules the more the organization's net of rules appears to have holes in it increasing the amount of uncertainty. (Dubois, p. 8) Thus, the zone of uncertainty refers to the holes that result from applying centralized and formal rules.

Despite the fact that employees possess power or control over zones of uncertainty, there would never be power symmetry between companies and workers but rather relative autonomies. (Heiland, 2022, p. 78). Holes exist in the organization in one way or another and are regarded as zones of uncertainty for actors to exploit when developing strategies. The extent to which they move in these zones reflects their level of authority. “Much more convincing is the point Crozier and Friedberg that the organizational rules of the game constrain all participants but are necessary for them by securing their capacity to play”. (J.Matejko, 1983, p. 451). There may be formal restrictions that exist to limit the actors, but there are always actors working to overcome them by utilizing the resources available to them.

3-2-3- The Concrete System

Organization relies on laws and procedures to control work relations within the organization. According to Crozier, this leads to another fact, the relationships are reflected in the way the actors organize themselves to deal with immediate problems that may arise from time to time. This is what is known as the concrete system which is represented “as a structured human ensemble which employs relatively stable game mechanisms to coordinate the actions of its participants. It furthermore maintains its structure, i.e., the stability of its games and the relationships among them, by means of mechanisms of regulation. These, in turn, form the content of still other games” (Crozier & Friedberg, 1980, p. 153). Crozier and Thoenig (1975) claim that “The analysis of such a system consists therefore in trying to reconstruct, building on the games previously discovered and described, the basis of the more general mode of regulation through which these games are organized and linked to each other. In other words, to depict the regulation enabling the existence of the system to

which these games belong and which legitimizes their rules.” (Dubois, p. 7.8)

4- Discussion

Work relations, as an area of research, implies ambiguity, ambivalence and fuzziness. Yet, it retains the same meaning as it has been explained in the theoretical literature review and scientific research that dealt with the topic from various angles as relations that arise within any organization through the interaction of actors who influence each other. This interaction does not occur solely between two groups. Work relations can exist between employees and leaders as well as between workers of the same rank, implying that it can take intervened directions vertical and horizontal. A large number of theories provide the organization with scientific methods for developing relationships based on trust, respect, exchange, and cooperation. However, the views on how these relations should occur and the possibility of controlling and regulating them vary from Max Weber's bureaucracy and Michel Crozier's strategic analysis.

Weber believes that the ideal-type bureaucracy, which is based primarily on the concept of authority for one side, is appropriate for rationalizing the organization, arranging work relations within it, and eliminating the area of uncertainty, even among peers, to ensure its positive conduct. The issue here is one of the relations within a formal organization, where there are neither personal relationships that may result from workplace friendships or social relations in general, nor alliances that Weber regards as informal relations. Thus, work relations are constrained by the force of the law and the legitimacy of authority, which is a one way traffic, from top to bottom. These in fact represent what Weber refers to as rationality.

Michel Crozier, on the other hand, has a different point of view based on his strategic analysis. He not only interprets work relations differently, but he also provides a different interpretation of the same conceptual system Max Weber used to defend bureaucracy, such as

authority, rationality, and the zone of uncertainty. Michel Crozier began with the premises that have been already mentioned in this article, which he derived from fieldworks, and he believes that they reflect work relations within any organization. He believes that the actors in the organization have goals and would never accept achieving only the organizational goals. He disagrees with the Classical School's premise that the organization's objectives correspond to the goals of its actors. (Weber ,1979) . This rationality remains limited for Michel Crozier, and any attempt to subjugate these actors solely to achieve the organization's goals while ignoring theirs will be counterproductive.

Furthermore, the actors in their relationship with the organization always have a share for maneuver that is made possible by any loopholes that may arise from official laws, giving them the option to participate in achieving the goals or refrain from doing so. Crozier's final premise may be intended to demonstrate the absence of an ideal practice within the organization. He emphasizes that the strategy defined by the actors in their relationships with colleagues or with the organization is always characterized by limited rationality, and there should be concessions because there are always counter strategies that prevent one side from achieving goals. Basing on the previous ideas, Crozier defines authority as an exchange relationship that must be negotiated. It means that the person who has the information, competence, is familiar with the law, and has a good relationship with the external environment has authority and exercises it over others, regardless of their position in the hierarchy.

Finally, Michel Crozier believes that workplace relations are nothing more than a game between two sides, one of which wants to impose his authority and the other works to overcome it through strategies guaranteed by the resources that he possesses and uses to defend his interests, or to gain other interests. Crozier claims that no matter how formal the procedures within the organization are, there is always a zone of uncertainty that allows the actor to move within a margin of freedom, and that the formal organization will never be able

to eliminate it. He insists that within the concrete system, there are always alliances through which the actors organize in their interactive relations to face the problems that may arise from time to time within the organization, regardless of how formal and codified the control within it is.

