

The manager position in the Moroccan public administration: the question of legitimacy?

Abdelhay Benabdelhadi, (PhD Professor)

*Laboratory of Researches in Management and Organizational Sciences
National School of Business and Management
Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco*

Hanane El kaout, (PhD Student)

*Laboratory of Researches in Management and Organizational Sciences
National School of Business and Management
Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco*

Correspondence address:

National School of Business and Management Ibn Tofail
University Box.1420 Morocco (Kenitra)
abdelhay.benabdelhadi@uit.ac.ma

Disclosure statement:

Authors are not aware of any findings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this study

Conflicts of interest:

The authors reports no conflicts of interest.

Cite this article

Benabdelhadi, A., & El kaout, H. (2020). The consequences of the perceived organizational justice: a holistic overview. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics*, 1(3), 183-199. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4282143>

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4282143

Published online: November 20, 2020

Copyright © 2020 – IJAFAME



The manager position in the Moroccan public administration: the question of legitimacy?

Abstract

This research examines the foundations of the manager's legitimacy within the Moroccan public administration as well as its effect on the attitudes and behaviors of his collaborators. Research was conducted with 96 officials from different public organizations in the Oujda-Angad prefecture to evaluate some components of the manager's legitimacy within the Moroccan administration.

The results highlight the positive relationship between the legitimacy of the public administration manager and power as well as leadership. This legitimacy would then have a positive effect on the attitudes and behavior of collaborators towards their superior.

Keywords: Legitimacy – Public administration manager - Moroccan public administration.

JEL Classification: L2

Paper type: Theoretical Research

1. Introduction

The concept of legitimacy has been the subject of growing interest by researchers for many years. It is mobilized by several theories of organizations and presented as an important resource for management because of its ability to improve the effectiveness of the organization's decisions.

Management research on the concept of legitimacy focuses mainly on private companies. However, the fragility of the function of the manager in the public administration, leads to wonder about the modalities of construction of its legitimacy in the same way as that of the private sector, as well as the effects on the behaviors and attitudes of officials.

The purpose of this paper is to provide insight into the legitimacy of managers in the public administration by studying the following questions: How do civil servants in the public administration recognize the legitimacy of their superiors? How does this legitimacy affect the attitudes and behavior of public servants?

In order to conduct this analysis, within the organizational context of the Moroccan administration, the first part will focus on presenting a brief overview of the managers occupying the positions of responsibility within the Moroccan administrations. Next, we will present a classification of managers that may exist in the public sector. We will then study the concept of legitimacy in organizational theories. In a third step, we will present our methodological approach and then reveal the results obtained during our field survey by focusing on the main components of the manager's legitimacy within a public administration. Finally, we will interpret and discuss the results obtained and conclude with ideas for possible research.

2. An Overview of Positions of Responsibility in Morocco's Administrations

Today's Moroccan administration is increasingly entrusted with highly qualified young managers. This is due to an institutional evolution in terms of access to certain senior jobs and positions of responsibility. These include the:

- Decree No. 2.11.681 of 25 November 2011 laying down the modalities for the appointment of heads of division and heads of services ;
- Organic Law No. 02.12 on Appointment to Senior Positions pursuant to the provisions of Articles 49 and 92 of the Constitution ;
- Decree 2.12.412 of 11 October 2012 taken for the application of Articles 4 and 5 of Organic Law 02.12 concerning the procedure for appointment to higher positions.

Indeed, since the end of 2011, access to the jobs of division heads and heads of services and certain similar jobs in the public administration, have been subject to a call for applications open to candidates meeting certain seniority requirements (competence, training and merit...). The aim is to attract high-level skills, capable of improving and increasing the managerial level of public services and thus guaranteeing their effectiveness in order to improve the quality of services to citizens, based on the consecration of the principles of merit, equal opportunities and transparency.

Statistically, in 2015, Moroccan public administrations included 10727 high-level officials, heads of divisions and services. The Ministry of Interior ranks first in terms of the presence of positions of responsibility, with 2,106 officials (19.63% of the total). It is followed by the Ministry of Health with 1963 managers (18.30% of the total) and the Ministry of National Education, Vocational Training, Higher Education and Scientific Research with 1099 managers (10.24% of the total). These large numbers reflect the need for these administrations to study in depth the important role played by the managerial aspect in the proper functioning of their organizations.

After presenting a brief overview of managerial positions in Moroccan public administrations, let us now proceed to the study of the concept of legitimacy before identifying the types of managers present in the public sector.

