Journal of Public Policy

Reimagining the Bureaucracy and Post-Bureaucracy Debate: A Review on Paradoxes in Public Administration

Usman Pakasi (1*) *Anirwan* (2) *Santrio Kamaluddin* (3)

(1,3) *Pascasarjana, Universitas Yapis Papua, Jayapura, Indonesia*
(2) *Universitas Pancasakti Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia*

Corresponding author.
usmanpakasi@gmail.com

Author(s) Statement

The author(s) declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to revisit and reframe the classic debate between bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy by exploring how public administration literature conceptualizes their coexistence. Rather than treating them as opposing models, this research investigates how paradoxes from their interaction shape modern governance practices.

Research Method: This study employs a qualitative Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method to synthesize relevant academic publications from 2018 to 2024, examining how paradoxes between bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic logics are described, interpreted, and managed within public sector institutions. The review process involved thematic coding and conceptual synthesis of 50 peer-reviewed articles from databases including Elsevier, Emerald, Wiley, and Springer.

Results and Discussion: The study reveals that bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy frequently coexist within hybrid organizational structures. This coexistence creates persistent paradoxes—such as stability versus adaptability and control versus innovation—that must be strategically managed rather than resolved. Ambidextrous leadership and paradox-sensitive governance are key mechanisms for navigating these tensions. The study offers a more integrative, paradox-based framework for public administration scholarship.

Implications: The findings highlight the importance of designing flexible and accountable public institutions. Managerially, they require leadership competencies that encompass duality and organizational complexity. Theoretically, the study bridges gaps between opposing models and promotes a reflective approach to institutional reform.

Keywords: bureaucracy; post-bureaucracy; public administration; hybrid governance.

Introduction

Public administration has traditionally operated under the bureaucratic model, grounded in Weberian principles of hierarchy, rule-based governance, and procedural rationality. This model has historically ensured stability, accountability, and administrative order. However, the contemporary governance landscape is increasingly shaped by rapid technological advancement, decentralization, and shifting citizen expectations (Kettl, 2015). These developments expose the limitations of rigid bureaucratic systems in meeting modern demands for agility, responsiveness, and innovation. As a result, the relevance of traditional bureaucracy is being questioned, and there is a growing call to rethink how public institutions are structured and managed. In response, the concept of post-bureaucracy has emerged, promoting decentralization, networked governance, and flexible organizational structures. However, the shift from bureaucracy to post-bureaucracy is not absolute. Instead, modern public institutions operate within a space marked by paradox—where they must maintain control while fostering innovation, ensure compliance while remaining adaptive, and uphold structure while responding to change. These tensions reflect deeper theoretical and operational challenges that current literature often fails to reconcile. Despite the increasing complexity of this governance reality, scholarly engagement with the bureaucracy vs. post-bureaucracy debate remains fragmented. The dichotomy is often presented as mutually exclusive, ignoring the coexistence and interaction of both paradigms in practice.

Recent public administration research has explored a wide range of organizational and structural issues, reflecting the growing complexity and fluidity of the field. Scholars have examined the implementation of telework in public organizations, revealing mixed effects on productivity and work-life balance (Mele et al., 2023). There is a growing interest in shifting from bureaucratic to adhocratic structures to foster innovation and enhance strategic implementation in the public sector (Chidziwa et al., 2023). A systematic review of public administration theories has identified 150 theories coalescing into a broad scholarly domain, with 15 core theories underscoring the field's pluralism and raising concerns over geographic dispersion and societal relevance (Hattke & Vogel, 2023). Moreover, research on diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) in public administration has surged since 2020, with studies addressing various issues and proposing future research agendas (Yeo & Jeon, 2023). These studies contribute to ongoing discussions about organizational structure, innovation, and inclusivity in public administration. Systematic reviews in the field have also drawn attention to the evolution of bureaucracy. Postcolonial scholarship has uncovered the colonial origins and legacies of bureaucratic systems in many countries, though engagement with these perspectives remains limited (Nisar & Masood, 2021). Similarly, research on race and gender in public administration has focused on representation but has not fully engaged with the processes of racialization and gendering, highlighting the need for more interdisciplinary approaches (Pandey et al., 2023).

