

Comparing event. as
a chief bureaucrat,
the president



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Comparing and contrasting presidential tools

Every institution either governmental or privately owned has bureaucratic procedures to be followed as stipulated by the constitution.

Bureaucracy is the procedures or actions followed within a chain of command; it defines how offices are set in terms of authority. It is noted that, bureaucracies have diverse skillful persons with the capacity to organize a great function or event. As a chief bureaucrat, the president has many tools at disposal capable of influencing and controlling bureaucracies. Powers on budget, appointments and executive commands are some of the tool used by the presidents to influence bureaus. Offices of the President, congresses, parliaments and judiciaries are some of the institutions that influence bureaucracy.

In comparison to other tools, power of appointment is considered as the primary tool to a president for manipulation of bureaus. In many states, the chief executive has the mandate to appoint persons that will work as his subordinate. As the executive boss, he has the power to appoint government and other institution's top officials as stipulated in the constitution. It is regarded as a stronger tool because of its vast influence and manipulation on bureau activities and performance.

Considering executive appointment powers, a president will hire persons who are loyal and submissive to him. Consequently, many appointees will perform their duties with presidential interests in mind. This may limit the use of executive orders by the fact that most crucial positions are under presidential supervision with submissive employees. In comparing setbacks, <https://assignbuster.com/comparing-event-as-a-chief-bureaucrat-the-president/>

executive orders create governmental controversies while executive appointment may result to employment of unqualified or unskilled personnel in crucial positions. In addition, unqualified presidential appointees do not last long in office due to unprofessional conduct resulting in underperformance in bureaus. Power of appointment is far much stronger than other tools; this is because control, directives and limited monitoring will automatically be at place as compared to executive orders where presidential interests are done only when orders are issued. Although in many state parliaments or congresses are given the basic mandate to exercise budgetary activities, presidents also do have some budgetary powers.

The chief executive can decide to delay his consent concerning the budget consequently stagnating budgetary activities. Additionally, the president has the authority to limit or increase fiscal expenditure on different institutions or bureaus. In comparison to effects caused by executive orders, the president may reduce the amount of expenditure thus inactivating organizational activities. Concerning their negative aspect, budgetary powers may act as an avenue for the president to punish some organization by minimizing their budgetary expenditure while executive orders may result to employment of unqualified personnel in vital positions.

The most effective tool

Basing my argument on effects caused by the tools and their influence on bureau, appointment power is the most effective presidential tool. In fact under normal circumstances when you are appointed by an employer, one

thing is that you will have to be submissive, same applies to presidential appointees.

When comparing the tools based on the level of influence, appointment powers has greater influence to an extent of surpassing the others. For example executive orders may not be necessary to persons appointed by the president. Furthermore, it gives the president more authority to control, manipulate and also directs the organizational activities making it more effective.

Effects of presidents on bureaucratic performance

In the event that these presidential tools are put into practice, they create immense influence on bureaucratic performances. Many presidents use these tools to manipulate bureau so as to suit their political and monetary interests at the expense of bureaucratic performance. Considering presidential appointment as a tool, unskilled or unqualified personnel may hold vital positions just for the reason that they are loyal to the president.

Such a bureau will suffer a great deal especially in key position where skills and professionalism is needed in practice. Bureau will not only fail to uphold professionalism but also conduct its activities to suit the interest of the president especially when his job is at stake. In circumstances where presidential executive orders are in execution, many activities of the bureau will be done as par the president's directives, especially when addressing his subordinates.

Bureaus may suffer extensively, especially when the president's directives are based on personal interest and not performance. By use of budgetary
<https://assignbuster.com/comparing-event-as-a-chief-bureaucrat-the-president/>

powers, a president can make an organization dormant with the aim of punishing them. He may decide to either delay a budget or reduce the amount of expenditure on an agency thus making it dormant. This affects an agency's performance. Even though chief executives can use these tools to influence activities of a bureau in order to gain political or personal interests, it is possible to limit them for the sake of bureaucratic performance. In some countries, before any action on these tools, approval must be done by a supreme body. In addition, the activities done are extensively monitored for the sake of bureau development.

This maintains bureau's performance at its peak whether the tools are being used or not. In conclusion, the degree of bureau's influence by presidents depends on the system of governance and the laws behind the tool. In addition, the performance of a bureau is also determined by presidential policies, some presidents uphold policies that are bureau friendly while other only care about their interests.