3. Literature review: the concept of legitimacy

3.1 Definition

Legitimacy is a concept that has several meanings. It has been approached in literature in an abstract way, based on the philosophical, political, sociological and legal fields, and each field has its own understanding.

By its etymology (from the Latin *lex, legis*: law), legitimacy is close to legality, but the difference lies in their meanings: legality consists in applying a law, whereas legitimacy claims principles which, in some cases, may be in contradiction with a law.

Several definitions can be found in the literature on the concept of legitimacy, which varies from one author to another. The following are a few examples:

- *A central element of legitimacy is to meet and adheres to the expectations of the norms of a social system, its values, rules and meanings (Hirsch and Andrews, 1986);*
- *In the most obvious sense, being legitimate means being able to respond satisfactorily to anyone who asks the question: What right do you have ? (Laufer and Ramanantsoa, 1982) ;*
- *Legitimacy is the right of an individual (or group) to act or speak in the name of a principle or value ... these laws are buried in the more unconscious social structures (Hatzfeld, 1998).*

These early definitions understand that legitimacy refers to the values and principles of human judgment in a given society. It finds its foundations in a law common to a group of men concerning their actions and their speeches. This human law comes from a natural right and not from a regulatory system.

- *The reflection on legitimacy is rooted in the movement to challenge the political authority of the absolute monarchy of divine right. It is by doubting the sacred and eternal character of power that we seek elements of legitimacy (Menissier, 2005);*
- *Authority can be without justification (...) but what is indispensable to him is legitimacy (...). Violence may be justifiable, but it will never be legitimate (Arendt, 1972).*

These two definitions address the concept of legitimacy in a political field. Which means that there is a link between politics and legitimacy.

There are in principle three internal reasons for domination, and therefore there are three foundations of legitimacy. First of all, the authority of 'the Lord yesterday'. Secondly, the authority based on the personal and extraordinary grace of an individual (charism)...Finally, there is the authority that is required by virtue of 'legality's... (Max Weber, 1959, p.104).

It can be understood that this definition establishes a relationship that allows us to interpret the foundations of legitimacy as a logical continuation of the internal reasons that justify domination. This definition addresses the concept of legitimacy as an attribute of power or domination.

In short, it can be said that in the literature, there are authors who consider legitimacy to be the result of an agreement shared in a social group. Others see it as an expression of power or legal domination. Thus, what is fair or equitable for a human community requires the exercise of rationality and a normative social construct of its members to allow this judgment.

3.2 The Foundations of Legitimacy in Organizational Theories

In organizational theories, the first sources or foundations of legitimacy are cited in Max Weber studies (1922). Other sources of legitimacy have been evoked in Suchman's studies (1995). In this section, we present in turn the studies of these authors, and then set out our research hypotheses.

3.2.1 The foundations of legitimacy in Max Weber's studies (1922)

Max Weber (1922) deepened the concept of legitimacy by studying a broader framework: that of types of domination. He first defined domination (sometimes also translated as authority) in relation to obedience. For the latter, each dominated person seeks to justify his or her domination on the basis of legitimacy. Thus, the recognition of legitimacy by the dominated person passes by an acceptance of the power in the place according to the norms and values carried by this person. In this way, the dominated give meaning to this domination. "No domination is voluntarily satisfied with purely material or purely emotional or purely rational motives in relation to a value in order to ensure its survival. On the contrary, each one seeks to give birth to and nourish the belief in its legitimacy" (Weber, 1922, Volume 1, p157). Thus, the characteristic of domination is to have a political power or authority accepted in such a way that those who submit to it recognizes the validity and justification of this power. This recognition of domination is legitimacy. He thus distinguishes three sources of legitimacy of this authority or domination, namely:

- Tradition or customary rules: The case where authority is based on the belief in predominant and unchanging traditional values. Legitimacy is thus granted to those who ensure that these values are respected. The most practical example is that of the hereditary system in the case of family businesses where the new chief is entrusted with his mandate by his predecessor without a challenge from the staff;
- Charisma or personality traits: The case where leaders succeed in persuading others of their exceptional skills. The belief in their legitimacy is based on their "heroic virtues", "exceptional sanctity" or "exceptional character" and cannot be transmitted, as it is based exclusively on an individual's personality;
- The rules of law: The case where authority is based on a belief in the legitimacy of laws, institutional rules, and the people who seek to enforce those laws. It is here the function rather than the individual who is vested with this authority. The author describes this impersonal system as a bureaucracy. Indeed, he considers it to be the most efficient form of administration because it operates on a commonly accepted hierarchical basis. In short, this form of authority is based on a belief in the legality of the right of those in higher positions to command and be obeyed.

