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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem—General Relevance

In 1968 Jencks and Riesman described the rising star of higher education and of the academic profession in their study of the academic revolution. In the ensuing decade books and articles on higher education and the academic profession are more likely to have pointed to troubled times for higher education. Institutional and faculty autonomy are challenged with rising costs and stable or declining enrollments and a diminished public faith in higher education. The academic landscape is measurably changed by affirmative action, collective bargaining, statewide coordination, the inroads of the consumer movement, and the managerial revolution on campus. These developments call forth strident responses. Some urge on this increased public accountability and call for a "return to responsibility." Others, of a more traditional bent, write pessimistically about the eclipse of the idea of the university and express their worries, or worse, about the uncertain future of higher education.

This study is an attempt to bring sociological insight and understanding to decisively important structural changes in American higher education that are of fundamental significance for the autonomy of the university and of university teachers. The following chapters identify and articulate the nature and significance of these emergent
changes as they reshape the organizational structure of higher education and the forms of control that structure university teaching. The key concept of the systematic mediation of professional power is developed to identify and highlight the key qualitative dimensions of these emergent structural changes. In a separate chapter, similar changes are shown to be beginning to reshape medicine as a profession. These emergent structural changes are shown to be related to changes in the larger society that also structure the milieu of other occupations in American society. These changes are viewed not as the product of a short-lived trend or social movement, peculiar to an aberrant period of questioning and distrust, but as developments that will continue to emerge to play a central role in the future of American society.

These emergent structural changes, which mediate or bring accountability to professional power, have important ramifications for the future of work autonomy, which is an important theme in American culture. In his classic article on the professions, Ben-David (1964:297) argues that the professions have become the ideal occupational goal for youth, replacing the self-made entrepreneur. In their study of the hidden injuries of class, Sennett and Cobb (1972) also point to the central and continuing importance of the cultural ideal of the professions and of the freedom and autonomy that professional work supposedly allows. This suggests a striking paradox that is at the heart of this study. As structural changes emerge which challenge the traditional autonomous character of professional work, the "dreamed of ideal" to become a professional...
continues to be important and even diffuses throughout the population. The issue of the shape and structure of the work milieu for tomorrow's educated labor is thus an important social issue that illustrates this study's larger social relevance.

The Problem--Sociological Relevance

While the issues of professional autonomy and accountability and of the delivery of professional services are of interest to wider publics, these same issues represent central problems in sociology and a number of its subdisciplines. In attempting to identify and articulate these decisive structural changes in American higher education, by focussing on how changes in a complex organization, the university, affect patterns of occupational control, the analysis simultaneously addresses issues in the sociology of higher education, the sociology of occupations and professions, the sociology of complex organizations, and the sociology of social change. In relating these changes to developments in medicine, the discussion also touches issues of interest to those working in the sociology of medicine. In the case of each of these subdisciplines, the relevance is to central issues of social structure rather than to issues, however important, of social psychology.

As Karabel and Halsey (1977:1) point out, social scientific research on education has come "from the humblest margins" of the social sciences to occupy an increasingly important position in sociology and the other social sciences. More recently, the sociology of higher education has come to be seen as a coherent field within
sociology (Clark, 1973). However, a specific concern with the university as an organization did not emerge until the 1970s with publications by Baldridge (1971), Blau (1973), Parsons and Platt (1973), Cohen and March (1974), Gross and Grambsch (1974), Frey (1977), and Baldridge et al. (1978). The most systematic sociological analysis of the academic profession has come in the writings of Clark (1961, 1963), Parsons and Platt (1968), and Light (1974a). However, despite important contributions in these studies of the university and of the academic profession, none of these works adequately addresses the issue of the sociological character and significance of current changes in organizational structure and patterns of occupational control in higher education. In focusing on organizational change in higher education as it relates to university teaching as an occupation, the analysis attempts to make contributions to several subfields within the sociology of higher education—social change, social organization, and the sociology of occupations and professions.

While the sociology of occupations and professions should be central to a sociology of modern or advanced social structure, much of the research in this area has been dominated by social psychological concerns (Roth et al., 1973). Much of the recent sociological analysis and research has retreated from the larger questions of the relationship of the professions to the division of labor and to the class system and of the professions' special role in industrial societies. Instead, the sociological literature has come to center on more delimited issues such as professional socialization patterns...
and the role strain experienced by professionals employed by organizations (Johnson, 1972:9-10; Ben-David, 1964:251). Thus, the macro-theoretical perspectives that informed the development of the sociology of the professions have become increasingly divorced from the empirical study of the professions. Much of the literature in this area, for example, has tended to ignore the way in which occupations affect and are affected by the surrounding social context, however broadly or narrowly defined (Grimm and Kronus, 1973:81). Only recently have problems of occupations and occupational change been systematically related to changes in the larger social structure in the works of Freidson (1970a), Elliott (1972), Johnson (1972, 1977), Haug (1973, 1975), Berlant (1975), and Larson (1977). In examining changing patterns of occupational control in higher education within the context of social structural changes outside individual colleges and universities, the analysis here contributes to this current re-orientation of the sociology of occupations and professions back to fundamental questions of the role of the professions in modern societies.

In their classic texts on organizations, both Blau and Scott (1962) and Etzioni (1964) point to the centrality of complex organizations in modern societies. For Blau and Scott (1962:ix), "modern man is man in organizations." However, this larger significance of the modern organizational society is frequently lost in the maze of sociological studies focussing on the relationships between organizational variables. Much of this research is an attempt to harness the sociology of organizations to the increasing managerial
rationalization of organizations by finding variables that are related to measures of organizational effectiveness (Benson, 1977a). While not taking issue with a legitimate concern about organizational effectiveness, the analysis below moves beyond that limited focus by addressing the issue of the nature and significance of current changes in organizational structures, especially in higher education. This approach is consistent with Benson's (1977a) call to move beyond the managerial biases which have shaped much of the recent organizational research and to center attention instead on dimensions of action, power, levels (environment), and process in organizational studies. This larger focus allows the sociologist to see and understand the significance of complex organizations as the central structuring agent of American society—and as the key structure in understanding the nature and significance of contemporary social change.

Perhaps more important than its contributions to the sociology of higher education, of occupations and professions, and of complex organizations are the promise and potential this study offers to a systematic understanding of contemporary social change. While the field of social change is unquestionably one of the most important to social theory, it is also unquestionably one of the weakest areas in sociological and social science theory (Chaplin, 1967:vii; Martin-dale, 1977:x). The attention to the description and explanation of emergent social structural changes in higher education, which parallel structural changes in other institutional spheres, promises a substantial contribution to a theory of modern social change or of advanced modernization. This work follows an important sociological

**Overview and Perspective**

Within the context of concepts and theories drawn primarily from the sociology of occupations and professions, the sociology of organizations, and the sociology of social change, this study seeks to describe and explain what are termed the decisive structural characteristics of change in American higher education—structural characteristics of change which also shape other institutional sectors of American society. These structural changes represent both a change in organizational structure and a change in the form of control over professional work in higher education. These structural changes take on their decisive significance when viewed within the context of the differing, though complementary, critical perspectives on modern society in the writings of Weber and Durkheim.

The principal focus of the study is on university teaching, rather than research, in undergraduate and graduate institutions other than community colleges or technical institutes. This includes both public and private institutions and liberal arts curricula, vocational or pre-professional curricula, and the curricula of the graduate schools. Public education, however, receives primary attention in this study. Though consideration is given to the variability of these changes in different sectors of higher education, primary
attention is given to describing the overall character and direction of change which is affecting all the sectors that are considered.

Chapter II of the study introduces conceptual and theoretical themes from the literature on the professions and on social structure which provide a specific framework for the discussion in Chapters III, IV, and V. Specific consideration is given to the concept of profession, to theories of the rise and decline of occupational power, and to profession and bureaucracy as types of social structure.

Chapter III, the central chapter in this study, traces the dimensions of emergent social structural change as they reshape American higher education. The concept of the visible hand type social structure and the concept of systematic mediation as a form of occupational control provide the organizing themes for the discussion of these changes. Chapter III also includes a review of the literature on the university as an organization and a brief discussion of the significance of these social structural changes.

Chapter IV traces similar emergent structural changes in medicine which shape the power of the medical profession. This discussion is introduced to demonstrate that structural change in colleges and universities is not unique or idiosyncratic to higher education.

Chapter V moves beyond the findings of the previous two chapters to explore why these changes are occurring at the present time. In this chapter an exploratory theory of modern structural change is advanced which identifies and interrelates the social conditions under which structures of independent professional power becomes structures of the systematic mediation of professional power.
Chapter VI summarizes the principal findings of the study, discusses its strengths and limitations, and suggests future lines for profitable inquiry on occupations, organizations, and their interrelationships.

The argument in this study is structured by several general themes and by a value orientation, in the Weberian sense of that term. Together these constitute a general frame of reference which gives the argument unity and coherence. While this frame of reference has, from the beginning, shaped the structure of the argument, it, in turn, has been shaped by the substance of the sociological facts that constitute the topic of this study. The presentation of the argument within this frame of reference, however, is not intended to deny the value of other alternative or complementary frames of reference or theoretical orientations. The "disciplined eclecticism" that Merton (1975:51) advocates might profitably stir others working from different theoretical orientations to analyze structural change in American higher education.

First, the argument and presentation are structured around the focus on social structural change. Social structure as the configuration of social relationships in roles or other social units, such as organizations, is the principal concern, not attitudes, perceptions, or emotions. Profession and organization, more specifically university teaching as a profession and the university as an organization, are viewed as social structures, not as configurations of attitudes. Nor does the analysis presume that social psychological traits or responses of individuals accurately reflect the nature of
these social structures. The analysis focuses on changes in university teaching and in the university as an organization which are taken as dependent variables to be described and understood. This contrasts with the more conventional sociological analysis where social structure, more specifically the individual's place in the social structure, is taken as the independent variable and an attitude or other social psychological dimension serves as the dependent variable.

This focus on social structure and structural change largely determines the qualitative orientation of the study and the neglect of the more traditional quantitative sociological methodology. As Ritzer (1975b:68-74) points out, traditional sociological methods—like the interview or questionnaire, observation, or experiment—are not appropriate to the social facts paradigm, despite the widespread use of interviews and self-administered questionnaires by sociologists working within that paradigm. Instead, those methods more appropriate to the study of social facts, historical and comparative methods, often are not suitable to the quantitative analysis conventional in sociological research. The use of documentary-type data, as presented in Chapters III and IV, is similarly unsuited to advanced statistical analysis.

The focus on social structural change also determines the qualitative orientation of this study. The methodological approach taken must capture the dynamic dimension of social structure, not just the static relationship between organizational dimension as reflected in the relationship between organizational variables. Both Hall (1977:97)
and Benson (1977a) point out that the prevailing variable analysis approach to organizations has not dealt effectively with the problem of organizational change. In considering the difficulties of measuring social structural change, Smelser (1968) points out that, while some change, such as changes in a population's attributes or rates of behavior, can be conceptualized quantitatively, for other types of changes it is necessary to turn to qualitative indicators of change to grasp changes in social relations. Smelser (1968:205) argues that, despite the importance of this kind of change, the "systematic description and classification of these qualitative directions of change—to say nothing of their explanation—is one of the least developed aspects of the study of social change." Chapters III and IV constitute an attempt to systematically describe such social structural changes that defy statistical analysis. Chapter V points the way toward the even more difficult task of explanation.

Second, the general approach taken and the significance given the findings can only be understood if this work is placed within the tradition of an historical sociology, rather than an analytical or categorical sociology which seeks to formulate abstract or formal propositions applicable to all social systems. This historical sociological approach is understandable given that both modern professions and complex organizations are essentially historical entities (Albrow, 1974). Furthermore, as Smith (1976:12) points out in a recent analytical treatise on social change, social change is "pre-eminently" historical in nature: The historical record is the starting point for every investigation of social change. This
tradition of historical sociology has a long and distinguished
tradition in classic sociological writings (Giddens, 1971), despite
the fact that so much of modern sociology is little informed by his-
torical perspective (Erikson, 1970). Despite the rhetoric of those
advancing a general science of sociology, very little sociological
work, by virtue of a limited comparative and historical focus, can
make claim to anything more than the analysis of variable relation­
ships within a limited temporal and historical framework. This work
consciously acknowledges its historical context and refuses to engage
in unjustifiable claims about universal properties or relationships
in social systems.

Third, the frame of reference adopted includes what may be
loosely termed an environmentalist perspective. Professions, and the
systems of control characterizing them, are viewed not as the out­
come of developments essentially internal to the occupation, but are
understood as the outcome of a complex social process involving the
occupation's relations with its various publics. Likewise, organi­
zational structure and dynamics, and specifically university struc­
ture and structural change, are analyzed in their larger social
context, as is suggested by the recent upsurge in interest in inter­
organizational relations. While this environmentalist perspective
may seem like a sociological axiom so fundamental as to need no
special discussion, the extent to which it is ignored in actual
theoretical discussion and empirical research makes it imperative
that it be emphasized. Unfortunately, few of the 'hard' methodo­
logical technologies developed by sociologists adequately take into
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consideration that larger social context. Thus, the theoretical 
and qualitative approach taken in the analysis in Chapters III, IV, 
and V is an attempt to work out an approach consistent with the 
fundamental realities of organizations, occupations, and their 
relationships, rather than to allow a fetishism of method to artifi-
cially structure those findings.

Fourth, power and conflict are given a central place in the 
conceptual framework and theoretical analysis. Power and conflict 
are stressed for three principal reasons. First, the central concern 
with occupational control makes power the central stratification 
dimension of interest, rather than status or wealth. Thus power, by 
definition, is central to this study. Second, professions and organi-
izations are viewed as fundamentally political entities, the outcomes 
of relationships involving power and conflict, rather than as the 
outcome of some mysterious process of societal consensus or functional 
necessity. Finally, this emphasis on power and conflict reflects the 
position that social structural change cannot be explained in terms 
limited to impersonal social process but must be systemically related 
to social conflict between social actors. However, this focus on 
power and conflict should not be viewed as the assertion of a volun-
taristic perspective whereby power interests, divorced from their 
social conditions, are the fundamental determinants of change. As 
Rueschemeyer (1977:23) points out, the exercise of power and domina-
tion largely reflects changes in other aspects of the society, though 
it may well have some "casual autonomy" in the long run.

The final general theme that structures the argument is a
substantive theme, best viewed as a value-orientation. A value-orientation determines the questions asked in a scientific study and determines why a particular question is important. The value orientation determines what out of the "extensive and intensive infinity of empirical reality" the social scientist will focus upon (Freund, 1968:56). While it is a subjective factor, it is also the starting point that makes any knowledge at all possible.

The value orientation that shapes this work centers on the relationship between individual autonomy and the complex organization, a relationship reflected in the study's examination of professional autonomy in the complex organization. Seidman and Gruher (1977) point out the central significance of this problematic of individual autonomy and bureaucratic organization in Weber's work.

While Weber saw that the modern world provided an ideal milieu within which individual autonomy could and did arise, he equally recognized that the peculiar combination of universal structures (economy, policy, law, science, bureaucracy) crystallized into a world in which submission and adaption progressively replaced self-determination as the paradigmatic form of conduct. (Seidman and Gruber, 1977:498)

Thus the progression of the iron cage.

The central problematic in Durkheim should be viewed as complementary to that of Weber. Durkheim was centrally concerned with a healthy form of organic solidarity (organization) suited to the modern division of labor and to the new object of the collective conscience, the cult of the individual. Put somewhat differently, structures had to be created intermediate between the individual and the state to effectively address the problems of individual integration and regulation. But Durkheim does not ignore the
individual costs of this emergent organic solidarity; he was con­
stantly aware of the discipline, "the inner tension and suffering"
of an increasingly specialized, differentiated, and interdependent
society (Bellah, 1973:xlvi). This is especially clear in Durkheim's
discussion of the problem of getting the child "to like the idea of
circumscribed tasks and limited horizons" (Durkheim, 1933:402).

The nature of the sociological project, the focus on emergent
structural changes, makes the approach taken here fundamentally
different from a testing of hypotheses. The empirical data cited in
Chapter III, rather than constituting the data on the basis of which
hypotheses are retained or rejected, constitute the working material
for the formulation of the theoretical argument advanced in Chapters II
through V. The theory is grounded in the data and shaped by it,
rather than being a preconceived set of hypotheses which are put to
an empirical test. However, this is not meant to suggest that the
theory advanced is not testable; rather as the argument centers on
emergent structural changes, historical developments in the near
future provide a relatively clear-cut empirical assessment of the
central argument that is advanced. Because of the focus on emergent
changes, this study should be viewed as primarily a theoretical
treatise, rather than an empirical study. Recognition must also be
given to the claim that the changes delineated are just emergent, are
not full-blown, but that the number of indicators of a consistent
pattern of change suggest more than a short-lived structural change.

The findings put forward in Chapter III are based primarily on
an exhaustive library research focussing on recent developments
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affecting higher education in the United States. The discussion of changes in medicine is based on a far less exhaustive search of the literature on medicine as a social institution. This library research does not focus primarily on sociological sources, for sociologists, by and large, have ignored the changes that are the central focus of Chapters III and IV. Rather, the library research relies on various journals and newspapers of higher education which document ongoing developments, like the *Journal of Higher Education*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and *Change Magazine*. Also of special importance is literature directed specifically to the new specialists within higher education administration, publications like *New Directions for Institutional Research* and *New Directions for Higher Education*. This material represents a potential gold-mine for the sociologist interested in social change. However, this already existing data, rich in sociological significance, is too frequently ignored as sociologists create their own data, often of dubious value and significance, through questionnaire studies. If sociologists are concerned to critically analyze contemporary dimensions of social change, the type of data relied upon in Chapters III and IV cannot profitably be ignored. As Karabel and Halsey (1977: 75) remark in their recent survey of the sociology of education:

> Yet, unfashionable as it may be to say so, an increase in the amount of time spent in the library by sociologists of education might be more profitable than the continued accumulation of studies with, in all too many cases, neither empirical nor theoretical significance.

In his recent study of the rise of intellectuals and of the new class, Gouldner (1979) remarks that clarity is dependent not on good
but on poor vision, on blurring complexity and detail in order to sight the main structure. This study is largely guided by Gouldner's clarity imperative, with all the strengths and weaknesses following from the imperative. It is to be hoped that further research in this field of structural change, both case study and multivariate analysis, might fill in the complexity and detail which this study lacks. Yet the clarity provided in this study should make possible a more theoretically sophisticated understanding of that complexity and detail.
CHAPTER II

PROFESSIONS: CONCEPT AND THEORY

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter II is to review and summarize the literature on professions and social structure that bears on the central issue of current changes in forms of occupational control in organizational contexts within the United States. The analysis represents both a summary and constructive critique of that literature, and the discussion provides the framework for the analysis of structural change in the following three chapters.