Although recent scholarship in public administration has significantly advanced discussions on organizational innovation, inclusivity, and theoretical plurality, critical gaps persist, particularly regarding the interplay between bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic paradigms. Studies such as Mele et al. (2023) on telework and Chidziwa et al. (2023) on adhocracy highlight shifts in structural preferences. However, they often treat bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy as binary constructs rather than interrelated logics. Similarly, Hattke and Vogel's (2023) mapping of 150 administrative theories highlights the pluralism of the

field, but also reveals a fragmented theoretical landscape lacking integration across paradigms. In parallel, the surge in DEIA research, as noted by Yeo & Jeon (2023), and postcolonial critiques of bureaucracy, as presented by Nisar & Masood (2021), offer essential socio-cultural perspectives but do not engage deeply with the organizational paradoxes arising from the coexistence of competing models. Pandey et al (2023) note the limitations of representation-focused studies, emphasizing the need for interdisciplinary analysis of deeper structural processes—yet a comprehensive theoretical treatment of how paradoxes are experienced within hybrid bureaucratic contexts remains absent. Empirically, the literature often overlooks how real-world public organizations balance simultaneous demands for control and adaptability, legality and innovation, or hierarchy and collaboration. The absence of a synthesized, paradox-oriented framework that captures the dual pressures modern public institutions face limits theoretical understanding and policy application.

Building upon the identified gap between theoretical debates and empirical realities in contemporary public administration, this study offers a novel contribution by reframing the relationship between bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy through the lens of paradox. Unlike previous studies that present these paradigms as mutually exclusive, this research proposes that bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic logics often coexist within public institutions, forming a dynamic spectrum of organizational tensions. Using the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method, this study systematically identifies, categorizes, and interprets relevant scholarly literature to uncover how paradoxes are articulated, experienced, and managed within the evolving landscape of public administration. The core innovation lies in its integrative approach, which combines theoretical discourse, practical challenges, and contextual complexity to build a reflective analytical framework. Rather than offering another comparison between rigid hierarchy and flexible networks, this study aims to understand how public organizations navigate conflicting demands such as control versus innovation, stability versus adaptability, and rules versus responsiveness. In doing so, the research contributes to a more nuanced and applicable understanding of governance reform. Based on this urgency, the central research question guiding this study is: How do paradoxes manifest in the literature on bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy in public administration, and what implications do they hold for theory and practice? This question forms the foundation for the study's primary objective: to construct a conceptual framework that captures and interprets the dynamic tensions between bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic elements within contemporary public administration.

Literature Review

Paradox Theory

Paradox Theory is a conceptual framework that focuses on the simultaneous existence of conflicting yet interdependent elements within organizations. Rather than viewing such contradictions as problems to be solved, paradox theory suggests that these tensions are inherent and persistent features of organizational life. Lewis et al. (2014) emphasize that paradoxes arise when organizations face competing demands, such as the need for control versus the need for flexibility or the desire for consistency versus the pressure for innovation. These dualities are not anomalies but ongoing dynamics that must be navigated, especially in increasingly complex and uncertain environments. Lewis (2000) further asserts that paradoxical tensions should not be simplified into dichotomies prioritizing one value over

another. Instead, effective organizations recognize the legitimacy of both sides and develop strategies to manage the resulting complexity in a constructive manner. In public sector organizations, such tensions are especially pronounced, as bureaucratic systems are expected to maintain legal-rational authority while responding to rapidly evolving societal needs. By applying paradox theory, researchers and practitioners can move beyond linear thinking and adopt a more nuanced, integrative approach to public administration that acknowledges the coexistence of order and adaptability as essential to institutional resilience and the creation of public value.

The relevance of paradox theory becomes particularly evident when examining the structural tensions within public administration between traditional bureaucratic forms and post-bureaucratic organizational structures. Bureaucratic systems, rooted in Weberian ideals, emphasize hierarchy, rules, and procedural consistency. In contrast, post-bureaucratic approaches prioritize decentralization, collaboration, and agility. Rather than replacing one with the other, contemporary public organizations often integrate both logics, resulting in hybrid structures that reflect institutional paradoxes. Lopes & Farias (2022) demonstrate that public organizations increasingly adopt formal governance mechanisms while simultaneously implementing collaborative and participatory processes. This duality reflects the ongoing balancing act between maintaining accountability and promoting innovation. Schad et al. (2016) further highlight that organizations are not eliminating these paradoxes but learning to manage them over time through ambidextrous strategies. Such approaches enable organizations to harness the benefits of both bureaucratic discipline and post-bureaucratic dynamism. Moreover, Cunha et al. (2020) argue that successful organizations deliberately cultivate paradoxical mindsets to sustain long-term strategic agility. In public administration, these insights challenge the assumption that reform requires a wholesale departure from bureaucracy. Instead, they reveal a more accurate picture in which both paradigms coexist, evolve, and influence one another, creating complex yet productive tensions that can drive institutional learning and adaptive governance.