Within the framework of our empirical study, we are going to verify these last two forms of foundation of managerial legitimacy: rational legal legitimacy and charismatic legitimacy, by establishing the following initial research hypotheses:

- *Hypothesis 1: The legitimacy of the public sector manager is based on his or her position or power within the organization;*
- *Hypothesis 2: The legitimacy of the public sector manager is based on his/her personal qualities as well as his/her charisma.*

3.2.2 The foundations of legitimacy in Suchman's studies (1922)

According to Suchman (1995), legitimacy can be seen as the stakeholders' perception that the organization is appropriate and has the right to operate. He generally distinguishes three sources or foundations of this legitimacy:

- Informal cultural representations: Legitimacy may depend on the evaluator's understanding of the context. This way is determined by the informal cultural representation that he or she has constructed in his or her environment and which will

provide plausible explanations of this or that act or object to be legitimized. Therefore, the organization can be deemed legitimate if it conforms to the tacit cultural understandings shared in the environment. These are expressed in words, signs and symbolic gestures, rituals, etc.;

- Evaluators' own interests: the object to be legitimized may depend on the close interests of the evaluators. These evaluators may recognize the legitimacy of the object to be legitimized in order to benefit from favorable exchanges of interdependence or to serve their interests in the broadest sense;
- The value system in force: this system will allow a positive normative evaluation of the organization and its activities. In other words, it will allow an evaluation of the appropriateness of an action or activity for the organization. Consequently, Suchman distinguishes four variables on which the evaluation of the object to be legitimized may depend. These are: the results achieved by the object to be legitimized, the adoption of socially accepted procedures and techniques, the adoption of quality and internal control procedures, the personal and charismatic qualities of the object to be legitimized.

In the framework of our empirical study, we are going to verify only one variable on which the evaluation of the object to be legitimized can depend, which is: the evaluation according to the results achieved, by establishing a third research hypothesis:

- *Hypothesis 3: The legitimacy of the public sector manager is based on his or her ability to contribute to the performance of the organization.*

2.3 The implications of legitimacy in organizational theories

The legitimacy of the manager in an organization must naturally generate a form of commitment in the work of the employees, or what researchers call "organizational commitment". Indeed, several theoretical models exist in the managerial literature dealing with the definitions and forms of organizational commitment. The following table summarizes these definitions:

Table 1: *The main definitions of organizational commitment*

Authors	Emotional commitment
Kanter, 1968, p. 507	The affective and emotional attachment of the individual to the group
Sheldon, 1971, p. 143	An attitude or orientation towards the organization that links or attaches the individual's identity to the organization
Hall, Schneider et Nygren, 1970, pp. 176-177	The process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individuals become increasingly assimilated or convergent.
Mowday, Porter et Steers, 1982, p. 27	The relative strength of an individual's identification and involvement in a particular organization
	The continuity commitment
Kanter, 1968, p. 504	The benefit of continuity, as opposed to the cost of leaving
Becker, 1960, p. 32	Engagement occurs when a person, by taking advantage of work-related benefits, connects incidental interests with a coherent field of activity.

Hrebiniak et Alutto, 1972, p. 556	A structural phenomenon that is the result of transactions and individual or organizational changes in work-related benefits over time.
	The normative commitment
Wiener et Gechman, 1977, p. 48	Engagement behaviors are socially accepted behaviors that exceed formal or normative expectations of the engagement goal
Wiener, 1982, p. 421	The totality of normative pressures built into the way of acting that meets the goals and interests of the organization

Source: Meyer, J. P. et Allen, N. J., (1997, p.12)

Within the framework of our empirical study, we are going to measure the emotional commitment of employees following the recognition of the legitimacy of their leader, based on the following hypothesis:

- *Hypothesis 4: The legitimacy of the manager of the public sector generates obedience and total confidence on the part of his working group.*

Having distinguished the different categories of legitimacy defined in organizational theories, its foundations as well as its implications, we move on to identify the categories of managers that generally exist in the public sector.

4. Categories of managers in the public sector

Several authors in the managerial literature have given a classification of managers in public administration such as Serge Alécian and Dominique Foucher (2007). According to these authors, there are three types of public sector managers, by level of responsibility, in order to highlight the hierarchical aspects that characterize public sector organizations. They call them first-level managers, second-level managers, third-level managers.