Chapter II is divided into three principal sections. The first section considers the concept of profession in sociological theory and research. Trait and functional approaches are critically reviewed, and an alternative formulation is advanced and defended. This alternative, a typology of forms of occupational control based on a power perspective, avoids the principal biases and shortcomings of trait and functional approaches. Issues and problems in using this typology for the analysis in university teaching are also discussed.

The second section in this chapter focuses on explanatory theories of profession and theories of occupational change. This section points to the central importance of considering factors both internal and external to the occupation in understanding and explaining changes in patterns of occupational control. Current emergent
challenges to professional power are briefly reviewed, and the concept of deprofessionalization is analyzed critically.

The third section reviews the literature on profession and bureaucracy as types of social structures. The works of Blau, Parsons, Freidson, and Montagna, all of which contrast these types of social structures, are reviewed. A critique of this work is advanced, centering around the increasing interdependence of bureaucratic and professional characteristics in emergent social structures.

The Concept of Profession

Trait, Functional, and Power Perspectives

The term profession and its derivatives--professional, professionalism, and professionalization--have a variety of meanings in both the popular and social scientific literature. For example, the label profession is often attached to occupations which are perceived as possessing that single feature said to define professional status such as a specialized knowledge base or an unselfish orientation to service. On the other hand, the terms professional and professionalism are frequently attached to individuals who singularly exemplify one or more professional traits. Finally, the word professionalization is loosely used to describe one of several overall changes in the occupational structure, including the increase in white collar as opposed to blue collar positions in the economy and the increased reliance on occupational qualifying associations. Each term has a myriad of meanings so that in reading about professionalism it is often necessary to determine the writer's value orientation.
Some social scientists studying the professions attempt a more systematic approach to the definition and conceptualization of profession. Professions are characterized by a number of traits or attributes, with professionalization the process by which occupations increasingly take on these professional traits or attributes. From the standpoint of the development of the occupation, professionalism is the end-state of the process of professionalization.

Among those who attempt to specify the defining characteristics of a profession or professionalism, there are considerable differences (Klegon, 1978:260). In reviewing the literature on professions, Millerson (1964:5) concludes that 23 different traits or elements have been advanced by various theorists as central to an occupation's professional status. However, Goode (1960:903) suggests that despite surface disagreement there is considerable unanimity and that the only differences are those of omission. Nevertheless, the reader surveying the literature on professionalism is likely to find much less consensus than he might expect. Following Johnson (1972:23), this definitional confusion can be tempered by distinguishing between trait and functional models of professionalism. This distinction will put into perspective similarities among and differences between the current approaches to conceptualizing the professions. While these two models of professionalism are described separately, their shortcomings are discussed together, since they share similar weaknesses.

The trait approach or model focuses on a relatively concrete set of attributes said to set off the professions from non-professional
occupations (Johnson, 1972:23). The traits or attributes whose development is generally cited as central to professionalization include: (1) an esoteric knowledge base; (2) an advanced education; (3) a professional code of ethics; (4) a professional association; (5) occupational licensing; and (6) altruistic service (Johnson, 1972:23). According to trait theorists, an occupation undergoes professionalization as it moves toward greater congruency with the abstract model of a profession. In the writing of the trait approach's more sophisticated exponents, professionalism is regarded as a scale, rather than as a cluster of attributes, and there is a continuum of professionalization rather than a strict dichotomy between professions and non-professions (Moore, 1970, p.5). Often associated with this trait model is the thesis of a natural history of professionalization (Wilensky, 1964), whereby professionalization is viewed as occurring in a determinate historical sequence of events with an identical series of stages.

Unlike proponents of the trait model, advocates of the functional approach are concerned less with enumerating the characteristics of professional occupations than in specifying those specific occupational attributes which have functional relevance for society as a whole or for the professional-client relationship (Johnson, 1972:23). The principal difference between trait and functional approaches is that functional approaches are much more concerned with explaining why professional attributes are of importance for professional-client relationships and for the larger social structure. The functional approach to the professions is best exemplified in the writings of Parsons (1954, 1968a), Goode (1957, 1960, 1961, 1969), and Barber.
Although there are some differences in their respective expositions on profession, the similarities between them are even more striking. Goode (1960, 1969) cites two occupational characteristics or qualities as "sociologically causal" with respect to professionalism: a basic body of abstract knowledge and a collectivity orientation. According to Goode (1960:903), the traits of professionalism enumerated by trait theorists flow from those two characteristics. Barber (1965:18) defines professional behavior in terms of four essential attributes: a generalized and systematic knowledge; a primary orientation to the interest of the community rather than to self-interest; mechanisms of self-control through a code of ethics internalized in educational and work settings; and a system of rewards, monetary and honorary, which are ends in themselves rather than the means to some "interested " end. Parsons (1968b:536) limits the core criteria to three: formal technical training in an intellectual competency where cognitive rationality is given primacy as applied to a particular field; the development of skills relating to this competency; and some institutional means of assuring that such competence will be put to socially responsible uses. Rueschemeyer (1964:17) summarizes the functional approach as follows: "professions are conceived of as service occupations that (1) apply a systematic body of knowledge to problems which (2) are highly relevant to the central values of society."

While several criticisms may be addressed to trait or functional theory or to both, two problems or difficulties seem central to both trait and functional theory and render their sociological usefulness
questionable. The first difficulty is the ambiguous meaning given to service orientation in the writings of both trait and functional theorists. Becker (1962) develops the argument most persuassively in his examination of the ambiguities in the perspective of Abraham Flexner, one of the original trait theorists. In reading Flexner, Becker (1962:29) wonders whether profession is to be characterized primarily by certain features of social organization or whether profession is to be reserved as a term of moral praise for exemplary occupations. While Flexner begins with a list of six objective criteria, he ends by insisting on the decisive importance of a genuine spirit of unselfish work (Becker, 1962:29). This ambiguity between profession as a scientific concept and as an evaluative concept appears, often in subtle ways, throughout the considerable trait and functional literature on the professions. Like the related question addressed to trait theorists, "which trait is professional?", it results in a not inconsiderable amount of special pleading for particular occupations.

The second and more decisive challenge to these models is advanced by Johnson (1972), who contends that these approaches rest on a fundamental theoretical confusion, unarticulated in the works of trait and functional theorists. Focussing on the ahistorical and ethnocentric biases of these theorists, Johnson (1972:29-30) argues that such theorists ignore the decisive historical conditions for the growth of the so-called professions. By doing so, they presuppose that there is something intrinsic about certain occupations which determines the form of occupational control that develops. According
to Johnson (1972:45), professions are not kinds of occupations, but a means of controlling an occupation; the professionalization process is not a realization of the essential characteristics of an occupation, but a political process of gaining control over an occupation. By ignoring such factors as the prior existence of entrenched occupational groups and the power of governments and academic institutions to impose definitions of occupational practice on occupational groups, these theorists make implicit and unrealistic assumptions about the growth and change of occupations. In his discussion of the profession of medicine, Freidson (1970a) similarly argues that the outcome of professionalism is determined by social and political rather than technical factors. The works of Jamous and Peloille (1970), Berlant (1975), Larson (1977), and Klegon (1978) advance similar criticisms of prevailing approaches to the professions.

These fundamental shortcomings of the trait and functional approaches to defining profession and professionalism may tempt one to discard these two terms as fundamental sociological concepts. Habenstein (1963:298) concludes his analysis by arguing that profession is not a "concept with analytic power, describing a limited number of characteristics whose relations and order are demonstrable." Becker (1962:132-33) questions the appropriateness of profession as a scientific concept, since the realities of occupational life diverge so significantly from the ideals embodies in the scientific concept. Yet in focusing on the weaknesses of the trait and functional approaches, both Becker and Habenstein overlook a major point that should be central to any sociology of occupations: some occupations
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have gained greater control over their work than have other occupa-
tions. This control over the social, economic, and technical aspects
of work is not unrelated to the concept of professionalism. Both
Becker and Habenstein are challenging not professionalism as concept
or category, but the theory that is smuggled into the trait and
functional approaches. In failing to differentiate between concept
and theory, Becker and Habenstein draw sociologists away from the
fundamental question of occupations and power toward the significant,
but hardly exclusive, question of the social psychological response
of people to occupations labelled as professions. Drawing the
distinction between concept and theory enables one to focus on the
important theoretical problems of occupations and power.

A fundamental reorientation of the concept of profession around
occupational power is advanced most convincingly by Johnson (1972);
sociologists like Freidson (1970a), Daniels (1973), and Toren (1975)
who stress autonomy as decisive for professional status also signifi-
cantly contribute to this reorientation of the sociology of the
professions. Johnson's (1972:27) major contention is that pro-
fessionalism is not an essential characteristic of certain occupations,
but is rather one historically specific institutionalized form of
occupational control which, after the fact, may appear as "natural"
of "functionally necessary." Johnson (1972) presents a typology of
three forms of institutionalized control which encompasses the forms
of control which emerge out of the relationship between occupational
group and clientele. These three forms are respectively: collegiate
control or professionalism; patronage or client control; and
mediation. Each form of control represents the resolution of the inherent tensions between producer (or occupational group) and consumer (or client) on a different basis. Under collegiate control or professionalism, the producer defines the needs of the consumer and the manner in which those needs are to be addressed (Johnson, 1972:45). Under patronage or client control, the client or patron defines his own needs and the manner in which they are met (Johnson, 1972:46). Under mediation, a third party like the state or the market intervenes to define both the consumer's needs and the manner in which they are to be addressed (Johnson, 1972:46). The sociologist's task is to identify the forms of occupational control characterizing the varying occupations and to specify the historical and social conditions under which such forms of control do arise or are likely to arise. The thesis of an historical lineal trend toward professionalization is suspended in favor of an historical analysis based on power relationships between occupational groups, occupational clienteles, and forces or groups mediating the two.

Johnson's distinction between needs and manner represents an attempt to recognize differing levels of occupational autonomy that have posed problems in previous work on the professions. The distinction closely resembles the discussion of zones of autonomy in the profession of medicine by Freidson (1970a). Unfortunately, Johnson (1972:46-47) provides little discussion of these terms, beyond suggesting that needs involve the choice of the occupation's clientele and that manner involves technical autonomy. Freidson (1970a) distinguishes between a basic zone of autonomy, technical autonomy, which
he considers central to professionalism, and autonomy over the social
and economic organization of work, which he does not consider essen-
tial to a genuine profession.

There are several advantages to this reorientation of the concept
of profession around the themes of autonomy and control. First, it
avoids the ahistorical error that plagues both the trait and function-
al approaches to conceptualization. Second, it avoids the political
entanglement of sociological theory and research with the efforts of
occupations seeking professional status. Finally, it avoids the
confusion and embarrassment that are created by those occupations
which share similar forms of occupational control, but which may
lack such "professional" features as a code of ethics (college
teaching) or a systematic body of abstract theory (law), since these
are no longer necessary elements of definition (Freidson, 1970a:187-
188).

The Typology of Occupational Control: Issues and Problems

In his early work, Johnson (1972) envisages his treatise as a
general, analytical theory of occupations; his later work (1977)
retains most of this conceptual framework, but takes a more histori-
cal and Marxist turn in its approach to occupational power. The
historical configuration of capitalism and its relationship to pat-
terns of occupational autonomy is central to this later work (Johnson,
1977). This study of university teaching uses Johnson's conceptual
framework, not for the purpose of elaborating a general and analytical
theory of occupations and professions, but rather to highlight the
nature of contemporary structural change affecting certain occupations. The concept of mediation is found especially useful in describing and understanding emergent structural changes in higher education. The primary purpose of Chapter III, the central chapter of this study, is to describe and clarify the character of that specific form of mediation, termed systematic mediation, increasingly appropriate in describing the structure of occupational power in higher education. Chapter V represents an attempt to explain why systematic mediation is emerging in higher education and other institutional spheres, rather than to explain why mediation as a generic type of occupational control emerges.

Johnson's discussion of mediative control, which is brief and allusive, gives only a few general guidelines for the sociological task of understanding mediation and its emergence. While he recognizes that various forms of mediative control of occupations are possible, he concentrates upon the conditions and characteristics of state control and his examples and perspective are largely drawn from the experience of Great Britain (Johnson, 1972:77-86). Johnson (1972:77-78) stresses that the effect of state mediation is to extend services to consumers who are defined on the basis of citizenship rights rather than social origin or ability to pay. This increases the diversity of the clientele, but, more importantly, it creates a guaranteed clientele (Johnson, 1972:76). State mediation also has the effect of creating divergent interests and orientations within an occupational 'community', thus undermining the community of professionalism (Johnson, 1972:80). One major ideological orientation
accompanying state mediation is the social service orientation—with its attention to the broad social consequences of the provision of services—rather than the personal service orientation of collegiate control (Johnson, 1972:84). Finally, under state mediation, efficiency becomes a principal criterion in determining the ideal social organization of the occupation in providing improved service to clients (Johnson, 1972:84).

This study will also follow Johnson (1972) in recognizing the distinction between two levels of autonomy: autonomy over needs or goals and over manner or technique. Consideration will also be given to the power of occupational members in the selection and retention of colleagues. The more general level of autonomy, which relates to the goals of professional work, is relevant because, while the work of professionals is generally tied to such socially defined values as health, justice, knowledge, education, and welfare, professionals claim not only the right to translate these goals into objectives and tasks, but to receive, collectively, "a mandate (or community sanction) to define and specify the very nature of the goals" (Heydebrand and Noell, 1973:296). Hughes clarifies this level of autonomy in his discussion of the professional Mandate.

Lawyers not only give advice to clients and plead their cases for them; they also develop a philosophy of law—of its nature and its functions, and of the proper way in which to administer justice. Physicians consider it their prerogative to define the nature of disease and of health, and to determine how medical services ought to be distributed and paid for. Social workers are not content to develop a technique of case work; they concern themselves with social legislation. Every profession considers itself the proper body to set the terms in which some aspect of society, life or nature is to be thought of, and
to define the general lines, or even the details, of public policy concerning it. (Hughes, 1965:3)

To the extent that an occupational group succeeds in exercising such a mandate we may say that to that extent it exercises collegiate control on the level of needs or goals. While the variety of different values that professionals advance varies so much that a comparative analysis of the extent of collegiate control is made extremely difficult, still this dimension of autonomy must be closely attended to.

The second level of autonomy, technical autonomy or collegiate control over manner, is easier to characterize. The technical autonomy of an occupation implies that in its work the occupational group, or its individual members, are the sole arbiters of what is considered desirable or acceptable practice. This would include the choice of surgical technique or of medication by doctors, pedagogical technique and instructional materials by university teachers. While on first glance this technical autonomy seems clearly separable from autonomy over goals, a closer examination of technical autonomy reveals that it is closely tied to autonomy over goals. The teacher's pedagogical choices generally presuppose some philosophy of education; the doctor's approach to medicine often presupposes some philosophy of health and illness. This would indicate that if outside forces are to successfully exert control over the goals of professional work, they cannot neglect the technical autonomy of the professional. This interdependence of needs and manner, goals and techniques, suggests considerable difficulties in Freidson's (1970a:24-25) attempt to draw
a clean line between justifiable and unjustifiable occupational autonomy.

Despite the advantages of Johnson's typology there are difficulties in accurately applying the typology of autonomy and control to problems in social research. For example, how is the type of occupational control characterizing an occupation, or segments of an occupation, to be determined by the sociologist? First, an examination of the formal structure of relations may prove misleading. Elliott (1972:115) and Berlant (1975:176) suggest that the formal structure of Britain's socialized medicine disguises the degree of collegiate control within the system. A structure that formally suggests a mediation of power is more accurately viewed as collegiate control based on co-option of the state. Similarly, the formal structure of universities and the formal power of university trustees belies the actual power that university faculties have gained over the last eighty years in the United States. Second, within an occupation, the stratification of practitioners in institutional settings, like legal or medical practice or colleges or universities, results in different patterns of professional autonomy within these settings (Hall, 1975). This stratification of practitioners is glossed over by such terms as the medical profession or legal profession or academic profession. Ultimately, the diversity of settings for professional work requires a more careful analysis of the exercise of occupational power as it is structured by these settings.

Both the problem of co-option and informal structures of power...
and of the social organizational stratification of occupational power suggest a skeptical approach to categorizing occupations or segments of occupations within the typology of forms of occupational control. However, some of the problems of determining patterns of occupational control may be addressed by focusing on the content of professional practice, as reflected in adherence to colleague norms or 'appropriate' definitions of professional practice; an analysis of the actual content of professional practice might supplement an analysis of the formal structure of power. The extent to which professional practice responds to client demands on the basis of client preferences, organizational priorities, and professional values and standards is itself an empirical question, which, in the final analysis, must be considered in any thorough examination of professional power. Colleague orientation, rather than client or organizational orientation, is fundamental to the pattern of collegiate control. In studying the medical profession, this would recommend a focus not only on adherence to professional, rather than client, standards, but also on the relative orientation to curative medicine, which suggests collegiate control, and preventive medicine, which suggests mediation as a pattern of control. In higher education, this would suggest attention to the extent to which the curriculum is centered on the discipline and on values of cognitive rationality, as opposed to centered on the client. Careful examination of the content of professional practice and changes in that practice may help to clarify dimensions of occupational control.

Another issue of applying the typology is suggested by the
employment of professionals in organizational settings and by the use of the term "professional" in describing various non-bureaucratic forms of coordination, like incentives or participatory forms of coordinating work (Heydebrand, 1973b:25-26). In a strict sense, collegiate control rests on internalized controls by the occupational group itself, not by the organization. This type of control generally allows considerably individual latitude or autonomy, though this is not a defining characteristic of collegiate control. The coordination and control of professional work by processes in the complex organization, whether by rules and regulations (bureaucratic forms of coordination) or various non-bureaucratic forms of coordination, as is advocated by modern theories of management, constitutes mediation. In the case of either bureaucratic or non-bureaucratic forms of coordination, patterns of evasion may emerge in response to these forms of control and coordination. Still, these forms of coordination and control constitute a constraint on negotiated processes of order within the organization. In the final analysis, only careful and detailed analysis of organizational processes can determine the actual significance of organizational patterns of coordination for professional work and professional autonomy.