Beyond its theoretical contributions, paradox theory offers significant practical value for leaders and policymakers in the public sector. Johansen (2018) argues that public managers must develop a cognitive awareness of paradoxes within their institutions and resist the urge to resolve them prematurely. Instead, they should cultivate organizational capacity to navigate and embrace these tensions as opportunities for strategic development. This perspective aligns with Carmine & De Marchi's (2023) findings, which demonstrate that organizations capable of adopting a systems-oriented view of paradox are more likely to achieve long-term innovation and sustainability. In public administration, paradoxes often manifest as the need to uphold procedural accountability while promoting adaptive problem-solving. Putnam et al. (2016) note that public sector leaders must engage in communicative practices that acknowledge, rather than obscure, such contradictions. Similarly, Hahn et al. (2014) emphasize that paradoxical framing can aid in managerial sensemaking, allowing organizations to reconcile competing demands without defaulting to simplistic either/or solutions.

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is traditionally defined as an organizational form characterized by a clearly defined hierarchical structure, specialized roles, impersonal relationships, and rule-

based decision-making processes. Max Weber, widely regarded as the father of bureaucratic theory, conceptualized bureaucracy as the most rational and efficient form of authority, emphasizing meritocracy, legal legitimacy, and standardized procedures (Schomaker et al., 2022). In the context of public administration, bureaucracy has long served as the institutional backbone of governance, ensuring the delivery of public services, regulatory consistency, and administrative accountability. However, contemporary scholarships increasingly argue that bureaucracy cannot be viewed as a static or outdated system. According to Bauer et al. (2016), modern bureaucracies are not merely rule-enforcing entities but also political and adaptive institutions that operate under global pressures, evolving social expectations, and complex governance demands. These dynamics necessitate a broader and more context-sensitive understanding of bureaucracy that recognizes its legal-rational core while accounting for its transformation over time. As administrative systems worldwide face growing demands for efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement, bureaucracy is being reexamined not as an obstacle to reform but as a potentially evolving structure capable of adapting to these pressures (Peters, 2018).

Recent research highlights that rather than being entirely supplanted by alternative governance models, bureaucracy increasingly exhibits hybrid characteristics that blend traditional and modern logic. Public sector organizations integrate formal bureaucratic mechanisms with participatory, collaborative, and flexible governance practices (Bandeira & Ferraro, 2017). This shift does not entail the abandonment of bureaucratic principles but rather their strategic adaptation to meet the dual demands of procedural accountability and innovation. Johansen (2018), through his work on paradox management, emphasizes that contemporary organizations—including bureaucracies—must move beyond binary choices between control and agility. Instead, they must embrace and manage the tensions between these opposing forces in ways that reinforce institutional resilience. These developments indicate that bureaucracy is no longer an inflexible apparatus bound solely by red tape; it is evolving into a more responsive and dynamic form of governance. Integrating performance management systems, digital technologies, and stakeholder engagement strategies has further enhanced the capacity of bureaucratic institutions to navigate uncertainty while upholding structural legitimacy (Ahmed, 2024). As such, bureaucracy today is increasingly conceptualized as a "living institution" capable of learning and adapting while providing the procedural rigor required for public accountability. This reframing invites scholars to move beyond reductionist critiques and explore bureaucracy as a complex, evolving entity within public administration.

Despite the bureaucratic model's capacity for adaptation, critical perspectives remain relevant, particularly regarding procedural rigidity, institutional inertia, and limited responsiveness to citizen needs. Ingaggiati (2024) argue that a systemic approach to bureaucracy must recognize its inherent paradoxes, most notably, the tension between administrative order and societal responsiveness. Without the ability to manage such tensions constructively, bureaucracies risk becoming stagnant and losing public legitimacy. These dualities are not anomalies but defining features of modern organizations, requiring deliberate strategies to navigate and leverage them effectively (Leong, 2024). One such approach is the cultivation of ambidexterity—the organizational ability to balance the exploitation of established processes with the exploration of new solutions. Smith et al. (2017) emphasize that public institutions must move beyond simplistic dichotomies and instead

foster paradoxical mindsets that embrace complexity and strategic duality. Stress the importance of open dialogue and communicative practices that allow leaders to acknowledge and navigate internal contradictions (Johnson & Hackman, 2018). In this context, bureaucracy should be seen not as a monolithic or outdated structure but as a dynamic site of governance innovation. When viewed through this lens, the continued relevance of bureaucracy lies not in its rigidity but in its ability to evolve and strategically manage the contradictions it embodies.

Post-Birokrasi

Post-bureaucracy is an emerging organizational concept that has developed in response to the growing recognition of the limitations inherent in traditional bureaucratic systems. Classical bureaucracy, as theorized by Max Weber, is characterized by rigid hierarchies, clearly defined roles, standardized procedures, and rule-based decision-making processes. While these characteristics contribute to stability, predictability, and legal rationality, they often hinder innovation, responsiveness, and adaptability—qualities that are increasingly essential in today's dynamic and complex public sector environments (Bekkers et al., 2011). The post-bureaucratic model advocates for a more flexible, team-oriented, and decentralized approach to organizational management. It emphasizes trust over control, networks over hierarchies, and empowerment over command, offering a contrasting logic to the formalism of traditional public administration. According to Leifso (2020), the post-bureaucratic shift does not imply the wholesale dismantling of bureaucracy but instead introduces a set of new practices that complement existing structures. In particular, digital technologies, collaborative governance, and cross-functional teams are seen as mechanisms through which public institutions can meet contemporary expectations for service quality, transparency, and citizen engagement.