4.1 First-Level Managers

First-level managers are newly recruited managers in the public service to supervise a work team, from a basic school or functional position, and address management issues for the first time. What is expected of these managers is to be technically efficient and know how to work with their employees.

The main managerial functions that fall under this category of responsible managers are :

- Dynamize the team: motivate and focus energies, communicate, conduct meetings.
- Organize the work of the team: distribute work among officials, supervise, monitor its proper execution ...
- Make technical decisions and also any decisions that is related to the collective life of the team...
- Manage conflicts between team members, or within other team leaders...

As a result of these functions, it can be assumed that the legitimacy of this category of managers is "pragmatic legitimacy" in that these newly recruited managers will insist on the consideration given to employees in order to be accepted. In other words, each manager will be concerned with serving the interests of his or her employees if he or she wants to be recognized as legitimate.

4.2 Second-Level Managers

This category of managers is defined as those who have to manage other managers. They are responsible for several teams or work units and must coordinate their activities. The

specificity of this level of responsibility is that the person in charge has different areas of activity, sometimes with little relationship with each other. This manager is therefore led to practice management, which becomes more instrumental (or directive) at this level. The main managerial functions of this category of managers are:

- Decline the general strategy of the administration or the public organization into operational objectives for each of the work units under their responsibility;
- Coordinate activities and allocate tasks among the different units of work, as well as establish an efficient system of delegation to ensure the smooth functioning of all units;
- Set up a control system and scorecards to ensure that objectives are achieved correctly and that there are no malfunctions;
- Evaluate the performance of each executive under their responsibilities, train them and provide them with the necessary means of work.

Managers in this category can no longer hope to base their legitimacy on their expertise (at least at the beginning); they are "doomed" to management, which is increasingly becoming their primary profession. This is why they should not focus only on their area of expertise and forget the managerial side. Their challenge then is going to be to ensure their "personal effectiveness", that is to say their ability to be good managers and experts at the same time because they will draw their power from their field of expertise. This is what is called in the theories of organizations' moral or normative legitimacy's.

4.3 Third-Level Managers

Third-level managers are senior managers. That is, those who have the supreme responsibility of an entity with broad autonomy. The nature of the responsibilities of this category of leaders is different. They must know only the "core of the business" of the entity for which they are responsible and not have a technicality, because they have too many areas of activity to be technicians in everything.

What is expected of these managers is to have a strategic, not analytical approach like other categories of managers. They only need to understand the content, and the power to place in time and space. Ensure strategic management of the entire structure. Having the ability to decide, quickly, well and when it is necessary.

It can be said that these managers derive their legitimacy from their environment or from tacit cultural understandings shared in their environment. They have the Supreme responsibility and no resistance to this responsibility can be made. This is almost the case with "cognitive legitimacy".

After discussing the different categories of managers that may exist in the public sector in general, let us now turn to our empirical study.

5. The empirical study

The study we have carried out is at the level of public administration under the prefecture of Oujda-Angad. We have limited ourselves to assessing the legitimacy of first-level managers to have faster results. In addition, we wanted to understand how, in practice, officials in administrations recognize legitimacy to their superiors. Our goal is to collect two types of information: firstly their assessments and definitions of the legitimacy of their superiors and, secondly, the realization of this legitimacy in their daily work and interactions with their superiors.

To collect this data, we used a 13-question questionnaire. It was administered in paper form to staff members interviewed. In order to ensure the confidentiality of the data, it was mentioned that the data would remain anonymous.

5.1 Data

In this survey, we will focus on public administration managers in the Oujda-Angad prefecture. Given the large number and diversity of the mother's population, which makes it difficult to design a sample that reproduces as closely as possible the characteristics of the mother's population, the blind sampling method was chosen by selecting the heads of departments of twelve public administrations in Oujda-Angad Prefecture. Thus, civil servants who were arbitrarily and hierarchically dependent on these heads of departments were interviewed using a questionnaire.

The main objective of this questionnaire was to measure the legitimacy attributed to this category of managers. It contains a total of 13 items, grouped into six parts (see annex).