University Teaching and Professionalism

Viewed within the context of the typology of forms of occupational control, university teaching is not a "true profession". Rather, collegiate control or professionalism is one pattern of occupational control that may characterize university teaching.
Research on university teaching might indicate that patterns of occupational control structuring university teaching vary both historically and institutionally. University teaching is being analytically distinguished from university research or science for the purpose of analysis; while university research will be affected by the structural changes discussed in the following chapter, principal attention is given to these structural changes as they affect college and university teaching. It should be noted that undergraduate teaching is the dominant faculty work in all types of institutions (Baldridge et al., 1978:102). Baldridge et al. (1978:102) contend that for all practical purposes undergraduate teaching is the exclusive work of the bulk of higher educational faculties. Also for purposes of analysis, all teachers in four year colleges and universities are treated as part of a single occupation, as is suggested by Metzger (1971:76-77) and by the existence of the American Association of University Professors. While research focusing on a different research problem may justifiably treat faculty members in a single discipline as members of a separate profession, the research problem in this study does not warrant such separate treatment of academic disciplines.

Patterns of occupational control of university teaching in the United States have varied both historically and institutionally and to a considerable degree. Early American colleges in the 18th and 19th centuries were characterized by a lay (mediate) control with faculty privileges considerably less than in England (Metzger, 1973). The mechanism of trustees and a strong university administration
took precedence over faculty autonomy and privilege (Clark and Youn, 1976:72). According to Clark (1961:295), after this beginning of lay control, the long-run trend in academic power and authority in the United States is for power and authority to move from external to internal sources. The last 30 years of the 19th century witnessed the "gradual but decisive" involvement of faculty in academic policies, especially in large universities and major colleges (Duryea, 1973:21); this paralleled the emergence of university teaching as a career distinct from college teaching (Schenkel, 1971:17). The movement for professionalism can be seen as reaching its early culmination in the establishment of the American Association of University Professors in 1915 (Lewis and Ryan, 1976:283). Jencks and Riesman (1968) document the further rise of the academic profession in the mid-20th century over such previously influential parties as legislators, trustees, religious denominations, students, and administrators, as faculty recruited from research-oriented American universities increasingly moved into teaching positions. In their summary of historical trends of power in higher education, Baldridge et al. (1978:205) contend that collegiate and university faculties obtained their predominant influence in the period from the 1940s to the early 1960s; while this growth of faculty power was selective by type of institution, it affected in various degrees faculty in all types of institutions of higher education.

The level of collegiate control of professionalism also varies institutionally in higher education, as is revealed by the stratification of professional practice. For example, a study by Parsons and
Platt (1968:VII-32) indicates that as the level of differentiation within institutions increases, departmental autonomy increases and administrative power and influence over departmental affairs is relatively curtailed. Clark and Youn (1976:13) suggest that the age and prestige of particular types of colleges and universities is generally related to the level of faculty influence; faculty power is higher in the older and more prestigious institutions. The extensive study of professional autonomy by Baldridge et al. (1978) find that larger and more prestigious colleges and universities have more peer evaluation, higher levels of departmental autonomy, and less bureaucracy and regulation than faculty in smaller, less prestigious, and less research-oriented institutions. Furthermore, Baldridge et al. (1978:207) find that strong pressures from the institution's environment can curtail faculty power and autonomy. Finally, Blank's (1978) study of teaching goals at different types of institutions suggests that autonomy and teaching goals vary at different types of institutions.

In addition to this variability, recognition should be given to characteristics of university teaching that make it unique as an occupation. First, the enforcement of professional standards has been assumed to be the responsibility of faculty within the individual institution, rather than of the profession as a whole or some segment of the profession that cuts across institutions (Commission on Academic-Tenure in Higher Educations, 1973:42). This sharing of faculty power over professional standards cut across disciplines, as the collective faculty at an institution are considered to be members
of a single profession. Second, while both university-wide academic senates and academic departments can be viewed as seats of faculty power, departmental power has been the core of academic power (Epstein, 1974:131). Baldridge et al. (1978:82) argue that the power of faculty senates has been exaggerated in the literature on academic power and governance. Third, the autonomy of university teachers is legitimated not by specialized expertise in pedagogy, but by the theory of academic freedom, which is principally tied to faculty expertise in the science or research role (Liebert and Bayer, 1975:196). Traditionally, formal training in teaching has not been stressed in the preparation of future university teachers (Jencks and Riesman, 1968:240). Thus, faculty autonomy in university teaching is parasitic for its legitimation on the research role. Together these three aspects of university teaching as an occupation represent conditions of faculty work that should be recognized in the consideration of the dynamics of occupational control over university teaching.

Professions and Power: The Theory of Occupational Change

In the preceding section, it is argued that the sociology of occupations and professions should move toward a focus upon the determinants of patterns of occupational control. From this perspective, an explanatory theory of occupations and professions would center on the description and categorization of social conditions related to the rise and decline of different patterns of occupational control. Though none of the recent work on the professions uses Johnson's
typology of forms of occupational control, the work of sociologists like Haug (1973, 1975), Berlant (1975), Larson (1977), and Klegon (1978) does reflect an approach to occupations and professions consistent with Johnson's orientation. This work also indicates an emerging consensus on the importance of history, power, and the social environment of the occupation in understanding the emergence of and change in patterns of occupational power. While, from the perspective of this study, this recent work is most significant for the theory of occupations and professions, the functional theory of the professions is still the best known theory of the professions and requires a brief discussion before consideration of these more recent works on the professions.

In a survey article on the professions, Parsons (1968b) advances a summary of the professions that constitutes an accurate description of the functionalist understanding of the professions. Parsons (1968b:537) suggests that the professions are central to modern societies because of their crucial role in the "institutionalization of the intellectual disciplines in the societal structure, and the practical application of these disciplines." The profession of learning, which contributes to the furtherance of learning through research and scholarship and transmits that learning to others, represents the institutionalization of the intellectual disciplines; the applied professions, like medicine and law, apply this knowledge generated by the intellectual disciplines (Parsons, 1968b:537). Thus the special role of the professions is in developing and applying knowledge which is relevant to central problems of social life.
However, as Rueschemeyer (1964:17) points out in his critical summary of the functionalist perspective, the functionalists also argue that the high degree of "learned competence" required for professional work creates special problems of social control. Laymen, they argue, cannot judge the performance of professionals and sometimes cannot even set concrete goals for the work of professionals (Rueschemeyer, 1964:17). As a result, the most common forms by which the social control of work in modern society is effected, bureaucratic supervision and customer judgment, are of only limited applicability. Yet because of the special importance of the work of the professions, some form of social control to assure responsible professional practice is imperative. According to functionalists:

The dilemma is solved by a strong emphasis on individual self-control, which is grounded in a long socialization process designed to build up the required technical competence and to establish a firm commitment to the values and norms central to the tasks of the professional. The values and norms are, furthermore, institutionalized in the structure and culture of the profession. (Rueschemeyer, 1964:17)

Thus the corporate autonomy of the profession becomes a necessary structure to assure the responsibility of the professional group and of individual professionals in rationally applying professional knowledge.

A careful examination of the functional theory of the professions suggests that, despite attempts to interpret it as an explanatory theory (Cullen, 1978), it is less a genetic explanatory theory than a functional theory; as Durkheim argues, functional and causal explanation must be clearly separated unless we accept a teleological
explanation of social development guided by final causes (Giddens, 1971:90-91). After critically examining Parsons' theory of the medical profession, Berlant (1975:41-42) concludes that Parsons' theory is a prescriptive theory. According to Berlant (1975:300), "Conspicuously absent in his thought are any sense of mechanism to link the alleged social role of the profession to its creation and any consideration that alternative forces might be responsible for the profession's institutionalization."

Even as a theory of function, the functional theory has been questioned. Daniels (1973) contends that professional autonomy in American medicine does not encourage workable systems of quality control of professional work and that alternative structures may promote better health care, more economically produced. McKinlay (1973:72) and Montagna (1977:104) point out that the social organization of the professions forestalls attempts at constructive innovation of the profession's knowledge base. Freidson (1970a) argues that professional autonomy breeds in the professional a hubris that is blind to the limitations of the professional. Rueschemeyer (1964:17) questions whether the central values toward which professional work is allegedly addressed are shared by all members of the society. Finally, Azumi and Nage (1972:317) point out that there is remarkably little research on whether professional autonomy is in the best interests of the client. Thus, even as a theory of function, the functional theory does not go unchallenged.

While the functional theory is best viewed as a theory to describe the social functions served by the professional patterns, the
writings of Johnson (1972, 1977), Berlant (1975), and Larson (1977) reorient the theory of occupations and profession toward a genetic or causal theory. Johnson's (1972) short treatise on professions and power advances propositions about the social conditions conducive to the growth of different patterns of occupational control. Berlant's (1975) analysis of the monopolization strategies of the British and American medical professions reflects an attempt to understand the conditions of successful monopolization strategies or the institutionalization of professions. Larson's (1977) examination of the rise of professionalism focuses on the processes by which the professions organize themselves to obtain market power. The writings of Jamous and Peloille (1970), Roth (1974), Klegon (1978), and Hall (1979) also recognize the importance of explanatory theory. These sociologists, like Johnson, Berlant, and Larson, advance perspectives on occupations and professions that recognize the significance of power, environment, and history in the development of occupational power.

In Professions and Power, Johnson (1972) considers modern professionalism as a form of collegiate control that develops under specific and relatively unique social conditions. He considers the development of a large urban middle class in the United States and Great Britain in the late nineteenth century as the specific historical condition opening up the floodgates of modern professionalism (Johnson, 1972:52). In addition, Johnson specifies several conditions conducive to the development of professionalism: an occupational community homogeneous in outlook and interest, with a relatively low
degree of occupational specialization and recruited from similar social backgrounds (Johnson, 1972:53); an effective demand for professional services from a large and relatively heterogeneous consumer population (Johnson, 1972:51); the sharing by the occupational group of larger resources of power by virtue of their membership in a dominant caste or class (Johnson, 1972:43); and a structure of uncertainty in the occupation, which poses special problems of consumer judgment due to the social meaning of the professional service (Johnson, 1972:42-43). According to Johnson (1972:52-53), professionalism will normally prosper in a fiduciary, one-to-one relationship, where the consumer initiates and the producer terminates the relationship.

More recently, Johnson's (1977) work has taken a strong turn to Marxism, as it focuses on the relationship between the nature of occupational power, the class structure, and capitalism as an economic system. He claims that collegiate control will arise "only where the ideological and political processes sustaining indetermination coincide with requirements of capital" (Johnson, 1977:100). Indetermination refers to the professional mystique or unrationaled part of the knowledge base of the professional. The patterns of occupational control that develop around certain occupations—whether collegiate control, mediation (or "heteronomy"), or patronage—thus are determined by the needs or requirements of the capitalist system.

Berlant's (1975) study of the successful monopolization strategies of the British and American medical professions is undertaken from a Weberian and conflict perspective. Berlant (1975:1) seeks to explain why these occupations became a special type of social group—
a profession—in the face of the various constraints that might have aborted their professional projects. While Berlant (1975:306) examines the significance of both internal characteristics of the occupation, such as occupational strategies, and considerations external to the occupation, such as the legal context of the occupation, he considers an external factor, the favorability of these group's constellation of interests with other powerful and politically significant groups, as the crucial factor. Berlant's (1975) use of historical materials, his consistent analysis of power relations, and his continuing awareness of the environmental context of the occupation supports the general orientation taken in this study.

In her study of the rise of professionalism, Larson (1977) examines how the occupations that we now call professions organized themselves to attain market power. Larson (1977:xvi-xvii) views professionalization both as the creation and control of a market for a special type of service and as a collective assertion of a special status in the system of social stratification. This special status is legitimated by the socially recognized expertise and competence of the occupational group. In her consideration of the potential for market control of different occupations, Larson (1977:47-48) notes that different professions have different resources available. These include: the nature of the service that is marketed (its saliency, universality, etc.); the type of market (e.g., the level of competition); the type of clientele; the cognitive basis (e.g., the level of cognitive standardization); the "production of producers" (e.g., the extent of control by the occupation); the power relations (e.g., the
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In her study of the rise of professionalism, Larson (1977) examines how the occupations that we now call professions organized themselves to attain market power. Larson (1977:xvi-xvii) views professionalization both as the creation and control of a market for a special type of service and as a collective assertion of a special status in the system of social stratification. This special status is legitimated by the socially recognized expertise and competence of the occupational group. In her consideration of the potential for market control of different occupations, Larson (1977:47-48) notes that different professions have different resources available. These include: the nature of the service that is marketed (its saliency, universality, etc.); the type of market (e.g., the level of competition); the type of clientele; the cognitive basis (e.g., the level of cognitive standardization); the "production of producers" (e.g., the extent of control by the occupation); the power relations (e.g., the
relation to other markets, the significance of the government in eliminating competitors); and the affinity with the dominant ideology. Larson (1977:50) stresses that the structure of the professional market is determined not by the occupation itself, but by the larger social structure, including the level of development, the class structure, the nature of the state, and the dominant ideologies. Larson (1977:18) especially emphasizes the central role of the state in supporting professionalism through its sponsorship of monopolistic educational systems. She also continually stresses the unique legitimation of the modern professions in terms of "objectively legitimated competence" (Larson, 1977:2).

The most systematic attempt to identify the social conditions that undermine structures of traditional professionalism is a case study of changes in the French University-Hospital system by Jamous and Peloille (1970). They argue that transformations of a profession have the greatest chance of occurring when two dynamics of change come together (Jamous and Peloille, 1970:142). One dynamic, the external dynamic of the socio-economic front, "provokes new demands as far as the social use of the production underlying the activity is concerned" (Jamous and Peloille, 1970:142). The second dynamic, the internal dynamic of the scientific front, is the product of new technical or scientific discoveries "which make it possible to better rationalize the means of arriving at the expected results of the activity in question" (Jamous and Peloille, 1970:142) and which provokes new demands on the part of the innovators for a redefinition of the nature of the professional activity. Jamous and Peloille
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(1970:142-143) argue that neither technical dysfunction nor social demand alone is likely to successfully challenge a prevailing structure of professional power.

Other recent work on the professions also recognizes the importance of both an internal and external dynamic in understanding the development of and changes in occupational power. In a short theoretical article, Klegon (1978) seeks to bury the taxonomic approach to the professions and to reorient theory and research to the larger social context of occupational struggles for power. Hall (1979), long associated with the taxonomic approach, contends that the theory of occupations should draw on recent literature on organization-environment relationships for an understanding of the dynamics of occupational change; however, he also suggests that occupational sociologists examine the way in which the taxonomic approach has been used by occupations seeking to legitimate their professional status. All of this literature indicates that much more consideration should be given to the environment of the occupation than has previously been the case, without denying the importance of the internal dynamics of the occupation within that larger context.

This literature suggests that not only does the larger social context determine the success of the professional project, but also that changes in that larger social context may push toward a re-structuring of occupational power as a new balance of social forces emerges.

Within both the sociological and popular literature on the professions, there is a recognition of the current emergence of social
changes that may challenge prevailing patterns of occupational power. This literature is scattered, of varying quality, sometimes merely speculative, and dubiously grounded in empirical data. Yet this literature does point to actual developments in the social and political arena which increasingly require the sociologist's attention. These challenges to professionalism include: the client challenge, the governmental challenge, the technological challenge, and the organizational challenge.

Wilensky's (1964) inquiry into the future of professionalization represents one of the most careful analyses of potential challenges to professionalism. He suggests that the rising educational level of the population may have paradoxical results:

with education come (1) greater sophistication about matters professional, more skepticism about the certainties of practice, some actual sharing in professional knowledge (the mysteries lose their enchantment); but at the same time (2) more willingness to use professional services. The question is open whether a population prone to greater use of professional service which is at the same time more critical and less deferential will mean greater pressure for high standards of technical and ethical performance or an increasing skepticism, the discounting of professional claims, even a tendency to see in the professional just another commercial vendor. (Wilensky, 1964:150)

Lopata's (1976) examination of expertization and the revolt of the client indicates that the recent pattern of client response to professionalism has two aspects, not too different from those identified by Wilensky. On the one hand, Lopata (1976:442-443) traces the partial rejection of experts and their advice in the "do-it-yourself" movement; on the other hand, Lopata (1976:443) identifies an increased demand for expert services, but with a changed relation with the experts—a relation that is less asymmetrical than the traditional...
professional-client relationship due to the greater knowledge of the client. Theoretical articles by Haug (1973, 1975) and by Toren (1975) and Ruzek's (1977) examination of the emergence of the women's health movement also support the thesis of a client challenge to professional power.

A second challenge to professionalism is suggested by Hall's (1975:123) consideration of the dual role of government. On the one hand, government sponsors professionalism and supports established professional groups against emergent challenges; on the other hand, Hall (1975) notes an emergent role of government as an active regulator over human service delivery systems, especially as the federal and state governments assume increasingly important financial roles in service delivery systems. Hall (1975:124) contends that this government intervention, while providing no guarantee of better professional practices, represents an important potential source of variation in occupational practice. The recent flood of court litigation regarding the professions (Yarmolinsky, 1978:171) and recent Supreme Court decisions affecting professional self-regulation and the monopoly status of professions (Business Week, 1976:127) further illustrate the emergence of an increasingly interventionist and regulatory role of government that restricts professional power.

A third challenge to professionalism is related to the potentially dynamic nature of the knowledge base of the professional. A classic article by Bucher and Strauss (1963) on the dynamic nature of professions in process points to the continuing challenge of
specialization to the community of professionalism. Toren (1976) argues that as the knowledge base of some professions, especially the more science-based, is subjected to increasing technological innovation and specialization, professional performance becomes subject to standardization and routinization. Haug (1973:200-201) stresses the potentials of computer technology in undermining the knowledge monopoly of the professional. Especially significant is the growth of new types of experts, their interdependence in the division of labor and in the performance of professional tasks, and the accompanying requirement that their work be coordinated (Hall and Engel, 1974; Zald, 1970:33; Bucher and Stelling, 1977b:123). In a technologically innovative society, occupational patterns of power are not immune to change.

The final challenge to professionalism, the organizational challenge, is closely related to both the governmental challenge and the technological challenge. On the one hand, governments are types of organizations with control over the resources, especially financial, which professions need to perform their work; on the other hand, organizations can be viewed as one type of technology, the technology of complex organization. The threat to professionalism from organizations is a continuing theme in the classical literature on professions (Johnson, 1972:14) and is recognized by Wilensky (1964:155) as the threat to professionalism (as opposed to the client challenge) likely to grow in influence. The conflict of organization and profession is usually described in terms of the clash between the bureaucratic and professional forms of social organization.
and is reflected in a whole line of empirical studies on the conflicts that professionals experience as workers in bureaucratic organizations (Benson, 1973). This complex relationship between profession and bureaucracy receives an extended treatment in the discussion in the following section on profession and bureaucracy as structural types.