The transition toward post-bureaucratic structures in public sector practice has been gradual, adaptive, and often incomplete. Rather than a complete rejection of bureaucratic norms, a hybrid model has emerged, in which post-bureaucratic elements are layered upon existing hierarchical frameworks. Empirical studies have shown that public organizations are increasingly experimenting with flatter organizational designs, participatory decision-making processes, and more fluid team-based approaches to governance. Osborne et al. (2013) argue that this reflects a broader shift toward a service-dominant logic in public management, where the co-production of public services with citizens is prioritized over top-down control. Likewise, Denhardt & Denhardt (2015) emphasize that the "new public service" ideal encourages serving citizens as partners rather than directing them as passive recipients. This model ensures accountability through formal procedures and relational and value-based practices. However, implementing post-bureaucratic principles in the public sector presents challenges. Public organizations must navigate legal frameworks, political oversight, and entrenched institutional cultures that may resist change. As such, post-bureaucratic reforms often result in hybrid arrangements that preserve bureaucratic functions while introducing more adaptive and citizen-centered practices.

Despite its theoretical appeal, the post-bureaucratic model does not eliminate the need for structure, consistency, and formal accountability in public administration. Instead, post-bureaucratic practices tend to coexist with traditional bureaucratic norms, creating what scholars describe as hybrid governance structures. Lodge & Gill (2011) illustrate how

administrative systems remain deeply embedded in bureaucratic traditions despite post-NPM (New Public Management) efforts, even in reform-oriented countries like New Zealand. Similarly, Hood & Dixon (2015) argue that while reforms aimed at creating governments that "work better and cost less" have introduced flexibility and efficiency, they have also raised concerns about accountability, coordination, and equity. In practice, public sector institutions must strike a balance between the competing demands of procedural compliance and policy responsiveness. This creates persistent tensions between innovation and control, decentralization and central authority, stakeholder empowerment, and regulatory consistency. Attwood-Charles (2018) emphasizes that accountability in post-bureaucratic settings requires new mechanisms that align with increased autonomy and informal structures without undermining institutional integrity.

Research Method

Study Design

This study employed a qualitative research design, utilizing the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method, to explore the conceptual development and practical applications of post-bureaucracy in public administration. SLR is particularly suitable for synthesizing existing knowledge, identifying research gaps, and generating new insights based on a structured, transparent, and replicable review process. The review focused on peer-reviewed journal articles and academic book chapters published between 2018 and 2024 to ensure the relevance and currency of the findings.

Sample Population or Subject of Research

The subject of this research comprised scholarly literature related to post-bureaucratic theory, practices in public administration, and hybrid governance models. The unit of analysis consisted of articles published by reputable academic publishers, including Elsevier, Emerald, Wiley, and Springer. Studies included in the review were selected based on their explicit focus on post-bureaucracy or its key elements (e.g., decentralization, collaboration, flexibility, participatory governance), particularly within the public sector context. Only empirical studies, conceptual papers, and theoretical frameworks with clear methodological descriptions were retained for analysis.

Data Collection Techniques and Instrument Development

Data were collected through a comprehensive and systematic search across electronic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and SpringerLink. Search terms included combinations of "post-bureaucracy," "public administration," "hybrid governance," and "organizational reform." A review protocol was developed to guide the selection process, which involved identifying, screening, and assessing articles based on specific inclusion and exclusion criteria, including publication year, language (English), peer-reviewed status, and relevance to the research topic.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was conducted using qualitative content analysis to identify recurring themes, conceptual patterns, and theoretical perspectives. Thematic coding was applied to

extract key constructs and relationships. Results were synthesized to map the evolution of post-bureaucratic thinking, highlight critical debates, and suggest future research directions.