Conclusion

In conclusion, work relations are a complex and dynamic aspect of organizational behavior that has been studied from various theoretical perspectives. While Max Weber's bureaucracy and Michel Crozier's strategic analysis differ in their approach to work relations, they both recognize the importance of interactions between actors in the organization. Weber advocates for formal rules and regulations to maintain a structured environment, while Crozier emphasizes the need for negotiation and flexibility in work relationships, which are influenced by personal relationships, alliances, and strategic goals. Work relations will continue to be a key area of research, as organizations navigate the challenges of managing interpersonal interactions in an increasingly complex work environment.

References

1. Aim, R. (2006). *L'essentiel de la Théorie des organisations* . Paris: Gualino éditeur.
2. Chester I, B. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive* . Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
3. Clydesdale, G. (2020). Peer Relationships in the Workplace: A Call to Arms. *Kindai Management Review* , 8, 48-62.
4. Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. University of Chicago Press .
5. Crozier, M., & Friedberg, E. (1980). *Actors and Systems. The politics of collective Action*. The University of Chicago .
6. D. Heaphy, E., Byron, K., A. Balingier, G., Hoffer Gitell, J., Leana, L., & M.Sluss, D. (2018). The Changing Nature of Work Relationships. *The Academy of Management* , 43 (4), 1-12.
7. Donalson, L. (2010). Organizational Sociology. *Historical Developments and Theoretical Approaches in Sociology* , 2, 32-47.

8. Dubois, C. Half a century of French organizational sociology: methodological roots, compositionist branches.
9. E.kram, K., & A. Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring Alternatives : The Role of Peer Relationship in Career Development. *Academy of Management , 28* (1), 110-132.
10. Ehrhardt, K. (2014, May). Understanding the Role of Workplace Relationships in Employee Commitment and Engagement: A Complementary Fit Perspective.(Doctor of Philosophy). Management Science, Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin.
11. Ezana, A. *Sociology of Work, Industry and Organization*. Departement of Soiology and Social Anthropolog: Addis Ababa University.
12. Gadwal, A. (2023). *Industrial Sociology*. Lulu Publication.
13. Harrati, T. (2020). The Role of Human Relations in Increasing Employee Performance. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute , 3* (1), 127-133.
14. Heiland, H. (2022). Black Box Power: Zones of Uncertainty in Algorithmic Management. In E. Armano, M. Briziarelli, & E. Risi, *Digital Platforms and Algorithmic Subjectivities* (pp. 75-86). London: University of Westminster Press.
15. Fayol,H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management* (Constance Storrs,. Trans.). London: Pitman and Sons, Ltd. Reviewed by Nancy M. Carter,.
16. J.Matejko, A. (1983). Actors and Systems.Compte rendu de The Politics of Collective Action, by Michel Crozier and Erhard Friedberg. *Relations Industrielles/ Industrial Relations , 38* (2), 448-452.
17. Kumar, R. (2016). Bureaucratic Theory by Max Weber – A Review Study. *Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education , 12* (23), 212-216.
18. M.Horan, S., M.Chory, R., S.Craw, E., & Jones, H. (2021). Blended Work/Life Relationships: Organizational Communication Involving Workplace Peers, Friends, and Lovers. *Communication Research Trends , 40* (2), 3-47.
19. M.Sias, P. (2008). *Organizing Relationships: Traditional and Emerging Perspectives on Workplace Relationships*. SAGE.
20. M.Sias, P. (2005). Workplace Relationship Quality and Employee Information Experiences. *Communication Studies , 56* (4), 375-395.

21. Plan, J. M. (2008). *Théorie des organisations* (Vol. 3). Paris: Dunod.
22. Rouillard, C. (2005). Michel Crozier and the study of complex bureaucratic organizations: Towards the development of French strategic analysis. *Canadian Public Administration* , 48 (1), 124-130.
23. Scott, W., & F.Davis, G. (2016). *Organizations and Organizing Rational, Natural, and Open System Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
24. Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2019). The Concept of Bureaucracy by Max Weber. *International Journal of Social Science Studies* , 7 (2), 12-18.
25. Visitchaihan, S. (2004). Revisiting Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy and. *Thai Journal of Public Administration its Usefulness for Analyzing Organizational Structures and Issues.* , 2 (2), 127-147.
26. Weber, M. (1978). *Bureaucracy. In Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (Vol. 2). (G. Roth, & C. Wittich, Éd.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
27. Weber, M.(1968 trans.). *Economy and Society: An Interpretive Sociology*, 2 vols., ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminister Press, (first published in 1924).
28. Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (trans. T. Parsons). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.