These challenges to professionalism are of considerable significance, especially in the context of the precariousness of professionalism as a form of occupational control. As Elliott (1972:24) notes, professionalism as an occupational organization has been presented as an alternative method of determining and serving social needs. But, Elliott (1972:24) argues, professionalism has no criteria by which professional judgments of need are linked with public demand and kept within the limits of available resources. Professionalism offers no way "to resolve the conflicting aims of different fields or to decide the allocation of scarce resources between fields" (Elliott, 1972:24). Elliott (1972:144) points out that the main competitors of professionalism in defining ends and means are the state and profit-making organizations, whose criteria for allocating resources are fundamentally different from those of professionalism. In identifying this critical problem of the lack of self-sufficiency, Elliott recognizes one of the inherent dilemmas of the professional project. While times of relative affluence (in terms of claims for public services) may obscure this dilemma, the problem may be expected to grow as new professionals seek markets for their services and as mechanisms must be developed to adjudicate the conflicting demands.
for resources of these occupational groups.

The challenges to professionalism of clients and others have suggested to some that the term deprofessionalization may better describe the future of occupations which have attained professional status (Haug and Sussman, 1969; Haug, 1973; Toren, 1975; Haug, 1976; Ritzer, 1977). However, while there may be considerable truth in an acknowledgement of challenges to professional autonomy, the term deprofessionalization obscures more than it clarifies. In the sections and chapters to follow, it will be argued that professional power is increasingly "mediated," not "deprofessionalized." The term mediation suggests that the challenges to professions should be seen as attempts to develop alternative structures to assure that expert knowledge is truly service-oriented, as the structure of professionalism was meant to assure; the challenge is neither a challenge to expert knowledge nor to the service orientation of the professional. The use of the term mediation, then, suggests that, while the client challenge to professionalism may be important, its claims will be mediated by governments and other organizations to assure that client interests are truly served and in the most rationally competent manner. The mediation of goals toward the service of client needs and the mediation of technique toward the most effective competent practice to achieve those goals will be the charge of mediating structures, outside the professional group which heretofore has made decisions about goals and means without opposition or judgment.
Profession and Bureaucracy
as Structural Types

While the issue of profession and bureaucracy can be posed as an issue in social psychology, such as role conflict or reference groups, the issue can also be viewed as a problem in the study of historical social structures. The increasing importance of this issue is indicated by the increasing "organizationalization" of the professions and the concomitant decline of the independent free practitioner (Cullen, 1978:9-10). While certain professional occupations have been primarily based in organizations, other historically independent professions increasingly find the need for organization owing to increased specialization and the need for collaboration (Blau and Scott, 1962:64; Hall and Engel, 1973), the requirement for expensive professional equipment (Etzioni, 1969:x1), and the need for auxiliary staff (Etzioni, 1969:x1). The issue of the relationship between the structural principles of profession and bureaucracy in emergent organizational forms is thus made more important by the changing nature of professional work; the issue may also be promoted in importance by the changing social context of professional work.

The differentiation between profession and bureaucracy as types of social structures, though implicit in much of the early literature on the professions, receives a focal statement in Parson's (1947) commentary on Weber. Parsons (1947:54) accuses Weber of having a "conspicuous blind spot" in failing to bring out the structural uniqueness of the modern professions which can be differentiated from the "'administrative' hierarchy of occupational structures." Weber's
bureaucracy, Parsons (1947:54) complains, combines both. In a lengthy footnote, Parsons (1947:58-60) clarifies the differences between two essentially different types of social structure which, Parsons contends, Weber had "thrown together." Parsons (1947:59) distinguishes between what might be termed bureaucratic authority, where exercise of authority is legitimized by incumbency in a defined office, and what is now termed professional authority, based on the technical competence of the professional and not carrying with it the coercion implicit in the bureaucratic exercise of authority. Parsons contends that when professionals come together in organizations they tend to develop a different sort of structure than the administrative hierarchy.

Instead of a rigid hierarchy of status and authority there tends to be what is roughly, in formal status, a 'company of equals', an equalization of status which ignores the inevitable gradation of distinction and achievement to be found in any considerable group of technically competent persons. Perhaps the best example of this tendency, which Weber curiously enough seems to have overlooked in its bearing on this problem, is to be found in the universities of the modern Western world. Much the same will, on close examination, be found to be true of the professional staffs of such organizations as hospitals or law firms. (Parsons, 1947:60)

In a monograph on the academic profession, Parsons and Platt (1968) identify this as an associational structure, which they claim constitutes another organizational type at least as important in American society as the bureaucratic. Parsons and Platt (1986:Intro-4) contend that in associational structures the focus is not on organizational effectiveness in achieving specific goals, but is on the rights and procedures for arriving at collective decisions and commitments. The egalitarian strain of associational collectivities prevails over the
hierarchical strain of bureaucracies.

This distinction between profession and bureaucracy receives considerable attention in the literature on occupations and organizations. Blau and Scott (1962:60-63) contend that both profession and bureaucracy share certain characteristics; both are characterized by universalistic standards, specificity of expertness, affective neutrality, and achievement over ascription. However, profession differs from bureaucracy in its distinctive control structure, which is at variance with the hierarchy of bureaucratic organizations (Blau and Scott, 1962:62). The profession is based on self-control, maintained by the internalization of professional standards and by the formal mechanisms of social control of the occupational group (Blau and Scott, 1962:63). In bureaucracy, the source of discipline is the hierarchy of authority, not the colleague group; discipline prevails over expertness (Blau and Scott, 1962:63).

In two recent articles, Freidson (1973a, 1973b) distinguishes between the occupational principle and the administrative principle, which can be likened to the distinction between profession and bureaucracy. Under the occupational principle, the structure of relations among occupations is not determined by the management of the work organization, but by exercise of authority over work by the occupations themselves (Freidson, 1973b:26). Freidson (1973b:50-51) contends that as societies move from industrial to post-industrial, there will be a movement toward greater stress on the occupational principle. According to Freidson, (1973a:51), neither the nature of professional work, nor the status of post-industrial professional
workers, seems amenable to the managerial rationalization of the factory of industrial society. While management may control the resources of the organizations, they cannot control what the workers do nor how they do it (Freidson, 1973b:22-23). As post-industrial society emerges, the administrative principal progressively loses ground to the occupational principle.

In a recent text on occupations, Montagna (1977) reviews and integrates much of this material on occupations and organizations, and the distinctions he draws help to clarify the nature of the technical competence of the professional. According to Montagna (1977: 172) bureaucracy is an ideal type characterized by rationality and control, while profession or professionalization represents, as an ideal type, the lack of rationality (standardization and accessibility) and control. Professionalization is accomplished by the occupation's successful control over its own body of knowledge by means of a mandate which is awarded to it by the state (Montagna, 1977:172). The work autonomy of the individual professional is thereby fully protected. Montagna (1977:172) points out that presumably this autonomy, derived from the professional mandate, allows more room for creativity and innovation, but he later points to the dilemma of profession and innovation.

However, the emphasis on keeping a tight in-group structure and, for the professions, a protected body of knowledge, does have serious drawbacks. The unwillingness to rationalize the mystery of the professional expertise, for example, forestalls most attempts at innovation. Practitioners do not feel any change is necessary or desirable. (Montagna, 1977:184)

McKinlay (1973) also points out this dilemma of the profession and
constructive social change.

Montagna's (1977) characterization of profession and bureaucracy identifies the dilemma inherent in the legitimation of uniquely professional power: the dual legitimation of professional autonomy. On the one hand, professional authority is the authority of the expert, justified by the specialized knowledge of the professional; however, as Montagna (1977) points out, this expert authority does not differ from the authority of the technician. On the other hand, the professional authority is a charismatic authority, justified by the privileged and tacit knowledge of the professional. This charismatic-type authority, which entitles the collective profession to exercise its mandate and legitimates the clinical judgment of the individual professional handling the unique case, resembles a priestly authority (Jackson, 1970:8-10). This might be viewed as a potentially unstable type of authority in a highly modernized, secularized, and rationalized society. The increased pressure to rationalize the knowledge base of the profession may come into conflict with the charismatic authority of the generalist professional; new specialist professionals—and eventually even machines and servo-mechanisms—may emerge to challenge and replace the generalist professional (Heydebrand and Noell, 1973:298).

While analytically one may follow Parsons and others in distinguishing between profession and bureaucracy as structural types, the more important question is the usefulness of this distinction in understanding emergent forms of social organization. The major argument suggested by the discussion of structural changes in higher
education and in medicine in the following chapters is that Weber was correct in joining together office and expertise in his attempt to understand the emerging rationalization of society. Experts and expert knowledge are integrated into the organization as the profession is increasingly bureaucratized and as the bureaucratic-type organization—principally organized to promote effectiveness and efficiency—is increasingly professionalized. Weber's view, summarized by Johnson, brings together professionalization and bureaucratization as expressions of the increasing rationalization of Western civilization.

While Weber would have agreed with Carr-Saunders and Wilson that the professions bring knowledge to the service of power, he saw this convergence not as a limitation upon the exercise of power through the humanizing agency of the professions, but as one element in the process of rationalization. It was a process in which the professional as technician or expert was caught up in the bureaucratic machine, as one of its creatures. (Johnson, 1972:15)

The argument in this study follows Weber in its contention that the independent, autonomous role of the professions will be considerably limited in emergent forms of social organizations, however varied they may be. As Heydebrand (1973a:185) argues, the frame of reference of professional work thus shifts from the occupational structure or the larger social system to an organization or class of organizations. According to Heydebrand (1973a:185), this parallels the "transformation of professional work from the specification of goals to the specification of procedures, i.e., to a form of technical specialization."

In his discussion of types of authority in the university, Blau (1973:158-159) distinguishes between the bureaucratic authority
of the university administrator, having its source in superior official position, and the professional authority of the faculty member, grounded in expert knowledge. However, as Perrow (1972:57-58) points out, this distinction by Blau, Parsons, and others fails to acknowledge the technical character of administration: the specialized knowledge in managing the organization. Larson (1977:197) discusses the rise of organizational professions which are generated by heteronomous bureaucracies and by the expansion of the state bureaucracy: hospital administrators, management analysts, school superintendents, college presidents, and the like. Such professions do not aim so much for an independent professional status; rather their specialized or professional expertise borrows from the ideology of professionalism to legitimate "techno-bureaucratic power" (Larson, 1977:179).

In his discussion of the new class, Gouldner (1979:50) notes the change in contemporary bureaucratic organization as it becomes increasingly scientized. This scientization of the organization brings to the fore the clash between the new technical intelligentsia and the old bureaucrats, with their different systems of social control (Gouldner, 1979:51). Gouldner (1979:51) notes that the New Class intelligentsia typically seek to control by rewarding persons for conformity to their expectations, while the bureaucratic system of control is based on ordering and forbidding. The New Class intelligentsia legitimate themselves on the basis of their ability to increase services and production while the old bureaucrats legitimate themselves on the basis of their official position (Gouldner, 1979:51). This shift of power to the New Class intelligentsia in the
scientized organization parallels the increasing importance of non-
bureaucratic forms of coordinating professional work.

While professional private practice has, in the past, been viewed
as the ideal form of professional practice, some recent sociologi-
cal writings suggest that the organization of professionals may
allow for a more genuine fulfillment of professional standards.
Elliott (1972:99) points to the ways in which independent practice is
structured by its situation and he argues that some organizations can
insulate the professional from client pressures to engage in "un-
professional" conduct. Similarly, in their comments on the growing
industrialization of the professions, Engel and Hall (1973) point out
that the freedom from economic pressures, team approach to ser-
vice, and the possibilities for peer and public evaluation may allow
for a more faithful adherence to the ideal of professionalism—ra-
tional competent practice in serving social needs—in an organization-
al setting. Hall and Engel (1974:332) contend that this professional
organization would reflect a debureaucratization—as non-bureaucra-
tic forms of coordination would play an increasingly important role.

The suggestion that the "organizationalization" of the professions
may permit a more "authentic" professionalism calls into question
whether autonomy would be viewed as an essential characteristic of
modern "professionalism." Perhaps collegiate control by modern
professional groups is just a temporary structural form that modern
specialized occupations take in a transitional state. Larson (1977:
219) contends that the alleged conflict between bureaucracy and pro-
fession is primarily a conflict between the structure of bureaucratic
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organizations and an ideology promoted by some organizational members. She argues that the underlying structural affinities between profession and bureaucracy would indicate that, in a world of bureaucracy, "professions are not inherently antihierarchical" (Larson, 1977:199). The examination of changes in university organization, as well as the organization of medicine, will shed light on the nature and significance of this coming together of profession and bureaucracy.

**Conclusion**

Chapter II has introduced concepts and themes which will guide and structure the discussion in Chapters III, IV, and V. In the initial section, the concept of mediation as a form of occupational control was introduced. A specific type of mediation, systematic mediation, will be clarified in Chapter III and structural indicators of the growth of systematic mediation will be carefully examined.

The second section—on occupational change—is principally relevant to the explanatory ambitions of Chapter V. The themes of an external and internal dynamic of change and the various challenges to professionalism will be integrated into the discussion of the causes of the rise of systematic mediation.

The third section addressed the issue of profession and bureaucracy and the argument was advanced that the authority of office and of expertise will be joined together in emergent social structures as the professions are bureaucratized and the bureaucracies are increasingly professionalized. The emergent social structural changes portrayed in Chapters III and IV illustrate this increasing integration.
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of the professional into the complex organization.
CHAPTER III

STRUCTURAL CHANGE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

Chapter III, the central chapter in this study, clarifies the nature, dimensions, and significance of emergent structural change in higher education. This clarification illustrates the type of analysis of the qualitative directions of social change that Smelser (1968: 205) finds one of the "least developed aspects in the study of social change."

This chapter has eight sections including a conclusion. The first section reviews the literature on the university as an organization. Its purpose is to provide a context of theory and research for the analysis of changes in university organization in the following sections.

The second section identifies and clarifies three prominent themes in organizational theory and research which orient the analysis of structural change in higher education: power, environment, and history. In addition, the concepts of the visible hand social structure and systematic mediation, around which the remainder of the chapter is principally organized, are briefly clarified.

The third section portrays the development of the visible hand type system in education in recent years. Developments on the state and institutional levels illustrating the growth of the visible hand in higher education are highlighted.
The fourth section clarifies the key concept of the systematic mediation of professional power, with special reference to higher education. This section delineates the central dimensions or aspects of systematic mediation as it emerges in American higher education—dimensions that are illustrated in the discussion of the structural indicators of mediation in the following three sections. These dimensions are the qualitative dimensions of structural change, the identification of which is the principal concern and contribution of this study.

The fifth section describes the emergence of systematic mediation as it impresses itself upon institutions of higher education from outside their walls. The governmental policies which increasingly affect program, personnel, and educational policy are the principal focus of the discussion.

The sixth section describes the emergence of systematic mediation on the level of individual institutions of higher education. The effects of systematic mediation on program, personnel, and educational policies are identified and clarified.

The seventh section focuses on changes in the curriculum as they reflect this emergence of systematic mediation. The inclusion of this section reflects a concern to identify emergent changes in the content of central professional practices that are related to the organizational changes described in this chapter.

In a brief concluding section, salient dimensions of these structural changes are again reviewed. This section also explores the meaning and significance of these changes for the academic professional educator and for academic social organization.
The 1970s witnessed a vast increase in the sociological literature on the university as an organization. This literature varies considerably in focus, purpose, theoretical orientation, quality, and significance. The most thorough review of the literature on the university as an organization is presented by Baldridge, et al. (1978), a work which may constitute the most significant empirical contribution to the sociology of higher educational organization. The purpose of this literature review, which draws on that of Baldridge et al., is to situate the argument that follows in the context of prevailing theory and research on the university as an organization. The approaches that are briefly reviewed include: the collegial approach in Clark (1961, 1963), Parsons (1968a, 1968b), and Parsons and Platt (1968, 1973); the organized anarchy thesis of Cohen and March (1974); the decision-making approach in Pfeffer and Salancik (1974), Rubin (1977), and Hills and Mahoney (1978); the open systems approach of Frey (1977); the political, environmentalist, and historical approach of Baldridge et al. (1978); and the goals approach of Gross and Grambsch (1974). In each case, the approach will be briefly summarized and assessed.

The collegial model, which represents the application of Parson's thesis of the professional structure to the university, stresses the uniqueness of the university as an organization. Clark (1961:300) contends that the need for coordination and integration in academic organizations is much lower, in fact almost different in kind, than
in other organizations; 'rationality' consists of leaving professors alone, rather than in coordinating their efforts. Parsons (1968:168) argues that in the collegium power tends to be decentralized and the formal apparatus of collective decision-making is deemphasized; integration of the organization occurs through persuasion and influence rather than through power and authority. According to Parsons and Platt (1968:VI-40), the accountability of academic organization rests on "implementation rather than achievement" or effectiveness, since academic outputs can be evaluated only in the long run. Parsons and Platt (1968:VI-40) obviously intend the collegial pattern as an empirical, and not merely a normative, pattern; in their research they hypothesize that the main tendency is to preserve and strengthen the collegial pattern.

Several criticisms have been directed at the collegial model. The most frequent criticism is that the collegial model confuses the normative or desirable with the descriptive, the explanatory, and the predictive (Richman and Farmer, 1974:29; Baldridge et al., 1978:33). Richman and Farmer (1974:29) argue that the collegial model assumes a bias toward harmony which hides the reality of conflict within the organization; furthermore, they contend that the collegial model could only work well under limited situations, such as abundant resources and similar values and goals among institutional participants. Gusfield (1974:293) similarly points to the avoidance of power in the collegial model as developed by Parsons and Platt. But certainly the most convincing criticism is that of Baldridge et al. (1978), whose empirical research indicates that current social trends
are likely to undermine the little collegiality that has existed in higher education. Baldridge et al. (1978:224) contend that "collegial governance for the most part, is dead."

On the basis of their study of 42 college and university presidents and the characteristics of their institutions, Cohen and March (1974) develop the organized anarchy model of university decision-making. Their key finding is the prevalence of ambiguity in many dimensions of university organization and the concomitant inapplicability of models of rational decision-making—either descriptively or prescriptively. Cohen and March (1974) find in the universities they studied an ambiguity of purpose and of goals, an ambiguity of power, an ambiguity of ability to learn from experience, and an ambiguity of success. They find that technology is unclear and that involvement by organizational participants is fluid. Neither coordination, nor control is practiced. Resources are allocated in the university without explicit reference to some superordinate goal; the system is decisively controlled by no one (Cohen and March, 1974:33-34).