Results and Discussion

Results

Coexistence of Bureaucratic and Post-Bureaucratic Logics in Public Administration

Literature consistently demonstrates that bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy are no longer conceptualized as opposing paradigms, but rather as complementary logics that coexist within modern public institutions. This hybrid coexistence is grounded in the practical understanding that hierarchical control and adaptive governance are essential for navigating today's complex policy environment. As Ingaggiati (2024) explains, public administrations increasingly reflect paradoxical structures where traditional bureaucratic rules and formal procedures coexist with post-bureaucratic practices, such as collaborative decision-making, horizontal team structures, and network governance. These layered systems enable institutions to ensure accountability and foster innovation simultaneously. Bandeira and Ferraro (2017) support this view by showing how participatory mechanisms have been integrated into existing representative and bureaucratic structures, not to replace them but to enhance their legitimacy and responsiveness. Ahmed (2024) also highlights that many government agencies adopt a "both-and" approach, maintaining formal institutional controls while promoting citizen participation and digital engagement. This dynamic reflects a shift toward adaptive institutional design where formal and informal practices reinforce one another. Such integration mirrors the evolution of strategic management in the private sector, where companies leverage core operational strengths while investing in agile, customer-oriented capabilities (Leong, 2024). This dual structure enhances organizational resilience in public administration, providing flexibility to respond to societal demands while maintaining the procedural integrity essential for public trust. Understanding this coexistence is key to reimagining governance as an evolving, multi-dimensional process rather than a fixed administrative model.

Dominant Paradoxical Themes in Bureaucratic Transformation

A key insight from this review is the identification of recurring paradoxes that define the bureaucratic-post-bureaucratic interface in contemporary public administration. These paradoxes represent persistent tensions that are not easily resolved but must be managed continuously. The most dominant among them is the paradox between stability and adaptability. Public organizations must maintain institutional stability while adapting to shifting policy environments, evolving stakeholder expectations, and emerging crises. Another common paradox is enforcing rules and maintaining standardization while encouraging creativity, innovation, and responsiveness to local contexts (Carmine & De Marchi, 2023). Schad et al. (2016) emphasize that organizations operate in a "logic of paradox," where competing demands are not eliminated but balanced through dynamic processes. Hahn et al. (2014) further explore how managers cognitively frame such paradoxes, revealing that effective navigation depends on recognizing rather than denying their existence. This entails designing institutions that balance centralized authority and decentralized responsiveness in the public sector. For example, Bekkers et al. (2011) discuss how innovation in public governance often emerges from this very tension between control and flexibility. The

literature also suggests that failing to acknowledge these paradoxes can lead to bureaucratic rigidity or managerial chaos, thereby compromising public value. Instead, successful organizations develop what Cunha et al. (2020) refer to as "paradox-sensitive capabilities," which enable institutional actors to interpret, adapt to, and act upon conflicting demands strategically and ethically. This orientation is increasingly critical in volatile governance landscapes.

Strategies for Managing Paradoxes in Public Administration

In response to these enduring paradoxes, public organizations have adopted a series of strategic responses to manage rather than resolve institutional tensions. The concept of "paradox management," developed by Johansen (2018), is central to understanding how administrative systems maintain balance amid conflicting demands. One of the most prominent strategies is ambidextrous leadership, which supports simultaneous efforts to refine existing practices and explore new opportunities for reform (Cunha et al., 2020). This leadership style acknowledges the value of both hierarchical control and adaptive experimentation. Structural strategies include the formation of hybrid organizations, which blend the verticality of bureaucracy with the flexibility of networked arrangements such as task forces, policy labs, and digital governance units. Ivanov and Dolgui (2021) demonstrate how digital tools, such as system modeling and real-time feedback loops, facilitate the synchronization of formal procedures with dynamic responses, enabling institutions to operate as robust and agile systems. These models are more resilient and foster a learning orientation within the organization. Feldman and Khademian (2002) advocate for inclusive management styles that empower employees and stakeholders, enabling shared sensemaking in complex scenarios. Additionally, Lopes and Farias (2022) underscore the importance of collaborative governance mechanisms that institutionalize feedback, reflection, and co-creation in the policy process. By implementing such multifaceted strategies, public institutions can enhance their capacity to proactively manage paradoxes, transforming them from organizational liabilities into sources of resilience, legitimacy, and public innovation.

Theoretical Evolution Toward an Integrative and Reflective Framework

The final and perhaps most significant finding is the evolution of the theoretical discourse on bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy from an oppositional to an integrative perspective. Early studies treated these models as mutually exclusive, associating bureaucracy with rigidity and compliance, and post-bureaucracy with innovation and agility. However, contemporary scholarship increasingly recognizes that the coexistence of these logics is both inevitable and potentially productive. Hattke and Vogel (2023) note a growing scholarly shift toward pluralistic and reflexive theories that accommodate organizational complexity. Lewis (2000) contributes to this transformation by proposing a paradox theory framework, which views contradictions not as problems to be solved but as dynamics to be managed creatively. K. Smith et al. (2017) argue that embracing dualities enhances organizational learning and long-term adaptability. This theoretical shift in public administration is reflected in studies exploring hybrid governance, institutional bricolage, and adaptive capacity as key concepts for managing reform in uncertain contexts. This body of work reframes the study of public institutions not merely as systems of rules but as arenas of ongoing negotiation between competing values and priorities. It also aligns with broader changes in public service delivery,

where responsiveness, transparency, and engagement are as important as legality and accountability (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). By adopting an integrative theoretical lens, this review contributes to the conceptual advancement of public administration, providing a dynamic framework that more accurately reflects the empirical realities of contemporary governance. Such an approach provides scholars and practitioners with tools to reimagine administration as a living system capable of order and transformation.