In total, almost 108 questionnaires were distributed to officials from different departments of the territorial administrations chosen at the level of the prefecture of Oujda-Angad, we obtained 96 usable questionnaires, a return rate of about 88.8 % as shown in the following table:

Table 2: *Distribution of the sample by work location*

Name of administration	Services investigated	Number of officials questioned	Number of officials responded to the questionnaire
Regional Delegation of Equipment And Transport of the Oriental Region	Management and programs Service	11	10
	Infrastructure Services	9	9
	Road Transport Service	7	7
	Maritime Public Domain Management Service	8	5
	Merchant Marine Service	7	7
Regional Delegation for Islamic Affairs of the Oriental Region	Islamic Affairs Service	5	5
	Service of Traditional Education and Social Affairs	5	4
	Administrative and Financial Affairs Service	6	6
	Equipment and Construction Service	8	7
Regional Investment Center of the Oriental Region	Business start-up assistance service	4	4
	Investment Support Service	9	7
	Business Start-Up formalities Service	6	4
	Investment Development and Cooperation Service	5	5
	Administrative monitoring service for investment projects	5	3
	Resource Service, and Arbitration	3	3
Regional Directorate for Youth and sports in the East	General Affairs Service	6	6
	Youth and Sports Service	4	4

Source: *Authors*

Our sample (96 public servants) is approaching of the mother population which is difficult to reach in a short time. We obtained a diverse sample of respondents in terms of the types of administration, gender and years of service.

5.2 Method of Analysis

Our method of analysis follows the steps of Churchill's (1979) methodological approach, designed to develop questionnaires made up of multiple attitude scales. The following table summarizes the steps in our methodological approach to developing our survey questionnaire:

Table 3 : *Our methodological approach*

	Search Step	
<i>The exploratory phase</i> in order to reduce the exposure of our measurement scale to the risk of random error.	Specification of the field of the structure to be measured	Carry out an initial literature review in order to define the domain of the construct to be measured (legitimacy of the manager).
	Elaborate a sample of items to measure the construct	Generate as many statements as possible able to capture the different characteristics of the construct from the analysis of the work that has dealt with the latter
	Data collection	Collect data related to the choice of survey technique to be adopted, sample size, and survey site.
	Purification of measuring instruments (Cronbach's alpha coefficient: 0.91)	Using SPSS software by testing the reliability of internal consistency and construct validity of items to eliminate those that reduce their metric qualities
The confirmatory phase in order to reduce the exposure of our measurement scale to the risk of systematic errors	Data collection	Collect the data of the new sample according to the measuring instruments adopted in the exploratory phase
	Evaluation of the reliability and validity of the construct (Cronbach's alpha coefficient: 0.93)	Using SPSS software by performing internal consistency and construct validity reliability tests in order to eliminate items that would hinder the internal consistency and construct validity qualities
	Standards development	Verify all of our research hypotheses by detecting the most significant correlations between items.

Source: *Authors*

6. Results

6.1 Relationship the power-legitimacy

The results of our statistical analysis enable us first of all to verify that the power and legitimacy assigned to the leader are indeed positively linked : for the respondents, a legitimate superior is a superior who has power ; power primarily exercised within the administration.

Table 4 : *Correlation matrix legitimacy - power*

Variables	The average	Standard deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Legitimacy of the manager (1=Strongly disagree ; 2=Totally agree)	-							
2. Weak Power	2,15	0,58	0.09					
3.Strong Power	3,29	0,35	0.93**	,00				
4. Internal exercise of power	3,55	0,30	0.89**	- ,16	,68			
5. External exercise of power	2,33	0,82	- 0.31	,01	,47	,00		
6. Use of Power	3,93	0,74	0.98**	- ,39	,84**	,05	,02	
7. Avoid Power	2,31	0,56	- 0.81**	- ,41	-,73	,03	- ,08	,00

Source: data extracted from SPSS software

The results of the correlation matrix between the variables indicate the following results:

- A statistically significant positive correlation between the power of the superior and the recognition of his/her legitimacy ($r = 0.93$; $p < .05$);
- A statistically significant positive correlation between the internal use of power within the administration and the recognition of legitimacy to the superior ($r = 0.89$; $p < .05$);
- A statistically significant positive correlation between the degree of power held by the superior and its use by the superior ($r = 0.84$; $p < .05$).

All these results allow us to validate hypothesis 1 that the legitimacy of the manager within the Moroccan administration is based on the quality and extent of the power that holds within that administration.

6.2 Relationship leadership-legitimacy

The results of our statistical analysis then show that the qualities of leadership allow us to describe the right legitimate manager. Therefore, this manager must mobilize them adequately in order to impose her/himself naturally within its working group.