The Cohen and March model is a valuable contribution to the literature on universities and organizations; there is considerable truth in their portrait of American universities. Yet the work of Chiet (1977), who has studied organizational changes forced on institutions due to financial adversity, points to a historical dimension of university organization neglected by Cohen and March (1974). Universities are increasingly being turned from loose collections of professionals into managed institutions. Such changes,
discussed in greater length later in this chapter, have the effect of increasing the importance of the formal structure of the organization. The university becomes less anarchical, more organized. There is an unrealistic dimension in the understanding of Cohen and March (1974), as is suggested by their recommendation to university presidents and other top administrators to engage in a playful dimension or employ the technology of foolishness in facing problems the university faces. Such advice fails to appreciate the context of accountability in which university administrators must operate. While a rational model does not and will not explain university decision-making, one would still expect ever increasing attempts by university administrators to bring rationality to university decision-making. The context of administrative decision-making will permit nothing less.

The third approach, which is termed the decision-making approach, includes the work of Rubin (1977), Hills and Mahoney (1978), and Pfeffer and Salancik (1974); like the work of Cohen and March (1974), it focuses on decision-making in the university, specifically resource allocation and reallocation. In her study of five state universities undergoing financial stress, Rubin (1977:248; 253) finds that the reduction of resources did bring about changes in procedures for allocation, including increasing the explicitness of criteria for decision-making and the use of organizational resources to address problems at the organizational level. These changes also brought an expansion of the information base of the university and the use of this information for more systematic decision-making (Rubin, 1977:247). Nevertheless, Rubin (1977:250) stresses the
distortions introduced into the decision-making process as a result of administrator and departmental response to the requirements of financial stress. In summary, Rubin's (1977) study points to the kind of organizational changes that are not adequately encompassed by Cohen and March (1974) in their characterization of the university as an organized anarchy; university administrators were not helpless in their plight.

The studies of Hills and Mahoney (1978) and Pfeffer and Salancik (1974) represent attempts to develop organizational models of the resource allocation process in complex organizations. Pfeffer and Salancik (1974) seek evidence from a study of resource allocation at the University of Illinois for either a bureaucratic (rational) model or a coalitional model of decision-making about resource allocation. The bureaucratic model assumes the use of universalistic criteria such as workload, while the coalitional model focuses on differential power of the subunits of the organization. Pfeffer and Salancik (1974) interpret their findings to support a coalitional model, which stresses the importance of subunit power. The study by Hills and Mahoney (1978) of resource allocation in another larger state university suggests that a bureaucratic model could encompass decision-making about resources during a period of abundant resources, while a model which encompasses subunit power, externally based in outside advisory boards, is required to explain changes in resource allocation in periods of scarce resources.

Each of these studies of university decision-making constitutes a contribution to the real world study of university organization.
Rubin's (1977) study points to the impact of financial stress on decision-making and resource allocation; Pfeffer and Salancik (1974) and Hills and Mahoney (1978) suggest the influence of differential power in organizational subunits, which may be especially important during periods of financial stress. While these decision-making studies are considerably limited in focus and scope, they do provide information on an important process within the university, resource allocation, which cannot be neglected in understanding universities as organizations.

In his study of university-environment relations in the state of Washington, Frey (1977) employs an open systems model of organization. Frey's (1977) purpose is twofold: to systematically understand the changing relationship between a state university and its environment and to develop open systems generalizations based on this study. The principal finding reported in Frey (1977:1) is the increased permeability of the boundary between state agencies, which constitute the most important part of the organizational set of the university, and the university. Frey (1977:80-96) notes specific policy changes which exemplify this turn: the increased activity of the Council on Higher Education (CHE), the higher education coordinating body; the introduction of performance auditing; the increase of item-specific provisions in state appropriations; the increasing importance of the state budgetary process; and the professionalization of legislative staffs. These changes in turn force the university to make decisions increasingly based on rational or universalistic considerations (Frey, 1977:66); they also increase the importance of the university's
boundary roles to the state agencies (Frey, 1977:19). Frey (1977: 73-74) notes that the pervasiveness of scarce resources in the larger environment, the lowered priority for higher education, and the increased competition for state government resources have significantly increased the dependency of the university. He concludes that while autonomy in policy level decision-making has largely remained with university officials, the evidence points to the fact that this autonomy is being slowly usurped through legislative action, as the legislature begins to dictate long term policy related to academic goals (Frey, 1977:108,132). Frey (1977:136) further contends that these changes make the traditional model of professional autonomy for faculty "not applicable."

Frey's (1977) study of state-university relations in Washington represents an important contribution to the sociology of higher educational organizations, most significantly in its acknowledgement of the salience of the university's political environment. The study reveals considerable insight into the actual forces at work in higher education, especially agencies of state government. On the other hand, while the environmentalist perspective of Frey is noteworthy, his specific use of the open systems model to explain these changes is disappointing. The open systems model represents a managerial and equilibrium model of organization, whose implicit assumption is that the environment of the organization can be managed. From a sociology of knowledge perspective, the development of the open systems model can be traced to the need to sensitize the organizational manager to organization-environment relations. As Frey's actual
portrait of higher education in Washington suggests, however, the environment threatens to overwhelm the university. As Rosengren (1975) points out, the more fundamental structural changes in formal organizations at the present time cannot be adequately understood through the use of equilibrium models of organization.

The study by Baldridge et al. (1978) of policy making in higher education represents an elaboration of the political model of university organization advanced in an earlier work by Baldridge (1971). The political model indicates that universities, like other complex organizations, can be viewed as small-scale political systems, with the prevalence of interest group dynamics and conflicts. Baldridge's (1971) earlier study focuses on the political dynamics in a large city university. The model is enlarged in the study by Baldridge et al. (1978) with its focus on the diversity of political processes in types of institutions from community colleges to elite private universities. The new model also introduces a strong environmentalist theme by identifying the impact of external factors on political processes in universities and an historical perspective, by examining long-term changes in decision patterns and structures in two suggestive chapters (Baldridge et al., 1978). Probably the major theme in the study by Baldridge et al. is the increasing environmental vulnerability of colleges and universities and the impact this has on the power of academic professionals.

In several ways the study by Baldridge et al. (1978) is a model for research on the university as an organization. The book combines the competent use of empirical methods with an historical sophistication;
also, the theoretical perspective in the study is adapted to the shape of the empirical facts. The major flaw in the study is a relatively simplistic juxtaposition of bureaucracy and profession, which fails to adequately appreciate the emergence of organizational processes mediating the interests of profession and bureaucracy. Nevertheless, the study provides the most insightful picture of higher educational organizations in the United States of all the works on higher education.

The goals approach to university organization, advanced by Gross and Grambsch (1974), represents one of the older empirical orientations to the university as an organization. Gross and Grambsch (1974) report two studies, one conducted in 1964 and a second in 1971, at large research universities to determine goals and goal preferences among potentially powerful parties in higher education. Gross and Grambsch (1974:204) report that there were few changes in goals or in the power structures of the universities studied between 1964 and 1971. Pure research and other faculty-centered goals still received primary emphasis; student-centered goals remained of relatively little importance. In both studies, the power structure consisted of the presidents and the regents at the top, the faculty in the middle, and the students at the bottom (Gross and Grambsch, 1974:133-134). Gross and Grambsch (1974:204) find an increased meeting of minds about university goals by parties within the universities between 1964 and 1971. However, they note that two quite distinct sets of goals were associated with the power of outsiders versus insiders: service-oriented goals for outsiders; liberal
arts goals, faculty professionalism, and freedom of student inquiry with the power of insiders. Thus the major cleavage identified by Gross and Grambsch (1974:169) is between external and internal power holders, not between administrators and faculty; administrators are portrayed as supporters of faculty-centered goals.

The studies by Gross and Grambsch (1974) indicate that faculty power at large research universities weathered the student revolution. The question nine years later is how faculty power is weathering the accountability revolution. Richman and Farmer (1974:99) argue that the increased financial problems facing many institutions have resulted in significantly decreasing the consensus on goals between faculty and administrators. Richman and Farmer (1974:100) also suggest that the power structure of universities and colleges has probably shifted toward external constituents, with their orientation toward more service goals. Finally, Content (1975:497) notes the startling omission of "non-academic, middle-management administrators" in the list by Gross and Grambsch of potential power holders. He contends that the failure to include this new "professional university management" personnel could have introduced an important bias in the study. Nevertheless, the two studies by Gross and Grambsch provide evidence of the extent of collegiate control in the more prestigious segments of higher education in the 1960s and early 1970s, if only assured by administrative sponsorship.
In his short treatise on complex organizations, Mouzelis (1967: 162-163) urged sociologists to turn away from the "excessive preoccupation" with managerial problems and to address anew problems more relevant from a theoretical point of view and "more crucial for understanding the organizational features of the society in which we live." Ten years later, that call relatively unheeded, Benson (1977) called for a similar reorientation of organization theory toward four analytical problems relatively neglected in organizational research: action, power, levels (environment), and process. The perspective on the university as an organization developed in this chapter is an attempt to respond to the call of Mouzelis and of Benson by focusing on the university from a perspective encompassing power, environment (levels), and history (process). In moving away from the managerial biases and perspective embodied in much organizational research, the perspective developed here moves toward a more sociologically adequate and relevant orientation to the university as an organization. Ironically this parallels an earlier imperative to challenge the "professional" biases and perspective in the literature on professionalism in order to achieve a more sociologically adequate understanding of the professions.

In his analysis of university governance, Epstein (1974:3) notes that both professors and political scientists might be reluctant to view the university and faculty decision-making as a properly political subject due to perceptions about the academic character of
such decision-making. The use of the term governance to describe university government may, in fact, be viewed as an attempt to depoliticize university decision-making. But the social order of every organization, including the university, is politically negotiated (Benson, 1973:383). Benson's (1977a) review of recent organizational research has focused on organizational power. The use of the political model by Baldridge (1971) and Baldridge et al. (1978) represents the clearest focus on political elements in studies of university organization, but power is recognized as important in most of the organizational perspectives discussed in the previous section. While tranquil times may disguise the political aspects of the university, turbulence brings out very clearly the politicality of university organization.

This power perspective on university organization must not, though, consider the university as a closed political system. Increasingly organizational research, by focussing on interorganizational networks and sets, recognizes that organizations are not closed systems (Benson, 1977a:10). In their development of the resource dependence perspective on organizations, Pfeffer and Salancik (1978:94) point out how management of the organization's environment has become the dominant problem of today's organization. This centrality of the environment of today's college and university is starkly clear in the research by Baldridge et al. (1978) and Frey (1977) and in the discussion by Mortimer and McConnell (1978:272-273) of problems of shared authority in higher education. Richman and Farmer's (1974:289) guide to academic managers also points out that academic
institutions are becoming increasingly open systems, in environments
that are turbulent and competitive. While the significance of the
environment may be latent at times, it is always a potential force;
the university, like other complex organizations, is not a self-suf-
cient enterprise.

In his critique of modern organizational theory, Benson (1977a:
11-12) notes:

The analysis of organizations has gone forward on the basis of
an assumption of stability in major organizational features.
The field is based largely on studies of correlated variability
in features of a produced and relatively stable reality. Studies
of the comparative-quantitative type constitute an extreme example
of this tendency. Yet, even where longitudinal measures are
employed and changes observed, the tendency is to assume the
continuity of the general features of the organization as we have
known it. Studies tend to examine relatively minor adjustments
among the components of the organization as a produced reality.

Benson (1977:11-12) argues that a process-oriented organizational
perspective would focus on the changing dimension of organizations neg-
lected by conventional organizational research. This study, above all
a study of social structural change, does not assume stability in
major organizational features; rather it focuses on major structural
changes: the emergence of new roles and new organizational units in
higher education, changes in social roles and organizational units,
and changes in the relationships of roles and organizational units.
The important contribution of this study is to show the historically
patterned character of these changes. Two terms are introduced and
discussed to clarify the nature of these structural changes: the
visible hand system and systematic mediation. The concept of systematic
mediation is the central concept is this study; the development of the
visible hand system in American higher education is discussed in order to provide a backdrop for the clarification of structural indicators of mediation in American higher education.

Bates (1974) introduces the term "visible hand system" to clarify differing ways in which the specialized parts of complex social systems can be coordinated. Bates (1974:4-5) contrasts the invisible hand system where the specialized parts are regarded as being autonomous with regard to authority, with the visible hand system in which a common authority structure has the responsibility for coordinating the operation of the parts of the systems. These terms can be applied either to relationships to units within a given sector of a society or to sectors of a society. The common authority structure of the visible hand system, according to Bates (1974), can take a number of forms; it may be reflected in an autocratic leadership or in patterns of collective leadership or participatory democracy. Bates (1974:4-5) contends that increasingly modern social systems move toward the visible hand system, both within and between sectors of society; this indicates to Bates (1974) the movement toward a managed society. According to Bates (1974:9), the most powerful factor pushing toward a social system organized around the visible hand of management is the growing belief that society can be managed.

While Bates' terminology of visible and invisible hand has not become popular, nevertheless the idea expressed in his terms is not unique to Bates' work. In his massive study of the nature and causes of changes in the American economic system, Chandler (1977) contrasts the visible hand of modern business management with Adam Smith's
invisible hand of market forces. Chandler (1977) tries to explain why the visible hand of business management has grown increasingly important in the American economy, and especially in certain segments of the economy. Bates' views of changes in organization is also consonant with Pfeffer and Salancik's (1978:94) argument that organizations are increasingly interconnected and that interorganizational effects then must be increasingly mediated by regulation and political negotiation rather than by impersonal market forces. Gouldner's (1979:98) contention that the socio-economic system is increasingly becoming a system, with an increasing mutual dependence of systems parts, suggests an affinity with Bates' (1974) argument.

The increasing development of the visible hand system in higher education is indicated by the increasing importance of the coordination and management of systems of higher (or post-secondary) education. On the state level, this is reflected in the increasing power given state coordinating commissions for higher education to coordinate the efforts of higher educational institutions, primarily public but also increasingly private institutions, into an effective system of post-secondary education. On a level intermediate between the state and individual institutions of higher education, the visible hand is reflected in the existence of multi-campus systems of higher education, which coordinate the efforts of more than one public institution (Lee and Bowen, 1975). On the individual college or university level, this is reflected in the move toward systems of planning and management to better coordinate what are increasingly recognized as interdependent activities. Higher education, then, is becoming a more
organized enterprise.

The growth of the visible hand is closely related to the growth of systematic mediation in higher education. As the brief review of the history of American higher education in Chapter II indicates, American higher education does have a long history of orientation to clients and markets (Rourke and Brooks, 1966; Waldo, 1969; Bledstein, 1976); mediation is not a new form of control applied to American higher education. But the increasing application of management practices, tools, and concepts to institutions of higher education indicates the emergence of a relatively new type of mediation, systematic mediation, a mediation of professional power through modern management to attempt to assure that the academic professional educators truly serve the educational needs of the society, both effectively and efficiently. The growth of systematic mediation parallels the increasing legitimation of management in terms of functional, rather than merely formal, authority; academic management becomes professionalized.

It is almost axiomatic that the visible hand system and systematic mediation will not affect the diverse sectors of American higher education alike. For example, while private institutions of higher education can be expected to be increasingly included in statewide planning, we can expect that they will be significantly less affected by this state public network than public institutions. Yet, if as is likely, private institutions come to rely on state funds, the integration of private institutions might be significant. The more elite sector of American higher education, both public and private, may be
expected to have organizational resources to insulate them from these pressures for change; yet Cheit (1977) points out that the elite public institutions may be the hardest hit by these developments, especially because of the greater incongruence of their structures with these emergent developments. The study by Baldridge et al. (1978) clearly shows the differential resources different types of institutions have to insulate them from environmental pressure. But at the same time that Baldridge et al. describe and extol diversity, their argument and its tone indicate a power of the environment that will reshape all types of institutions of higher education. In the description of structural change that follows, recognition and attention will be given to diversity, but the primary purpose is to describe the overall direction of these changes, a direction best exemplified in the public sector of higher education that has become the dominant sector of higher education.

Finally, the recognition of the salience of these structural changes in university organization is not to deny the continuing anarchical element in university organization. The structural change that is described is only emergent, not complete or definitive. It is difficult to predict the eventual extent to which these developments will actually reshape the work of university teachers. Nevertheless, it is a central argument of this study that, despite the fact that academic man can be expected to resist these developments, their effects are likely to be considerable. And insofar as these structural changes reshape the university, an institution particularly resistant in its structure and culture to organizational rationalization,
one can expect similar developments to reshape other institutional sectors in American society.

The Growth of the Visible Hand in American Higher Education

Historically, American colleges and universities have enjoyed considerable independence, both from one another and from the close scrutiny of political authorities (Godwin, 1975:236), although the degree of independence has varied considerably with the differing traditions of state governments (Clark and Youn, 1976:21). The mechanism of the lay board of trustees and a self-regulating system of accreditation has substituted for direct political control (Folger, 1977a:vii). Constitutional provision for the independence of the university has been one means to prevent political incursions into the university, though most states have preferred to keep relations more ambiguous and undefined (Glenny and Dalglish, 1973b:1). While, formally, individual colleges and universities have a common authority structure centering around a lay board of trustees, the considerable independence that many faculty have gained is reflected in the dual hierarchy--financial and academic--of the university (Garbarino, 1975:23–24) and in the relative autonomy granted academic departments and their faculties. The degree of faculty autonomy is directly related to size, institutional prestige, and the degree of research orientation of the university (Baldridge et al., 1978).

The growth of the visible hand in higher education is directly related to the birth of new state agencies and the strengthening of
existing agencies of state government, especially in the executive branch of state government (Glenny and Dalglish, 1973b:41; Wattenbarger, 1974:2). It is also related to the growth of the public sector in higher education: Since 1950 there has been a steady shift toward public enrollment with 75% of students enrolled in public institutions in the early 1970s (Newman, 1973:19). The dependence of state universities on state funds provides the structural basis for the increased involvement of state government in higher education. Budgeting and the appropriations process are the overriding consideration in the operation of state colleges and universities (Glenny and Dalglish, 1973b:73; Jacobson, 1977:6-7). As a study of public universities and the law by Glenny and Dalglish (1973b:143-144) illustrates, institutional autonomy rests on the trust of state government officials, not on some special legal status of the university like constitutional autonomy. They contend that the strengthening of the state government and the new management control techniques, especially centered in the office of the governor, are increasingly undermining higher education as a distinctive area of state government, to be dealt with differently than other state agencies (Glenny and Dalglish, 1973b:141). This results in increasing demands for management and operational information from those public higher educational institutions for the purpose of state budgetary decisions on higher education. While the increased intervention by state government in university operations is sometimes attributed to trends in enrollment and the need for state fiscal restraint, a study by Lee and Bowen (1975:73) of multi-campus systems finds that this increased
intervention is attributed by those within these institutions to the increasing size and competency of state executive and legislative staffs, to conflicts between executive and legislative branches of government, and to a legacy of distrust from the days of student activism. Glenny (1976:70) notes that despite a stabilization in the percentage of university funds as a part of state budgets, state agencies increasingly request more data and information and place more controls over college and university operations. It should be noted that not all states are characterized by these developments; in some smaller states with strong executives and citizen legislatures, relatively little new regulation has taken place (Folger, 1978:34).