Discussion

This study reveals that the coexistence of bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic logics should not be interpreted as a failure of administrative reform but rather as an intentional and adaptive strategy to cope with the increasing complexity of modern public sector environments. In contrast to traditional dichotomous thinking that views bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic systems as opposing paradigms, the findings indicate that many public institutions are actively blending these models to construct organizational frameworks that are both stable and dynamic. Specifically, contemporary public organizations uphold hierarchical structures and procedural rules derived from Weberian bureaucracy to ensure predictability, control, and legal-rational legitimacy. Simultaneously, they integrate post-bureaucratic principles such as organizational flexibility, cross-sector collaboration, and continuous innovation to meet the demands of a more volatile and participatory societal context. This hybrid arrangement enhances institutional responsiveness and supports resilience in the face of disruption. Public organizations can better navigate the dual pressures of regulatory compliance and public value creation by maintaining bureaucratic order while embracing the strategic openness of post-bureaucratic reforms. Such an approach aligns with evolving models of governance that recognize the need for integrative strategies capable of balancing both stability and change. Ultimately, the coexistence of these two logics represents not a contradiction but a strategic synthesis that equips institutions with the operational diversity required to function effectively in complex and uncertain governance landscapes.

The findings of this research further demonstrate that the relationship between bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy should not be viewed through a lens of exclusion or competition but rather as one of mutual complementarity. Both logics represent different but equally necessary responses to the multidimensional challenges public sector institutions face. Traditional bureaucracy provides the backbone of legitimacy, standardization, and procedural clarity, while post-bureaucracy offers agility, responsiveness, and an openness to innovation. The intersection of these frameworks creates a productive spectrum of organizational tensions. Core paradoxes emerge within this spectrum, particularly those involving the balance between stability and adaptability, control and innovation, and adherence to formal rules versus responsiveness to rapidly evolving societal needs. These paradoxes are not anomalies to be resolved or eliminated but are structural features of modern public administration. Effective institutions are distinguished not by their ability to avoid such tensions but by their capacity to manage and leverage them strategically. Instead of choosing one paradigm over the other, public organizations are increasingly adopting integrative practices that embed both sets of principles into their everyday operations. In doing so, they cultivate a disciplined and experimental organizational culture. Recognizing and embracing these tensions enables a dynamic and evolving approach to governance that reflects the reality

of serving diverse constituencies in a complex policy landscape, fiscal constraints, and shifting political expectations. In this way, the paradox becomes a resource rather than an obstacle.

Within this evolving administrative context, paradox management emerges as a core leadership competency for modern public sector executives. Leaders are no longer expected to resolve tensions by privileging one institutional logic over another. Instead, they are tasked with navigating, sustaining, and transforming those tensions into drivers of learning and innovation. The ability to manage paradoxes—especially those stemming from the interplay between bureaucratic rigidity and post-bureaucratic fluidity—is now central to effective governance. Public leaders must possess high cognitive complexity, emotional intelligence, and strategic agility to recognize and constructively integrate opposing institutional demands. This involves cultivating spaces within the organization where hierarchical authority and collaborative engagement coexist, regulatory compliance does not preclude innovation, and accountability mechanisms align with participatory processes. Leaders who succeed in this environment are ambidextrous, simultaneously leveraging the strengths of existing systems while exploring novel methods of service delivery and policy implementation. Such leadership also requires the capacity to communicate paradoxes clearly, fostering an organizational understanding that competing goals can, and often must, coexist. When paradoxes are reframed as opportunities rather than contradictions, leaders can inspire teams to adopt a mindset of both/and rather than either/or. In doing so, they enable public institutions to adapt to complexity while maintaining the public trust.

The findings of this study align closely with the paradox theory in organizational research, which suggests that persistent tensions between competing demands are not merely challenges to be resolved but relatively enduring features of complex systems that must be actively managed. In the context of public administration, the tension between bureaucratic stability and post-bureaucratic adaptability reflects this organizational paradox. Rather than attempting to eliminate or suppress such tensions, effective organizations recognize them as integral components of institutional life and leverage them as sources of innovation, learning, and resilience. This perspective is rooted in the foundational work of Marianne W. Lewis (2000), who argued that paradoxes—defined as "contradictory yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time"—offer the potential for organizations to evolve and thrive when embraced rather than denied. In the case of public institutions, managing the paradox between hierarchy and flexibility enables more adaptive and citizen-centered governance models. By fostering rule- and innovation-driven cultures, organizations can better navigate uncertainty and complexity. This theoretical lens helps interpret the coexistence of bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic logics not as signs of institutional incoherence, but as strategic assets reflecting the maturity and agility of contemporary public administration.