Table 5 : Correlation Matrix Legitimacy – Leadership

Variables	The average	Standard deviation	1	2	3	4
1. Legitimacy of the manager (1=Strongly disagree ; 2=Totally agree)	-					
2. Personal qualities	2,35	0,28	,96**			
3. Communication	3,05	0,30	1,03***	,59*		
4. Motivation	2,87	0,19	,81**	,79**	,76**	
5. Leader's image	2,30	0,98	0,35	,36	,18	,29

Source: data extracted from SPSS software

The results of the correlation matrix between the variables indicate the following results:

- A statistically significant positive correlation between personal qualities of the manager and the recognition of his legitimacy ($r = 0.96$; $p < .05$);
- A statistically significant positive correlation between the communication mobilized within the working group and the recognition of the legitimacy of the superior ($r = 1.03$; $p < .05$);
- A statistically significant positive correlation between the motivation of the group members and the definition of the legitimacy of their leader ($r = 0.81$; $p < .05$);
- A positive but not statistically significant correlation between the leader's effort to have a good image in his working group and the recognition of his legitimacy ($r = 0.35$; $p < .05$).

All of these results support hypothesis 2 that the superior's legitimacy in the Moroccan administration is based on his ability to lead a working group effectively. As a result, even the public sector manager must be as interested in leadership as the private sector.

6.3 Relationship organizational performance-legitimacy

The results of our statistical analysis do not show that the legitimacy of the manager in public administration is based on the results that he achieves.

Table 6 : *Correlation matrix legitimacy - Matrice de corrélation légitimité - organizational performance*

Variables	The average	Standard deviation	1
1. Legitimacy of the manager (1=Strongly disagree ; 2=Totally agree)	-		
2. Judgment by results achieved	3,42	0,51	0,38

Source: data extracted from SPSS software

The results of the correlation matrix between the variables indicate the following result:

- A positive but not statistically significant correlation between the results achieved by the group and the recognition of the legitimacy of its leader ($r = 0.38$; $p < .05$).

According to this result, hypothesis 3 can be rejected which supposes that the superior's legitimacy in the Moroccan administration is based on what he does in favor of the organization. This result can be explained by the fact that officials are not in the right position to judge the performance of their administration.

6.4 Relationship organizational commitment - legitimacy

The results of our statistical analysis allow us to verify that the legitimacy attributed to the manager of the public administration automatically generates obedience on the part of his collaborators without any resistance to his power.

Table 7 : *Correlation Matrix legitimacy – impact on the group*

Variables	M	Ecart type	1	2
1. Legitimacy of the manager (1=Strongly disagree ; 2=Totally agree)	-			
2. Level of implementation of decisions	3,37	0,34	0,96**	
3. Level of confidence attributed to the superior	2,98	0,29	0,75*	0,51

Source: data extracted from SPSS software

The results of the correlation matrix between the variables indicate the following result:

- A significant positive correlation between the legitimacy attributed to the manager and the level of execution of his decisions ($r = 0.96$; $p < .05$);
- A significant positive correlation between the legitimacy attributed to the manager and the level of confidence attributed to him ($r = 0.75$; $p < .05$).

All these results validate hypothesis 4 according to which the legitimacy of the public sector manager generates obedience and total trust on the part of his or her working group. Therefore, the legitimacy of the leader in the public sector is paramount to ensure a certain stability in the ranks of officials.

7. Discussion

The results indicate that the legitimacy of the public sector manager is positively and significantly correlated with the extent and quality of his power ($r=0.93$; $p<.05$). This means that the public sector manager cannot avoid the legitimate power attributed to him if he wants to impose his presence in his working group. Moreover, this is what confirmed M.Weber(1922) in his analysis of rational legal legitimacy, which is based on the belief in the legality of normative rules, which define the way in which one can designate a person responsible and enact a law.

This presence will subsequently take the form of obedience, support or trust as indicated by the results of the validation of hypothesis 4 ($r = 0.96$, $p < .05$; $r = 0.75$; $p < .05$). Therefore, any manifestation of resistance to this manager's directives and orders can be explained by the fact that his or her legitimacy is being questioned. However, it is important for the manager to know that it is not enough to possess more types of power, but he needs to practice it with a compatible way with the standards and values repository that is present in the administration (Suchman(1995)).

Moreover, our study concludes that leadership style can have a significant impact on assessing the legitimacy of the manager in the public sector. This impact is on dimensions such as the personal qualities of the manager ($r=0.96$; $p<.05$), communication ($r = 1.03$; $p < .05$) and the motivation of the group members ($r=0.81$; $p<.05$). This means that the more efforts the public sector manager makes to develop his leadership, the more his legitimacy will be recognized. This is in line with Weber's concept of charismatic legitimacy: "*Charisma is a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which it is classed as apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least particularly exceptional powers or qualities*", (Weber, 1922, p.239).