Probably the most significant development on the state level is the growth of statewide planning in higher education, especially through coordinating boards or agencies for higher education. The movement of states toward higher educational planning is reinforced by the federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972 which underlined the need for broad state planning of "postsecondary education" (Glenny, 1973; Wise, 1979:99). The growth and acceptance of statewide planning has been a recent phenomenon. In 1960, the (Milton) Eisenhower Committee defended the principle of institutional autonomy and the undesirability of state level regulations, and statewide planning played a minor role (Folger, 1975:227). In 1976, on the other hand, only two states lacked some type of coordinating agency (Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:231). Mortimer and McConnell (1978:219) identify four types of coordinating boards: the voluntary association, the advisory
coordinating board, the regulatory coordinating board, and the consolidated governing board. They note that the voluntary associations have disappeared, and those coordinating boards with some level of regulatory authority have increased substantially (Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:220). Others also note a definite tendency for states to increase the power of their coordinating agencies, especially in the area of program review (Folger, 1975:230-231; Glenny, 1976:41; and Barak, 1977:74-75). These advisory and regulatory coordinating boards are increasingly comprised of lay persons, not employed by colleges or universities or advocates for particular segments of higher education (Johnson, 1976:13; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:223). The private sector of higher education is also being increasingly drawn into this planning and coordination process (Glenny, 1973; Hendrickson, 1976:29; Wilson, 1975:31; Yarmolinsky, 1976:21; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:220).

Because it is resources that those in the upper reaches of this inter-organizational hierarchy control, it is not surprising that the budget becomes one of the principal management tools in this growing coordination of post-secondary education. In 1972, Glenny identified state budgeters as "anonymous leaders of higher education" as they had become increasingly concerned with programs and productivity rather than line items in budgets. Four years later, in his extensive study of state budgeting in higher education, Glenny (1976:3-4) notes the development of the budget as a central policy instrument and the growing power of the professionalized budget staffs who push state budgets from the line item form (so dear to legislators) toward the
performance or functional budget. While Glenny notes the difficult problems in introducing such performance budgets, which increasingly attend to the outcomes of those services budgeted, he still argues that states will move toward program-type budgets, "alien to the purists, but pragmatic for budgeters" (Glenny, 1976:31). Glenny (1976:23-24) contends that the result of this development is to increasingly place policy power in the hands of the budget review staffs, at the expense of the legislators or the governor.

The development of the visible hand also parallels the increasing professionalization or expertization of those state-level management personnel involved in decision-making about higher education. In their study of multi-campus systems of higher education, Lee and Bowen (1975:15) note that executive budget offices and legislative fiscal committees are increasingly being staffed by those who have recently obtained advanced degrees in such disciplines as political science, economics, and public administration. They indicate that those within higher education view this as a mixed blessing, since they fear that such personnel "do not always recognize or accept the difference between the university and other agencies" (Lee and Bowen, 1975:15). Besides documenting the professionalization of budget staffs, Glenny (1976:117) notes that most coordinating agencies employ specialists for at least three functions—program review and approval, budget review, and statewide planning—and that these staffs are increasingly committed to the public administration view of their role. Trow (1975:126) records his impression that the views of these new "populist technocrats" on the state level are "markedly egalitarian,
hostile to elite values and institutions," and more sympathetic to nonselective, rather than elite, public institutions of higher education.

This growth of the visible hand system in higher education has not been without its trenchant critics. Enarson (1973: 16) complains of the "heresy loose in the land" that universities, like other agencies of state government, are units to be "policing, regulated, and whipped into a bureaucratic mold." He argues that a managerial revolution is under way, whose articles of faith are "control, coordination, efficiency, and something called 'accountability'", threatening to "convert relatively free-standing, self-directing institutions of higher learning into homogenized state systems" (Enarson, 1973: 16). Trow (1975: 122) notes with fear the development of modern management systems and data systems, especially by state governments, that threaten a crucial element of the private life of higher education: the spontaneous and creative aspect that is crucial to teaching and learning. Nevertheless, Trow (1975: 124) points to the difficulties universities have in resisting such developments, given their commitment to the dissemination of knowledge and the universities' own development of management systems for their own purposes.

On the institutional level, the growth of the visible hand of management is directly related to the rise of the steady state and to the changing role of state governments in higher education (Chait, 1977). For both public and private institutions, the increasing reliance on management systems can also be viewed as an adaptive response by the
organization to preserve its autonomy in the face of intense environmental pressure. The ideology and practice of management in higher educational institutions is not, however, without a history. Writing in 1961, Clark notes the battle between faculties and administrations:

"Going into battle, the faculties march under the banner of self-government and academic freedom, emphasizing equality of relations among colleagues and de-emphasizing administrative hierarchy. The administrations move forward under a cluster of banners: let's bring order out of chaos, or at least reduce chaos to mere confusion; let's increase efficiency, utilize our scarce resources of men and money effectively; let's give the organization as a whole a sense of direction with knowledgeable hands on the helm; let's insure that we handle external forces--the legislature or our constituencies--in ways that will insure the survival and security of the whole enterprise. (Clark, 1961:296)"

Five years later, Rourke and Brooks (1966) devoted a full-length monograph to the managerial revolution in higher education, focussing on its manifestations in the non-academic life of institutions. But the forces of managerial rationalization, of the visible hand of management, had relatively little effect on organization (Cheit, 1973:16). It is with the growth of the steady state and increased state demands for accountability that the methods of management emerge to have a significant impact on the organization (Cheit, 1977). In a period of continuing growth, the interdependence of decisions can be avoided; in the steady state or the state of decline, they cannot (Cheit, 1977). Toombs (1973:16) points out that the tradition of management "claims special ability in optimizing the use of resources by sorting out mixed goals and rationalizing internal relationships". However, that issue did not emerge as a university decision problem.
until the growth curves in university resources began to level. With this levelling off of resources, according to Toombs (1973:16), came the realization that faculty were serving many objectives and that within these activities there was a "network of dependencies" that reached well beyond institutional boundaries. "This combination of conditions--limited resources for multiple goals in a decentralized organization whose interdependent units operate under an impression that they are autonomous--is the substance of management decisions" (Toombs, 1973:16).

This rise of the steady state, this stabilizing of student and financial resources, might be viewed as an unusual condition peculiar to higher education and requiring some special, ad hoc explanation. That issue of uniqueness will be addressed later in the study. But an important point to note is that these developments illustrate the special problem clarified in Elliott's work: the lack of self-sufficiency of the professions and the inability of the professional form of social organization to deal adequately with resource allocation decisions. As Fincher (1975:49) points out, the academic traditions that have pervaded university life have allowed participants to structure their roles without regard for the economic consequences of their doing so. While it is possible to view this lapse as a problem peculiar to one profession, the academic profession, following Elliott (1972) it is more accurate to see this as a recurrent problem of a particular type of social organization, the decentralized organization associated with the dominance of "unmanaged" professionals.

The growth of management systems in institutions of higher
education, which are indicators of the growth of the visible hand, is reflected in a number of interdependent developments: (1) the changing language and jargon of higher education; (2) the development of management internship programs; (3) the increased development and use of management tools and planning models for charting institutional futures; (4) the increased use of the budget as a tool for systematic management; and (5) the growth and professionalization or expertization of management functions in higher education and the development of professional associations for these upper and middle-level managers in institutions of higher education. These emergent developments parallel changes in the state level management efforts toward higher education.

The new language of managerialism represents one of the most striking changes in academe accompanying the managerial revolution. Academic management replaces academic governance or university administration as the term to describe the more active role of the university administrator in organizational affairs (Richman and Farmer, 1974:14, Shoemaker, 1977:4). The word management also reflects the increasing concern for efficiency in university operations (Baldridge et al., 1978:231). The accountability demands of legislators and the emergence of faculty unionization also bring other business phrases and words to the university like workload, productivity, employee/employer relations, and management by objectives to replace the more traditional language of the university: academic freedom, collegiality, scholarly research (Kelley and Rodriguez, 1977:103). The management systems approach also introduces the management information system,
which entails an increased collection and organization of information to improve decision-making processes (Tierney, 1977:211). Resource allocation models and program budgets reflect the increased budgetary consciousness of the university. Overall, the central task is identified as developing "information that can help us to manage resources by carefully integrating our academic policy objectives with the allocation of funds" (McCorkle, 1977:2). Or, with a little more of the new systems jargon, administrators are urged to design "a framework of thought... to help decision-makers select the best choice in a complex situation containing a number of interdependent variables" (Chen, 1977:59).

This movement toward management systems is promoted by extensive public and private support for management internships or management development and training programs. The Advanced Institutional Development Program of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 emphasizes as one of its three foci management development in higher education, and several institutional programs have been subsidized under this act (St. John, 1980). Webster (1979) describes in broad outline the Higher Education Management Institute (HEMI), a management development and training program designed to improve college and university performance by helping managers carry out their responsibilities. The system deals with the managers primary responsibilities for setting goals, obtaining and allocating resources, working effectively with people, and achieving results (Webster, 1979). The program had 23 pilot colleges and universities who were selected from more than 450 applicants (Webster, 1979). The program, which is based
on an extensive review of the general management literature, is funded by the Exxon Education Foundation and has recently been incorporated into the American Council on Education (Webster, 1979).

A similar management improvement program funded by the Exxon Education was the Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP), which was limited to private liberal arts colleges and universities and was begun in 1973. The program was designed to support institutions desiring to improve their management practices. In material announcing the program, Exxon noted that:

While the needs of individual colleges will differ, we assume that modernizing management practices will usually include (1) a clear redefinition of authority and responsibility within the institution, (2) a definition of the objectives of the institution and its constituent units, (3) a system of continuous comparison of achievements to objectives, (4) a system requiring a review of all possible options before any decision is made, and (5) a management information system capable of projecting the financial, personnel, and physical space allocation consequences of each option being reviewed. (Baldridge and Tierney, 1979:2)

Two hundred institutions applied for the grants to improve management practices along one or more of these lines, and 49 programs were funded, including at such prestige colleges and universities as Carleton, Dartmouth, and Haverford. Baldridge and Tierney's (1979) examination of 34 of these institutions installing either a management information system or a management by objective systems indicates that such systems can improve college management and decision-making.

The systems movement in higher education has also received impetus from the evolution of a specialized service industry, which has been instrumental in the development of management tools and techniques for use by higher education decision-makers (Sheehan, 1977:91-92). As
early as the 1960s, the possibilities for improving higher educational administration through systems approaches and rigorous analytic techniques attracted a few researchers (Chett, 1977:57). By the end of the 1960s, this effort had created a new field of specialization with research organizations, conferences, technical publications, and a dazzling array of acronyms (Chett, 1977:58). At the present time, this development of systems approaches and techniques goes on in all parts of the country and in a variety of institutions—public, private, and profit-making (Chett, 1977:58). According to Cheit (1977:58), no physical or intellectual center exists, although the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) at Boulder, Colorado has become a focal point for work because of its size and the level of its public financial support. However, considerable contributions have also been made by the Systems Research Group in Toronto, the Analytical Studies Group at the University of California, the Program for Research in University Administration at Berkeley, several Big Ten institutions, the Florida state system, and by men and women in public accounting firms, consulting organizations, and research institutes (Chett, 1977:58). These organizations and individuals have contributed to the development of several types of analytical tools, including enrollment projections models, program profile models, resource requirement simulation models, and flow models (Craven, 1975:132).

The National Center for Higher Education Managements Systems (NCHEMS), founded in 1968, is the most visible contributor in this service industry. NCHEMS, which has been heavily subsidized by the
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Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, had as many as 800 institutions from 50 states as active participating members as early as 1973 (Danforth, 1973:135). NCHEMS' goals are to improve management and decision-making on the institutional, state-wide, and national levels (Danforth, 1973:135). Most of NCHEMS' work has centered on the development of quantitative techniques such as cost-analysis procedures that standardize terminology and increase the variety of cost data available to decision-makers (Toombs, 1973:22). However, NCHEMS has also worked on such problems as the development of an inventory of higher education outcome variables and measures (Astin, 1974:24). More recently, NCHEMS has shifted its principal concern to more qualitative dimensions and is strongly pushing the concept of 'strategic' planning in higher education (Jacobson, 1980).

Statewide systems of higher education have shown considerable interest in these NCHEMS' products (Toombs, 1973:40), and Glenny et al. (1976) find a considerable use and prospective use of NCHEMS products in public institutions of higher education.

While Glenny et al. (1976) report no evidence of disenchantment with NCHEMS products, an analysis of recent higher education literature suggests considerable criticism of NCHEMS products and especially of the assumptions underlying their development and use. These criticisms of NCHEMS products indicate the seriousness of efforts to improve decision-making through systematic efforts to collect and structure information that relates to decisions that must be made. In a study of the uses of management information, Wyatt and Zeckhauser (1975) found that the computer-based information systems they studied...
often did not meet the information needs of decision-makers and failed to mesh with their decision styles. Schroeder (1977:99) questions six assumptions of management system design including the assumption that a comprehensive decision-information system can be built, that state and institutional information needs are compatible, and that a vendor-supplied system will meet institutional needs. He favors the development of more limited systems organized around decisions that must be made. Porter et al. (1979) and Wiseman (1979) both articulate a critique of generalizing planning models, insisting that only a more institution-specific model that integrates institutionally relevant factors can take hold within an institution and impact on its decision-making processes. Parker and Gardner (1978) note the failure of prevalent conceptions of management information systems to deal with the organizational realities of power in colleges and universities. This work indicates the extent of reflection that is going on about the types of management systems that will firmly root themselves into the institutional context and improve decision-making processes.

Despite this growing literature on management techniques in higher education and this growing availability of tools and techniques, there is no survey of the current extent of use of various management systems and techniques in higher education. One of the few sources of information is a University of Pittsburgh study of the development of comprehensive planning systems in American research universities (Freeman, 1977). Comprehensive planning can be seen as the fullest commitment to the applicability of management practices to the university.
Fifty-six of the largest research universities were surveyed, 32 responded, and 23 of those 32 indicated that they had developed or were developing systems of comparative planning that would integrate long-range academic, administrative, financial, and facilities concerns for the entire university and its principal components (Freeman, 1977: 40). On the basis of the replies obtained in the study, Freeman (1977) draws a number of conclusions about planning systems in higher education: that the movement is still in its infancy (p.40); that the interest in planning is growing (most planning systems have been developed within the past five years) (pp. 40-41); that planning processes tend to be centrally controlled and highly structured (p.41); that trustees, faculty, and students are demanding greater participation (p.42); that institutions find present management information inadequate to the planning process (p.45); that there is considerable resistance to planning (p.45); that conceptual approaches to planning vary widely (p.43); and that external agencies influence the extent of planning (pp. 42-43). Freeman (1977) also found that comprehensive planning has been developed almost exclusively in public institutions, although there is evidence of increased interest in planning in private institutions. Freeman (1977:48) finds that a central aspect of these planning processes, in whatever type of research institution, is their integration of fiscal and academic concerns and the centrality of the issue of adequate resources.

This centrality of the resource allocation process makes the university budget a potentially central management tool. Blau (1973:
278) notes that the most important decisions in academic institutions, as in other organizations, concern the allocation of resources and that the top administrators make the main budgetary decisions. However he strangely concludes that this is an issue which does not create conflict in universities "because the academic interests of faculty members... make them uninterested in diverting time from their academic pursuits to the financial affairs of the university" (Blau, 1973:278). This parallels the findings of an earlier study by Dykes (1968:4) which suggested that the connection between educational and financial decisions was quite evanescent in the minds of many of the respondents, who tended to view educational and financial affairs as parts of two different worlds. Such a concept of education and finance is possible, given that institutional budgets have been traditionally built on the incremental form, with across-the-board increases or decreases in departmental allocations (Tierney, 1977:214).

The increasing attention to the budget as a management tool brings challenges to the traditional incremental or decremental practices in budgeting and brings increased use of program or performance-type budgets, which more systematically link fiscal outlays and academic policy objectives. Though the more ambitious of such program budgeting policies, such as Planning Programming Budgeting System (PPBS), have been unsuccessfully implemented, this has not deterred institutional leaders from more modest and realistic versions of the program budgets (Freeman, 1977:39). In their follow-up study of multi-campus systems, Lee and Bowen (1975) note the increasing
importance of the budget and the closer relationship between budgeting and academic planning. Caruthers and Orwig (1979:3,4,58) note a definite trend toward greater program budgeting in higher educational institutions, which they do not anticipate to slow in the coming years. They argue that one of the principal forces pushing public institutions toward such budgeting practices is the use of program budgeting on the state level. Caruthers and Orwig (1979) also find that private colleges and universities are increasingly resorting to program or performance budgets. The movement toward program-type budgeting is illustrated in many university practices, including the current trend where line items in budgets, like faculty salaries which have become open due to resignation or renewal, revert to the central office of the university for reassignment (Hanson, 1976:27).

The implementation of various requirements of the new management systems requires an increase in the number, variety, and specialization of administrative offices within the university. In 1972-1973 administrators accounted for one in five higher education positions; four years later, in 1976-1977, administrators accounted for one in four positions (Scott, 1978b:17). Even with the stable enrollments of recent years, this growth, specialization, and differentiation of administrative positions appears to have continued, especially at four year colleges (Scott, 1979b:17). The principal causes of this growth are intensified needs for general management information, donations, students, and information to fulfill governmental requirements (Scott, 1979b). Scott (1979b:17-18), following others like Baldridge et.al. (1978), expects a continued growth in
administration and its specialization resulting from the complex
decisions institutions face and the influences of the external en-
vironment. The categories of administration which will grow in size
are those working closely with the institution’s environment: "the
financial technocrats," fund raisers, lawyers, labor negotiators,
safety officials, institutional researchers, and management informa-
tion specialists (Scott, 1979b:18).