This study expands the current understanding of the relationship between bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy by emphasizing their coexistence and the paradoxes that arise from their interaction. In contrast to earlier research, which often portrayed bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy as mutually exclusive frameworks, this study reveals that their integration can lead to more adaptive and responsive public sector organizations. Scholars such as Chidziwa et al. (2023) have advocated shifting from rigid bureaucratic structures to more adhocratic forms to promote innovation. However, such perspectives have often underappreciated the stabilizing function that bureaucracy continues to serve, particularly in

ensuring procedural accountability and institutional legitimacy. Previous studies have primarily focused on the value of flexibility and innovation in public administration (Osborne et al., 2013), often positioning these features in opposition to traditional bureaucratic practices. In contrast, this study suggests that the coexistence of both logics—bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic—constitutes a strategic organizational response to the complexity of the environment. The effective management of paradox, rather than binary decision-making, emerges as the key to integrating these competing demands productively.

Conclusion

This study aimed to reexamine the longstanding debate between bureaucracy and post-bureaucracy by investigating the paradoxes that arise from their interaction within contemporary public administration. Through a systematic literature review, the research examined how these two organizational logics—often treated as opposing in earlier discourse—are being increasingly integrated into hybrid structures that reflect both stability and flexibility. The core finding addresses the research question by demonstrating that paradoxes between bureaucratic control and post-bureaucratic adaptability are not merely tensions to be resolved, but rather persistent dynamics that must be strategically managed. The study underscores that successful public organizations do not eliminate such paradoxes but instead embrace and operationalize them as part of their institutional reality.

The originality of this study lies in its integrative approach to understanding organizational dualities, offering a nuanced perspective that bridges theoretical discourse and practical governance. By reframing the bureaucracy–post–bureaucracy dichotomy through the lens of paradox theory, this research makes a meaningful contribution to the development of public administration scholarship. It provides practitioners and policymakers with a reflective framework to design public institutions that are both resilient and responsive. From a managerial standpoint, the findings highlight the importance of ambidextrous leadership and adaptive institutional design that fosters innovation while maintaining legitimacy and accountability. This dual strategy offers a pragmatic pathway for navigating governance challenges in complex and evolving policy environments.

Despite its contributions, this study has limitations. As a qualitative synthesis, it relies on secondary data from existing literature, encompassing the scope, context, and methodological diversity of the reviewed studies. Additionally, the findings are interpretative and may not fully capture sectoral or regional specificities. Future research should consider empirical investigations that apply paradox theory in specific public sector settings to validate and extend these insights. Researchers are encouraged to explore how paradox management practices vary across institutional cultures, administrative levels, or governance models. Such efforts would enrich theoretical development and offer more context-sensitive guidance for public managers navigating structural tensions in real-world settings.

References

Ahmed, L. K. F. N. (2024). Public Administration. Prachi Digital Publication.

Attwood-Charles, W. (2018). Post-bureaucratic organizations: normative and technical dimensions. Boston College.

Bandeira, P., & Ferraro, A. (2017). Integrating participatory institutions into the traditional representative and bureaucratic model of public governance. International Political Science Review, 38(5), 642–658. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512116641815

Bauer, M. W., Knill, C., & Eckhard, S. (2016). International bureaucracy: Challenges and lessons for public administration research. Springer.

Bekkers, V., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (2011). Linking Innovation to the Public Sector: Contexts, Concepts and Challenges BT - Innovation in the Public Sector: Linking Capacity and Leadership (V. Bekkers, J. Edelenbos, & B. Steijn (eds.); pp. 3–32). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307520_1

Carmine, S., & De Marchi, V. (2023). Reviewing Paradox Theory in Corporate Sustainability Toward a Systems Perspective. Journal of Business Ethics, 184(1), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05112-2

Chidziwa, T., Chidziwa, L., & Langa, V. (2023). Moving From Bureaucracy To Adhocracy: An Innovative Approach Towards Torwards An Improved Operations Strategy. EPH-International Journal of Business & Management Science, 9(3), 17–22. https://doi.org/10.53555/eijbms.v9i3.149

Christopher, M. (2016). Logistics and Supply Chain Management: Logistics & Supply Chain Management. Pearson UK.

Cunha, M. P. e, Gomes, E., Mellahi, K., Miner, A. S., & Rego, A. (2020). Strategic agility through improvisational capabilities: Implications for a paradox-sensitive HRM. Human Resource Management Review, 30(1), 100695. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100695

Denhardt, J. V, & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). The new public service: Serving, not steering. Routledge.

Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability: Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. Academy of Management Review, 39(4), 463–487. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0341

Hattke, F., & Vogel, R. (2023). Theories and theorizing in public administration: A systematic review. Public Administration Review, 83(6), 1542–1563. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13730

Hood, C., & Dixon, R. (2015). A government that worked better and cost less?: Evaluating three decades of reform and change in UK central Government. OUP Oxford.

Ingaggiati, M. (2024). Public Administrations Between Bureaucracy And Post-Bureaucracy: A Paradoxical Perspective. https://hdl.handle.net/2434/1121631

Ivanov, D., & and Dolgui, A. (2021). A digital supply chain twin for managing the disruption risks and resilience in the era of Industry 4.0. Production Planning & Control, 32(9), 775–788. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1768450

Johansen, J. H. (2018). Paradox management: Contradictions and tensions in complex organizations. Springer.

Johnson, C. E., & Hackman, M. Z. (2018). Leadership: A communication perspective. Waveland Press.

K. Smith, W., Erez, M., Jarvenpaa, S., Lewis, M. W., & Tracey, P. (2017). Adding complexity to theories of paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change: Introduction to organization studies special issue on paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change. In Organization Studies (Vol. 38, Issues 3–4, pp. 303–317). SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617693560

Kamalahmadi, M., & Parast, M. M. (2017). An assessment of supply chain disruption mitigation strategies. International Journal of Production Economics, 184, 210–230. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.12.011

Kettl, D. F. (2015). The transformation of governance: Public administration for the twenty-first century. Jhu Press.

Leifso, J. B. (2020). Shapeshifting: political rationalities, lean, and the transforming landscapes of Canadian public bureaucracies. https://doi.org/10.7939/r3-a0wn-e125

Leong, D. (2024). Organizational Homeostasis: A Quantum Theoretical Exploration with Bohmian and Prigoginian Systemic Insights. Journal of Information and Organizational Sciences, 48(1), 215–242. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1248239

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 760–776. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707712

Lewis, M. W., Andriopoulos, C., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Paradoxical leadership to enable strategic agility. California Management Review, 56(3), 58–77. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.3.58

Lodge, M., & Gill, D. (2011). Toward a new era of administrative reform? The myth of post-NPM in New Zealand. Governance, 24(1), 141–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2010.01508.x

Lopes, A. V., & Farias, J. S. (2022). How can governance support collaborative innovation in the public sector? A systematic review of the literature. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 88(1), 114–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852319893444

Mele, V., Belardinelli, P., & Bellé, N. (2023). Telework in public organizations: A systematic review and research agenda. Public Administration Review, 83(6), 1649–1666. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13734

Nisar, M. A., & Masood, A. (2021). Bureaucracy and the other: A systematic review of postcolonial scholarship in public administration. Available at SSRN 3886409. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3886409

Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Nasi, G. (2013). A new theory for public service management? Toward a (public) service-dominant approach. The American Review of Public Administration, 43(2), 135–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012466935

Pandey, S. K., Smith, A. E., Pandey, S., & Ojelabi, O. A. (2023). Reimagining race and gender in public administration and public policy: Insights from an interdisciplinary systematic review. Public Administration Review, 83(1), 14–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13570

Peters, B. G. (2018). The politics of bureaucracy: An introduction to comparative public administration. Routledge.

Putnam, L. L., Fairhurst, G. T., & Banghart, S. (2016). Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach. Academy of Management Annals, 10(1), 65–171. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162421

Schad, J., Lewis, M. W., Raisch, S., & Smith, W. K. (2016). Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. Academy of Management Annals, 10(1), 5–64. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162422

Scholten, K., Sharkey Scott, P., & Fynes, B. (2019). Building routines for non-routine events: supply chain resilience learning mechanisms and their antecedents. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 24(3), 430–442. https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-05-2018-0186

Schomaker, R. M., Bauer, M. W., & Ege, J. (2022). Bureaucracy and Internationalization BT - Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance (A. Farazmand (ed.); pp. 1067–1075). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_3748

Wijaya, A. (2024). Peningkatan Kinerja dan Perlakuan Risiko Rantai Pasok Beras Cadangan Pangan Pemerintah (Studi Kasus pada Perum BULOG, Kantor Wilayah Jawa Barat). JURNAL PANGAN, 33(3), 97–118. https://doi.org/10.33964/jp.v33i3.881

Yeo, J., & Jeon, S. H. (2023). Diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in recent public administration research: A systematic review of the literature since George Floyd. Journal of Policy Studies, 38(2), 33–54. https://doi.org/10.52372/jps38204

Yusuf, Y. Y., Gunasekaran, A., Adeleye, E. O., & Sivayoganathan, K. (2004). Agile supply chain capabilities: Determinants of competitive objectives. European Journal of Operational Research, 159(2), 379–392. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2003.08.022