Then, it is noted that officials do not wish to assess the legitimacy of their superior by the actions they take to promote the result of the organization ($r = 0.38$; $p < .05$), especially in the case of the public sector where the official is usually not interested in the obligation of his administration to produce an important result. It should be noted that the link between the results

achieved by the organization and legitimacy is studied in accounting and finance. There is a whole stream of research that focuses on the management of corporate legitimacy through annual reports, including the demonstration of corporate social responsibility (Mathews, 1993; Deegan, 2002).

Finally, the results of our survey confirm the strong link between the legitimacy attributed to the manager and the behavior of his officials. This is positively correlated ($r = 0,96$; $p < .05$) at the level of the execution of the decisions taken by the manager, it is also positively correlated with the confidence placed in the manager and the supportive behaviors towards him, when he is in difficulty or in his absence ($r = 0.75$; $p < .05$). The results show a relatively high level of commitment, trust and support to the public administration manager on the part of his collaborators. This is consistent with what has been found in the managerial literature on affective organizational commitment (Kanter (1980), Sheldon (1971)).

8. Conclusion

This research allows us to formulate and clarify the main elements of legitimacy analysis relating to the public sector manager. It allowed us to highlight the following key points:

The legitimacy of the public sector manager, find its foundations in the power that holds. The results show us that power and legitimacy are positively correlated ($r = 0.93$; $p < .05$). For this reasons, it is necessary for each manager to specify the conditions under which each type of power held can actually feed its legitimacy. For example : the repository of traits, roles, figures but also values what makes a ‘good leader’...etc

Then, the practice of leadership by the public sector manager plays an important role in recognizing its legitimacy. The results of the analysis confirm this ($r = 0.96$; $p < .05$); ($r = 1.03$; $p < .05$); ($r = 0.81$; $p < .05$); ($r = 0.35$; $p < .05$). This is why the public sector manager is invited to reflect on the new behavioral standards expected by officials as well as the private sector manager.

Moreover, official representation of the legitimacy of their superiors does not affect the extent of the results they can achieve in favour of the organization, unlike private sector managers who are bound by the obligation to achieve results, despite increasing efforts to hold public sector managers accountable and monitor their achievements.

Finally, the recognition of the legitimacy of the public sector manager polarizes the discipline of its employees ($r = 0.96$; $p < .05$); ($r = 0.75$; $p < .05$). Therefore, no resistance to his power can be made unlike that of the private sector.

In fact, while this study allows us to formulate and refine a model for analyzing legitimacy, it is only a starting point because legitimacy is not static: its development is eminently contingent and dynamic. Legitimacy is a fragile quality (in time) that varies with context (culture, sectors, organization in particular) and especially with the characteristics of the person who attributes to it.

Furthermore, we believe that these relations are studied in depth if, for example, some components of the manager's power are introduced, such as: reputation, hierarchical position or some control variables such as: the gender of the respondent, the level of study, the length of service to have more results that are significant. The study of responses based on length of service, for example, will be very interesting as the perception of official changes with years of work.

In the end, the results of our study have two main limitations. On the one hand, the small sample size ($N = 96$) does not achieve the required representativeness. On the other hand, it must be more diversified in terms of the rank of manager (first level manager, second level manager, third level manager). Because it is clear that there will be widely different results between the legitimacy of the manager at the first level and the legitimacy of the manager at the third level. For this reason, we propose to readers interested