This growth of the specialist administrator—budget and systems
analysts, lawyers, management information system specialists, legis-
lative liaison officers, and others—indicates a professionalization
or expertization of the management functions in higher education.
This professionalization is promoted by a number of developments in
higher education: collective bargaining (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975:
9-10); federal regulations (Gellhorn and Boyer, 1978:50); the impact
of legal rationality on the university; and increased external and
internal demands for information. In arguing that the university
presidency is becoming increasingly professionalized, Mortimer and
McConnell (1978:187-188) suggest that the changing demands of the
university presidency forces an increased reliance on functional
authority based on competence, rather than on merely formal authority
based on position. The growth of professional development programs
for both academic and non-academic administrators, through the pro-
fessional associations of these administrators, both illustrates the
changing requirements of institutional management and supports the
professionalization movement. While, from the faculty point of view
we can expect skepticism about these claims for expertise (Epstein,
nevertheless these changes in university administration and management personnel reflect real changes in the nature of university administration.

The well-publicized development of collective bargaining in 4-year institutions of higher education introduces another factor into the development of the visible hand system in higher education. In 1980 collective bargaining agreements were in force in 170 4-year public institutions and 83 4-year private institutions (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1980:7). The widespread faculty support for the principle of collective bargaining is illustrated by a recent study which found that about 75% of college and university faculty members support the principle of unionization (Ladd and Lipset, 1978). The movement toward collective bargaining is slowed, however, by the absence of enabling legislation in many states (Mortimer and McConnell, 1978) and by a recent Supreme Court ruling that "mature", private universities cannot under current law be required to engage in collective bargaining with their faculties (Watkins, 1980).

This development of collective bargaining in American higher education has an ambiguous relationship to the development of this visible hand. On the one hand, collective bargaining represents a reaction to and against the increased centralization of higher education, both within institutions and within systems of higher education (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975; Garbarino, 1975). On the other hand, collective bargaining contributes to the further growth of the visible hand of management in higher education by promoting the strength of the formal structure and by clarifying rights and responsibilities.
within colleges and universities and within state systems of higher education. This is not surprising since collective bargaining itself represents the spreading of a visible hand of union management over certain faculty domains that have been previously dealt with on a more decentralized and informal basis (Crossland, 1976:38). Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) point out that, although collective bargaining does complicate the process of administration, administrators, with the clear exception of middle managers, do not appear to have lost power as a result of collective bargaining and may, in fact, gain increased power from this formalization that collective bargaining brings.

This spread of the visible hand system in the sphere of higher education is directly related to an increased formalization and centralization in higher education. The study by Baldridge et al. (1978) documents this increasing centralization of higher education, which is traced to financial austerity and increased environmental pressure on institutions of higher education. The spread of management systems and techniques promotes centralization both within institutions of higher education and within systems of higher education as information, and the power that can go with control over the information, moves upward. The study by Baldridge et al. (1978) and the work of Mortimer and McConell (1978:280-281) also document the increased formalization in higher education, as rules, regulations, formulae, and standard operating procedures increasingly prevail within institutions of higher education and systems of higher education. The introduction of management techniques, the increasingly litigious atmosphere of
higher education, and the movement toward collective bargaining also promote an increased formalization. These developments have the effect of promoting the power of the formal structure of higher education and of undermining the traditional and considerable informal power structure of the university.

This consideration of the visible hand of management in higher education does not attempt to claim triumph for the visible hand. The focus has been, instead, on the emergent developments that are indicators of the growth of the visible hand. The anarchical elements of academic organization remain strong and continue to resist efforts at managerial consolidation. Nevertheless, those forces of organizational consolidation continue to press forward in their quests.

The Structure of Systematic Mediation

In their discussion of the arts and sciences faculty in the American university, Parsons and Platt (1973:125) argue that three organizational models are not highly relevant because they fail to adequately address the fiduciary aspects of the academic system. Those three models are: the economic market with the faculty as producers and the students as consumers; the bureaucratic organization, with the trustees and top administrators as bosses, faculty as middle level and lower executives, and students as workers; and the democratic association where all involved are in principle equal participants. The rise of systematic mediation in higher education is clearly related to the growth of each of these three models of social organization: the bureaucracy, the market, and the democratic
association. The bureaucratic character is suggested by the growth of systems of post-secondary education, ultimately accountable to the larger society through its elected and appointed representatives. The university as economic market is illustrated by the federal policy to promote the student as a consumer to attempt to assure responsive colleges and universities; it is also promoted by the policy of some coordinating boards to rely upon institutional competition to achieve selected educational goals and by the economic circumstances of a buyer's market. The principle of democratic association is indicated by the relatively egalitarian and participatory form the systematically mediated college or university will take. The principles of collective bargaining and collaborative planning reflect this character, as does the increased provision for the explicit and formalized protection of the rights of participants in university life. These three principles of social organization also correspond to three principles of accountability which become increasingly structured into the system of higher education: accountability to providers, the bureaucracy; accountability to consumers, the economic market; accountability to members, the democratic association.

A closer examination of the terms mediation and systematic can clarify several basic dimensions of this form of occupational control. Interestingly, in his later work, Johnson (1977) contends that the term heteronomy should replace mediation in his typology of occupational control in order to emphasize the imposed character of mediated control. The term mediation has been preserved in this study because this form of control does constitute a mediation of professional and client interests, though different interests of each party are preserved.
The systematically mediated synthesis attempts to preserve and protect the professionals' interest in professional competence, technique, and effectiveness; on the other hand, it does not preserve the professionals' interest in trust, privilege, immunity, and autonomy. The mediated synthesis attempts to preserve the interest of the client (both the student and the larger society) in effective and efficient service to client and social needs and goals; it does not preserve the student client's interest in direct control over the professional and in doing so recognizes the valid claims of other university clienteles. The organization, instead, becomes accountable through its mediating structures and processes to attempt to assure the effective and cost-effective service of the professional to the educational needs and goals of the society.

This systematic mediation represents the principle of organizational control over work—whether the organization be a university department, an individual college or university, or some larger organization of organizations, like a coordinating commission for higher education. This agency of mediation legitimates itself not merely through formal authority or political legitimacy; rather it combines both formal and a functional authority, based on its alleged ability to rationalize complex resources to better be responsive to social and client goals. Such a use of scientific organizational methods, modern principles of management, makes systematic mediation a different type of mediation than the mediation of some formally powerful figures whose formal authority allows them to make capricious decisions.
The systematic mediation of professional power, it must be re-emphasized, must not be confused with bureaucratic forms of coordinating work. Those various non-bureaucratic forms of coordinating work that Heydebrand (1973) describes—like incentive structures and participatory management structures—also represent processes of organizational consolidation that mediate professional power. For example, the increasing use of the budget as a systematic management tool can be viewed as a non-bureaucratic form of coordinating work. The importance of these non-bureaucratic forms of coordination can be seen in their centrality in the Higher Education Management Institute (HEMI) management development and training program, which is based on an extensive review of current management theory. This management theory stresses that successful managed companies tend to be characterized by such factors as open communication, good team work, and considerable worker participation (Webster, 1979:244). These principles of management can be viewed as part of the attempt to mobilize all of the professionals' strength toward the organizational goals and to promote the legitimation of the managerial authority by allowing for "professional" input into the decision-making process. This then requires the faculty member to become much more of an organization man, as faculty members join with others in the institution in becoming co-managers, with all the responsibilities that entails.

Systematic mediation also entails an increasing integration of institutional and larger social goals, as is suggested by the nature of the mediated synthesis. In two remarkably prescient articles on the university and the governmental-political, Waldo (1969, 1970)
argued that the American university from its beginnings had a more important governmental-political role than was customarily perceived, but that its governmental-political role was growing in importance and that current developments were pushing the university toward the center of political life. Waldo (1970:109) pointed out how universities were becoming more important both to governmental goals and to personal goals, and with this importance would come an increased political regulation of university affairs. The growth of systematic mediation in higher education does entail an increased de-differentiation of higher education from the governmental-political, despite Parsons' (1968a:178) claims that the health of the academic system rests upon a clear differentiation. Universities lose their preferred positions in relations with the government and must share the burdens other enterprises bear in an increasingly regulated society (Rosenzweig, 1978:29). Goodfriend (1973:4) and Mortimer and McConnell (1978:4) point to the increasing likeness of higher education to the status of public utility. Hartle (1977:201) argues that higher education is beginning to take on characteristics of an industry and of a collectivity for social goals by the government.

In his review of the character of state mediation, Johnson (1972) points to the affinity of mediation with a social service orientation, which contrasts with the personal service orientation of traditional professionalism. Under systematic mediation in higher education, the organization increasingly mediates the orientation of the professional to the student client, in contrast to collegiate control where only the profession itself could play such a mediating role. With this
systematic mediation of professional power, service to the student-client may be individualized, tailored to certain aspects of different types of students like their relative speed at certain tasks. However, professional service will not be personalized, geared to the unique student self, or constitute some sacred teacher-student relationship. The requirement of systematic mediation is competent professional practice to maximize the greatest "value" for the greatest number.

The following three sections clarify, through the identification and description of examples of structural indicators of mediation, the qualitative dimensions of change entailed by the emergence of systematic mediation in American higher education. These structural indicators of mediation all relate to governmental and organizational policies with implications for academic policy. These sections identify and clarify the new roles and structures, changes in roles and structures, and the changing relationships between roles and structures, which are the structural indicators of the emergence of systematic mediation in American higher education. In the sections on interorganizational and organizational mediation, the ramifications of these changes for program, personnel, and educational policy are clarified. The section on curriculum constitutes a more hypothetical or speculative consideration of the potential significance of these developments for current and future changes in the curriculum.
Interorganizational Mediation in Higher Education

Introduction

The systematic mediation of professional power through interorganizational process occurs principally through the impact of policies of federal and state governmental agencies. The policies of multi-campus systems of governance have also been included, since in several respects they parallel the policies of state coordinating agencies for higher education. The policies and practices discussed in this section include specific laws, executive orders, or regulations, like those dealing with affirmative action or consumer protection, and more general policies that evolve out of normal budgetary processes in state government. Included as systematic mediators of higher education are: selected federal agencies; the courts; executive budget agencies; state legislative auditing agencies; coordinating commissions for higher education; and multi-campus systems of university governance.

The structural indicators of mediation clarified in this section principally address professional goals or the needs of clients rather than professional technique or manner directly. For example, program policies attempt to integrate data on efficiency and effectiveness into the state budgetary process. The federal government's promotion of consumer protection seeks to strengthen client-centered goals in higher education. Affirmative action policies represent an attempt to implement the social goal of employment equity into the personnel practices of colleges and universities. But the interdependence of
of goals and techniques is also illustrated in these developments. The best example is affirmative action where the thrust of guidelines is to substantially formalize faculty personnel practices and thereby shape the manner in which professionals evaluate their peers. A closer examination of the eventual effects of other policies would also indicate at least indirect effects on professional manner or technique.

Program Policies

The systematic mediation of professional power through program policies is illustrated in the emergence of state-level policies variously called program review, program audit, program evaluation, performance audit, or performance budgeting. Regardless of the terminology, the intent is the same: to assess program performance in terms of results or impact (Mickel, 1976:5-6). Quality, cost, or productivity, or some combination of these, is typically the focus of program review (Groves, 1979:1). This requires the collection and summary of quantitative and/or qualitative data about the performance of those programs to make such judgments possible. Statewide planners and decision-makers for higher education have become increasingly concerned with such program review efforts, in higher education and in other fields, as limited resources and competing demands make it necessary to consider program cutbacks or terminations to fund program additions (Southern Regional Education Board, 1977:2). Coordinating agencies for higher education have made slow but steady progress into the program review process (Glenny, 1976:148).
By 1975, there were 19 state level governing boards, all of which had program review authority; there were also 28 coordinating agencies, of which 20 had authority to review programs and eight others had authority to recommend program approval (Barak, 1977:76). The functions of coordination have changed with the onset of financial austerity. The allocation of expanding resources is supplanted by the necessity for trade-offs in distributing scarce resources between institutions (Glenny, 1976:148; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978:218).

The focus then shifts to the review of current programs and their worth and priority relative to programs in other state institutions and to proposed programs (Glenny, 1976:148).

Barak's (1977) study of coordinating agency reviews reveals the nature of coordinating board involvement in this review process. These reviews are primarily intended to assess the relative efficiency or effectiveness of programs at one institution vis-a-vis programs at other institutions of post-secondary education (Barak, 1977:70). Criteria for program review include: "productivity (such as the number of graduates per program over a given period of time); program costs; the need for the program, which is frequently based on manpower needs; and program quality, as judged by peer consultants and certain combinations of other indicators" (Barak, 1977:70). These reviews vary in their sources of information used. For example, the reliance on self-reviews, outside reviews, or reviews by agency staff varies from state to state (Barak, 1977:71). The process of review generally consists of a screening stage to identify questionable programs according to some predetermined criteria and then a more intensive
examination of those questionable programs (Barak, 1977:74). Several decisions, based partially on the power of the coordinating boards, may be made, including probation, termination, or cutback (Barak, 1977). The Education Commission for the States and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) have been involved in developing criteria and measures for such statewide program review (Glenny, 1976:148).

Barak (1977) describes several examples of coordinating agency reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs and introduces case studies of New York's review of doctoral programs and of Florida's program review system. He also points to program review in several other states, including a review mechanism by the West Virginia Board of Regents, which required institutions to make forced ratings of their programs on criteria related to costs, outcomes, priorities, and program quality (Barak, 1977). Buchanan, Fancher, and Fuldauer (1978) describe a Tennessee coordinating agency review of low-producing degree programs which resulted in the consolidation of 10 programs and the termination of five others. Finally, Katz (1978) reports on a new system of accountability for higher education being implemented through the New Jersey Department of Higher Education, which would include consideration of fiscal accountability, academic quality, and institutional responsiveness to state higher education policy.

A second structural indicator of the mediation of program policy is illustrated in the examination by Peterson et al. (1977) of the emergence of performance budgeting in states, as it affects higher
education. Performance budgeting, which first emerged as a concept on the federal scene in 1912 with a recommendation of the Taft Commission, "is a budgetary structure that focuses on activities or functions (program structures) which produce results (outcomes or impacts) and for which resources (inputs) are used and a budgetary process that attempts to allocate resources on the basis of anticipated or past results" (Peterson et al., 1977:2). Performance budgeting attempts to be both a cost-accounting system and a results-oriented decision-making or resource allocation approach (Peterson, 1977:21). According to Peterson et al., (1977:4), the controversial character of performance budgeting is related to the current emphasis on qualitative as well as quantitative measures of results and to the attempt to allocate resources on the basis of outcome measures.

A survey of higher education agencies in 1976 indicated "embryonic developments" toward a performance budgeting structure in several states, although only six (Washington, Hawaii, Michigan, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Tennessee) cited an explicit collection and reporting of outcome measures in the process of budget preparation and review (Peterson et al., 1977:3-4). Ten other states reported attempts to use performance measures in the preparation of the state budget (Peterson et al., 1977:3-4). Peterson et al. (1977) give special attention to the uneven and troubled attempts of two states, Hawaii and Washington, to implement such a system in public higher education with the resistance this generated within the state universities. Frey's (1977) sociological study of state-university relationships in Washington also notes the potential significance of the
emergence of performance budgeting. Overall, Peterson et al. (1977) note that, despite attempts to use qualitative measures (e.g., level of academic performance) in the budgetary process, quantitative measures, such as degrees awarded, are much more commonly used, partially owing to the fact that qualitative measures are more controversial and threatening to institutions of higher education.

A third structural indicator of mediation related to program policies is indicated by the state-level movement toward legislative program evaluation. Chadwin (1975) notes that while no state legislature had a full-time staff responsible for program evaluation in 1970, over a dozen such bodies—committees, commissions, auditor's offices, etc.—had appeared by 1975 with no sign of let-up in growth. A national group of staff members concerned about such legislative program evaluation has been formed and has become a section of the National Conference of State Legislatures (Berdahl, 1977:36-37). The significance of this movement is in its concern to go beyond the traditional post-audit concerns with legality and efficiency and to raise questions about program effectiveness (Berdahl, 1977:36-37). Berdahl (1977:38) notes that of the first 150 such studies in twenty states, twenty looked at some part of higher education. He notes the significance of the conflict between traditional conceptions of higher education's differentness and the legislative efforts to increase state-level accountability of higher education (Berdahl, 1977).

Berdahl (1977) discusses as an illustration of a legislative program evaluation a relatively aborted attempt to implement such an evaluation of the University of Wisconsin system. Interestingly, one of those
institutions expressed willingness to cooperate in the study, as its own objectives-oriented management style complemented the orientation of legislative program evaluation (Berdahl, 1977:49). Overall, the universities in the system resisted (Berdahl, 1977). Few of the other legislative evaluation studies of higher education conducted thus far seem to have attempted to genuinely evaluate academic programs and most have had a limited focus (Berdahl, 1977:38). Nevertheless Berdahl (1977:38) suggests such efforts have a larger meaning as warnings about potential legislative intrusions, if institutions fail to provide relevant and useful program data to state agencies for use in their decision-making processes.

On the multi-campus level of university governance, Lee and Bowen (1975) note a similar increased interest in program review efforts. They find that an increased intensity in program review in eight of the nine systems is directly attributable to fiscal stringency, declining enrollment growth, or to both (Lee and Bowen, 1975:39). With limited resources, the review of both proposed and existing programs becomes central to multicampus governance, as new programs can only be added at the expense of existing activities (Lee and Bowen, 1975:36). This results in a closer integration of academic planning with the resource allocation process. Lee and Bowen (1975:137) note the continuing centrality of enrollment as a central criteria in the resource allocation process.

This growing importance of interorganizational program review process is, of course, an emergent development, and caution must be expressed about overstating or overemphasizing its current impact.
However, these indicators, taken together, reveal the growing determination to integrate program information—whether quantitative or qualitative—into the budgetary or resource allocation process in state government, so that larger state interests in program effectiveness and efficiency are recognized. This movement can be viewed as a stimulant to individual institutions to put their own houses in order to forestall interventions by state agencies. The greater significance of these developments may be in their impact on organizational processes of mediation considered in the following section.

Personnel Policy

The most important developments outside the university mediating institutional personnel policies have been the extensive federal and state laws extending equality of employment opportunity and prohibiting employment discrimination on the basis of race, religion, national origin, and sex. The relevant federal laws and regulations include, but are not limited to, Executive Order 11246 of 1965, subsequently amended in 1968 by Executive order 11375, prohibiting government contractors (e.g., colleges and universities with government contracts in excess of $10,000) from discriminating in employment against any employee based on race, color, religion, national origin, or sex; and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans discrimination in employment opportunity and covers all educational institutions with fifteen or more employees (Fishbein, 1975). Also, most states and many local governments and municipalities have similar laws, statutes, or ordinances (Fishbein, 1975).
Of all laws and regulations affecting the university, Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375, has had the greatest and broadest impact on university life (Solomon, 1977:271). These orders require "the collection of data on all employees, utilization analysis, projection of goals and timetables for hiring members of minority groups and women, and the development of systems to monitor hiring procedures and practices (Solomon, 1977:271). This requirement of affirmative action, along with the other numerous laws, statutes, and regulations, makes it increasingly necessary to justify academic personnel policies to nonacademicians (Fishbein, 1975). They also have the effect of greatly increasing the importance of legal counsel in institutional decision-making (Fishbein, 1975:3). The demand for equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, whose institutional impact will be briefly discussed further in the following section, represents a challenge to the autonomy and trust of the academic profession in its personnel practices and introduces a required accountability of the university organization to attempt to implement the social goal of equity in its personnel policies and practices.