in this subject to deepen the theoretical analysis of this concept in the managerial literature, before being able to examine it in an organizational context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1). Arendt H., (1972), Sur la violence. In : Du mensonge à la violence, essais de politique contemporaine, Paris, Calmann-Lévy (coll. Agora) ;
- (2). BARTOLI A., (2005), Le management dans les organisations publiques, Dunod, collection Management public, 2ème édition;
- (3). Blake R. R., Mouton J. S., (1969), Les deux dimensions du management, Éditions d'organisation, Paris ;
- (4). Desmarais C. (2008), Encadrer sous contrainte dans les fonctions publiques ?, Revue française d'administration publique 4, (128) ;
- (5). Dowling J. et Pfeffer J. (1975), Organizational legitimacy: social values and organizational behaviour, Pacific Sociological Review 18 (1), 122-136.
- (6). Durat L. (2010), Dirigeants de la fonction publique territoriale, une recherche en analyse d'activité, Revue Savoirs 22, 89.
- (7). Durat L., (2007), « Analyse de l'activité de dirigeants de la fonction publique territoriale », Rapport de recherche, programme coordonné INET CNFPT / CNAM RESP, Paris. P 102-111 ;
- (8). Favoreu C., (2001), « Légimité, contenu et nature du management stratégique public : le cas des démarches stratégiques urbaine ». Actes de la Xe conférence de l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique. P 28-45.
- (9). Favoreu C., (2001), « Légimité, contenu et nature du management stratégique public : le cas des démarches stratégiques urbaines », Actes de la Xe conférence de l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique. P 87-95 ;
- (10). Hatzfeld H., (1998), Construire de nouvelles légitimités en travail social, Dunod, ;
- (11). Julie Demaret, (2014), « Le processus de construction de légitimité des contrôleurs de gestion », Thèse de doctorat en sciences de l'Homme et de la Société, Université FRANÇOIS – RABELAIS DE TOURS. P 198-206;
- (12). Lamertz K., Baum J.A.C. (1998), The legitimacy of organizational downsizing in Canada : an analysis of explanatory media accounts, Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'administration, vol.15, n°1, pp 93-107.
- (13). Laufer R. et Burlaud A., (1980), Management public : Gestion et Légimité, Dalloz, Paris ;
- (14). Laufer R., (1996), Quand diriger, c'est légitimer, Revue française de gestion 111, 12-37.
- (15). Laurence Durat and Marc Bollecker (2012), La légitimité managériale : le cas des directeurs généraux des services, Revue Politiques et management public vol 29/12, 154-158 ;
- (16). Lindblom C. K., (1994), « The implications of organizational legitimacy for corporate social performance and disclosure », paper presented at Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference, New York. P 115-125.
- (17). Mathews, M.R., (1993), Socially responsible accounting, London, Chapman & Hill;
- (18). Menissier T. (2005), Eléments de philosophie politique, Ellipses ;
- (19). Meyer J.W., Rowan B. (1977), Institutionalized organizations : formal structure as myth and ceremony, American Journal of Sociology, vol.83, n°2 pp 340-363.
- (20). Report of the Ministry of Public Service and Modernization of the Administration of the Kingdom of Morocco (2015), "Les postes de responsabilité dans les administrations au Maroc".

- (21). Scott W.R. (1995), *Institutions and organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
- (22). Sergé Alécian, Dominique Foucher, (2007), *Le management dans le service public.*, Eyrolles, éditions d'Organisation ;
- (23). Suchman M.C. (1995), *Managing legitimacy : strategic and institutional approaches*, *Academy of Management Review*, vol.20, n°3, pp 571-610.
- (24). Suchman M.C. (1995), *Managing legitimacy : strategic and institutional approaches*, *Academy of Management Review*, vol.20, n°3, pp 571-610.
- (25). Thomason S. (2004), *Legitimacy and social capital*, *Academy of Management Annual Conference*, New Orleans, p 38-75;
- (26). Valérie Petit et Véronique Boulocher, (2009), « *Equipes dirigeantes : Comment développer la légitimité managériale ?* », EDHEC Business School. *Leadership et Corporate Governance Research Centre de Lille*. P 14-45.

ANNEX: SURVEY

Please check the box or boxes corresponding to your choice

1. **Gender :** Male Female

2. **Seniority :** Less than 2 years Between 2 and 3 years 4 years and more

3. **Your superior is :**
 - Not legitimate at all
 - Totally legitimate to lead your team

- **Legitimacy and power :**

4. **In your opinion, the power of your superior is:**
 - Weak
 - Strong

5. **In your opinion, the power of your superior is exercised:**
 - Inside administration
 - Outside administration

6. **Your superior use his hierarchical power to be accepted by his working group :**
 - Yes
 - No

- **Legitimacy and leadership :**

7. **The personal qualities of your superior allow him to be the ideal manager :**
 - Strongly disagree
 - Rather disagree
 - Rather agree
 - Totally agree

8. **The level of communication of your superior allows you to recognize his legitimacy :**

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree

9. The level of motivation within your work group allows you to recognize the legitimacy of your superior :

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree

10. Your superior takes care to give a good image of leader in your service :

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree

○ **Legitimacy and organizational performance :**

11. You recognize the value of your superior by the actions he undertakes for his organization

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree

○ **Legitimacy and impact on the working group :**

12. You directly execute the decisions made by your superior:

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree

13. You have enough confidence in your immediate superior that you would be willing to defend his decisions when he is in trouble or in his absence :

- Strongly disagree
- Rather disagree
- Rather agree
- Totally agree