This imposing legal environment of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, not to mention collective bargaining, suggests that the more informal means of assessing faculty performance have become and will continue to be "impractical, unfeasible, and illegal" (Holley and Field, 1977:428). More formalized systems will be required. In analyzing the legal and regulatory literature for guidelines to the development and use of performance evaluation
systems in education, Holley and Feild (1977:447-448) draw a number of recommendations, including a first recommendation that "the performance evaluation method should be shown to be job-related through content and/or empirical validation procedures." This would suggest legal pressure on an institution of higher education to develop technically adequate performance evaluation measures for personnel decision-making based on institutional and program missions and on the actual responsibilities of the faculty member. For example, the primary use of research criteria in evaluating a faculty member whose principal institutional responsibility is undergraduate teaching may be seen as a potentially discriminatory use of a performance evaluation system. Were such a legal ruling to be made, this would push the university toward the development of formal performance evaluation systems more consonant with the tasks that faculty members actually perform.

A final and related structural indicator of mediation is illustrated in the federal and state interest in faculty development efforts. The Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), through its National Project for Elevating the Importance of Teaching, has supported faculty development programs to strengthen commitment to the teaching function (Gaff, 1975b). Thorne (1976) describes one such project which examined factors influencing tenure and promotion in institutions within the Oregon state system of higher education. One principal finding of the study was that many faculty did not consider that teaching was an important criterion in tenure and promotions decisions in those institutions where teaching was the
primary mission (Thorne, 1976). This research gave impetus to the development of new incentive structures within the Oregon state system of higher education to improve the quality of instruction (Thorne, 1976). This would suggest a larger state and federal interest in integrating institutional missions and faculty reward structures. Several, though far less than most, of the faculty and staff development programs described in a recent directory of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) were given their impetus by state higher education system offices (Resource Center for Planned Change, 1976a).

Educational Policy

The emergence of interorganizational systematic mediation of educational policy is illustrated in two actual developments and one prospective development with the potential for far-ranging consequences. Perhaps the most important development is the impetus given to the student consumer movement by the federal government. Over the last fifteen years, the federal government's policy toward higher education has shifted away from institutional aid and aid to categorical programs toward financial aid to students, who may attend the "post-secondary" institution of their choice (Glenny, 1973:6; Davidson and Stark, 1976:10). For example, increased support for students accounted for almost $6 billion of the $7 billion added to the federal higher education budget between fiscal 1968 and 1977, and student aid rose from 33% to 62% as a percent of federal outlays (Finn, 1978:11). This federal turn toward student assistance is
illustrated in such programs as the National Defense Education Loan program, the Equal Opportunity Grants, and the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. With this shift toward student financial assistance has come a philosophical shift toward a conception of higher education "as a service industry responding to a student-demand market" (Davidson and Stark, 1976:10). As Willett (1975:167) points out, the student is defined by the federal government as a direct consumer of educational services and, following from this, educational abuse (of student consumer rights) becomes viewed as a responsibility of the federal government and its various agencies.

This federal effort toward advancing and protecting student consumer rights has been sporadic, diverse, and uncoordinated at the federal level, as the responsibility for consumer protection has been fragmented among several agencies (Stark, 1976a). Most of the federal activity has taken a broad regulatory approach toward consumer protection and three distinct objectives underlie at least some of these regulations: protection of the student from specific abuse; promotion of better student selection among educational options and institutions; and assurances about adequate program quality (El-Khawas, 1976:36-37). El-Khawas (1977b:173) suggests that the two principal issues of consumer rights are (1) effective communication of information on relevant aspects of institutional policy and practice and (2) fair practices toward students. These objectives and issues have, of course, been addressed in regulations affecting these loan programs. The Guaranteed Student Loan program now requires the institution to provide accurate information to the prospective student on the current academic or
training programs in which he or she has an interest, which is to include, for programs preparing students for a particular vocation or career field, placement statistics for those graduates (Davidson and Stark, 1976:11). A section of the Education Amendments of 1976 requires institutional disclosure of twelve items, including data regarding student retention rates at the institution (El-Khawas, 1977b:175). Furthermore, the Education Amendments require increased research into improving consumer responsiveness, and several research and development efforts are under way to seek the best ways to present and to supplement information that students are now entitled to receive from institutions under the law. Current campus demonstration projects to advance these objectives include:

- provision of current regional and national information on jobs for college graduates by career fields; projections of actual educational costs; full disclosure of student attrition and retention rates; developing a profile of successful students at the institution; soliciting current student and faculty perceptions of the quality of campus learning process; conducting surveys of the careers and achievements of alumni; using national survey data to comparatively describe campus environments. (Hoy, 1977:183)

In addition, the concept of educational auditing is being explored to assure that institutions provide accurate information to prospective students (Stark, 1976b:69).

This government sponsorship of student consumer protection is, like other policies described in this section, still working itself out. Nevertheless, these policies do promote an accountability to consumers, associated with the economic market, by pushing the institution to greater responsiveness to student-defined needs in their programming and policies. These regulations also push toward the
development of more comprehensive information systems by institutions with their potential for use in institutional decision-making. The provision for student receipt of information on retention and placement rates and the potential dissemination of products of the current demonstration projects are especially significant. While the long range results are unclear, it can be expected that such developments would promote a responsiveness of institutions in goals and practices that the student, rather than the collegial profession, considers central.

A prospective development affecting educational policy follows this logic of consumerism. Bonham (1976) and Barnes (1978) suggest that the issue of professional malpractice may soon spill over from medicine and the law to the academic profession. Out of the fledgling student consumer movement have already come several lawsuits against university teachers, administrators, presidents, and trustees that can be considered issues of academic malpractice (Barnes, 1978:10). At least two of those have dealt with the issue of quality of academic programming (Barnes, 1978). Such suits have generally not been successful, both because no legal definition of academic malpractice has yet to be accepted and because of the courts' reluctance to intrude into university affairs (Barnes, 1978). However, there are no assurances that such developments will not emerge in the future.

The potential significance of such an acceptance of the concept of academic malpractice is suggested in the legal status of the faculty. Since, by law, a faculty member may be considered an employee of the institution for which he or she works, the legal doctrine of
respondeat superior might well lead the courts to find the employer ultimately responsible for the sins of the employee (Barnes, 1978:11). Such an interpretation could force administrators to become increasingly aware of what their faculty are doing and promote a greater organizational responsibility for the learning that occurs within a higher education institution.

A third and final structural indicator of the emergence of interorganizational mediation over academic policy is illustrated by the continuing state-level concern for equality of educational opportunity and especially for the special educational needs of minorities and other disadvantaged students. This has resulted in many special programs for such students, funded either through an institution's general fund resources or through categorical federal or state support for such programming to promote educational equity. Such programming, in the context of the state-level concern with equality of opportunity, illustrates the introduction of larger social policy objectives into the operation of public institutions of higher education.

Conclusion

These structural indicators of systematic mediation, taken singly, might not seem worthy of special attention. But taken together, they reveal the powerful density of the environment of current institutions of higher education, especially public institutions. Each of these structural indicators represents a principle of accountability which higher education is increasingly expected to respect: an accountability to providers, especially through program policies; an accountability
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to members, especially through personnel policies; and an accountabil-
ity to consumers, especially through educational policies. These
developments promise to continue to emerge and to provide a powerful
context for the operation of institutions of higher education

Organizational Mediation in Higher Education

Introduction

The systematic mediation of professional power through organiza-
tional process occurs in the context of this interorganizational sys-
tematic mediation of professional power. The organizational planning of
program, personnel, and educational policy that constitutes systematic
mediation is constrained both by that political and legal context of the
larger environment and by internal agreements (and policies--tenure pro-
visions, collective bargaining agreements,) etc.--which are legally san­
tioned by that larger environment. Such constraints serve both to re­
strain the policy power of the academic administrator and to strengthen
the imperative to plan to ensure the survival and viability of the or­
ganization and its autonomy from its environment. This context makes
the playfulness and foolishness that Cohen and March (1974) recommend
something less than wise, or even acceptable, institutional policy.

A complete account of systematic mediation on this institutional
or organizational level would require an additional analysis of the
impact of these same forces on the research or science role, as well
as the teaching role in colleges and universities. This complete ac­
count is beyond the scope of this study. The multiple goals (teaching,
science, etc.) of higher education, and especially the relative importance
of the research role, can be viewed as a buffer to the systematic mediation of the professional power of the university teacher. However, this same systematic mediation will result in a greater scrutiny of the extent and nature of graduate training and research within the context of the larger goals of the society.

The following discussion focuses on the emergence of structural indicators of mediation of professional power through organizational process that impact on program, personnel, and educational policy. The principal focus, as in the previous section, is on the mediation of goals rather than professional technique. But again that interdependence of goals or needs and manner or technique makes systematic mediation a force that eventually impacts both professional goals and techniques.

**Program Policy**

The systematic mediation of professional power through program policy occurs through various institutional policies that attempt to more systematically allocate resources to achieve institutional or organizational goals or objectives. Fundamental to this task in the steady state is the gathering of relevant data or information, the setting of priorities, and the assignment of resources (Hanson, 1976: 25). In this steady state, the self-renewal of the organization can no longer rely upon growth, but must rely instead upon the substitution and reallocation of existing resources. This requires the gathering of information, quantitative and qualitative, to justify those shifts. A study by Bowen and Glenny (1976) of institutional criteria
for allocating resources under budget reductions found that the first round of reductions tends to be absorbed in across the board cuts, but later decreases force institutions to define program priorities and to make cuts in those programs that are less supportive of an institution's core mission. Glenny (1976:31) notes that this has resulted in some state budget offices, who have pressed for institutions to move toward a program budgeting format, finding that higher educational institutions are running ahead of them. Much of the impetus for this program planning movement has come from such outside agencies. Groves (1979:1) notes the external stimulus for institutional program review from governing boards, coordinating boards, budget bureaus, and legislative staffs. Multicampus systems of higher education generally encourage individual campuses to review all graduate programs on a five year cycle, though the extent to which these systems generally encourage or monitor campus-based program review varies substantially (Lee and Bowen, 1975). The report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1975:82-110) on more than survival has also given substantial impetus to institutional program planning and review efforts. Finally, the recent decision by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to emphasize strategic planning illustrates its push for program planning to move beyond quantitative concerns to stress the quality of academic programming in the light of market trends (Jacobson, 1980).

The extent of the implementation of various program budget and program review practices cannot be documented at this time, though an analysis of the literature would suggest the increasing acceptance
of these practices. In his examination of program review in the Illinois public system of higher education, Groves (1979:8) stresses that routine cyclical reviews of academic programs are a "recognized campus function" to maintain program quality and currency and to facilitate the orderly development of new programming. In their study of current changes in higher education, Glenny et.al. (1976:30) find that program evaluation is the only institutional area where institutions anticipate a greater increase in personnel in the next six years (for that study, 1974 to 1980) than was experienced over the previous six years (1968 to 1974). Sixty-eight percent of the institutions responding to this study anticipated extensive change in program evaluation techniques from 1974 to 1980, as compared to the 27% who recorded having experienced extensive change from 1968 to 1974. Furthermore, Glenny et. al. (1976:31) find a much greater proportion of public institutions than private institutions expecting to add personnel in this area, with only 6% of private research universities expecting an increase. An American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) directory of ongoing program evaluation processes (defined as "organized and continuing efforts of an institution to examine the several dimensions of its educational program for purposes of improving it") lists 40 programs in 21 states with most of those in operation for four years or less and almost all less than seven years old at the time of this study (Resource Center for Planned Change, 1976b). This AASCU directory does not include accreditation studies or reviews imposed by outside agencies.

Reflecting this increasing institutional interest is the beginning
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of a literature on program review processes, though there is still little guidance in the form of criteria or guidelines for successful program review efforts. For example, Dressel and Simon (1976) describe a systematic model for resource allocation that involves systematic program review on an ongoing basis. Recent articles in the establishment journals of higher education by Davis and Dougherty (1979), Shirley and Volkwein (1978), Cranton and Legge (1978), and Arns and Poland (1980) illustrate this emerging concern, with three of those articles reporting experiences with program review efforts by public institutions. Groves (1979:8) notes the growing recognition that program reviews are less likely to serve the spectacular purposes some attribute to them, but are well suited to orderly improvement in program planning and development. Kelley and Rodriguez (1977:108) note the increased demands by faculty to participate in program planning and evaluation processes.

Two general approaches or strategies toward more systematic resource allocation policies to programs can be identified. The first approach represents the more common attempt to reallocate institutional resources based on shifts in enrollment. Thus the credit hour—a strictly quantitative criterion—becomes the criterion used to measure the amount of instruction given to students. This use of the credit hour reflects the relatively little progress in developing a technology for quantifying outputs of educational effectiveness (Sandin, 1977:22). This instructional policy of allowing students to vote with their feet increases the motivation of departments to adopt policies to maximize departmental enrollments, including such
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policies as the addition of courses attractive to students and the elimination of courses which generate few student credit hours (Tierney, 1977:219-220). Thus the curriculum is made more responsive to the mass of students, though increasingly those students attracted to programs with less mass popularity find their programs and courses threatened by low enrollment. This illustrates the social service orientation that is central to the systematic mediation of professional power.

The second approach, which can be expected to be increasingly important in the future, is a more thorough program review or evaluation process, which demands increased participation by university members. Program review, in this second sense, advances a more multifaceted examination of academic programs and program performance on the basis of which allocation decisions for scarce resources can be made. Such policies can be seen as responses to the increased demand for faculty input into program planning cited by Kelley and Rodriguez (1977: 108) and Freeman (1977). The program review model used at the University of Vermont and described by Arns and Poland (1980) illustrates this second type of process, which seeks improved value and quality as well as the effective use of resources. Such program review efforts are consistent with the model of strategic planning which has been recently stressed by NCHEMS and also consistent with the Higher Education Management Institute (HEMI) model of management development discussed in an earlier section.

This second type of program review process can be said to have several important purposes and meanings. On the one hand, it makes
possible a more orderly claim by departments and programs for continued or increased shares of institutional resources. At the same time, it promotes a closer examination of course offerings, duplication of courses, and potential collaboration with other programs and departments to more effectively and efficiently use scarce institutional resources. Furthermore, by providing a vehicle for faculty input into this program review process, this process serves to promote the legitimation or regularization of the otherwise arbitrary power of the university administration to allocate institutional resources. Such policies then support the development of a functional authority of the university administration.

While this second type of program review effort may increase faculty involvement in this planning process, the domination of program planning with considerations of the adequacy of resources also increases the power of the new cost controllers, budget forecasters, and other financial specialists who increasingly examine the financial feasibility of new or current programming (Baldridge et al., 1978:208). Thus the generation of institutional revenue becomes an increasingly important criterion in the program planning process, a criterion which the faculty as well, must heed. As Baldridge et al., (1978:208) point out, those other experts in the process of cutting, squeezing, trimming, and reducing also gain increased power and influence in program planning in this context of financial adversity.

This program review and resource reallocation process exists in a context of not only state agencies, but also private professional program accrediting agencies, which can be said to be interest groups.
for those programs. Increasingly, as the steady state makes itself felt, the relationships between colleges or universities and such accrediting agencies and states and those accrediting agencies cool. Meinert (1977:83) reports a cooling of relationships between several states and some private accrediting associations who are perceived as interested in neither institutional regulation nor consumer protection, but in the protection of occupational self-interest. Scully (1979) reports the increasing attacks on professional school accrediting agencies by institutional administrators for their efforts to force institutions to upgrade, or at least not cut back, professional programs in order to keep their accreditation. While these accrediting agencies continue to be effective advocates for their programs, it would follow from the central argument of this study that there will be increasing pressure to bring these private accrediting associations under some form of public accountability. These measures might be indirect, like differential tuition policies for high cost programs or the consumer policies identified in the previous section. However, the challenges to these accrediting agencies might also take the form of legal action to require such accrediting agencies to justify the criteria they use in accrediting professional programs or state-level action to eliminate or consolidate high-cost professional programs in one or more public institutions. Regardless, these accrediting agencies will not be exempted from accountability.

The program planning, review, and evaluation processes discussed above have the effect of making departmental and program information increasingly available for the use of administration and thus represent
that movement toward systematically integrating institutional policy objectives and resource allocation decisions that is at the heart of academic management. Such policies have the effect of asserting the larger organizational interests and objectives into the curricular decision-making process at the expense of departmental and faculty autonomy. These processes can be expected to spur the important institutional purposes of increased curricular planning, the identification of duplication, and increased collaboration between programs and departments for the shared purposes of the organization.

**Personnel Policy**

The systematic mediation of professional power through organizational personnel policy is illustrated in several developments at colleges and universities, public and private alike. Each of these developments signifies that personnel policy is more of an organization-level concern than was previously the case. This planning for the effective use of faculty personnel becomes a significant organizational concern, as reflected in affirmative action policy, faculty development strategies, and re-examined tenure policies.

Equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, as structural indicators of mediation, were discussed in the earlier section on interorganizational structural indicators of mediation. There it was pointed out that the thrust of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action is to introduce a required accountability on the organizational level to implement the value of equity in employment practice. Affirmative action following from Executive Orders 11246
and 11375, by requiring utilization analyses, goals, timetables, and monitoring systems, also spawns a vast new personnel management system, with new structures--like affirmative action coordinating committees--and new roles--like affirmative action officers--that promote a vastly increased personnel planning to implement those goals and timetables. This impetus to extensive personnel planning, made even more difficult by the steady state, is an important effect of affirmative action.

A second structural indicator of mediation of organizational personnel policy is exemplified in the emergence of various faculty development policies at colleges and universities. These new faculty renewal efforts result from several factors, including steady or declining enrollments which threaten to produce an immobile and unresponsive professoriate, the growing influx of new students in higher education for whom traditional instructional strategies may be unsuccessful, and increased demands for academic accountability (Yanikoski, 1977:602-603). As Gaff (1975b:173-174) points out, what is new about faculty development is that old forms of faculty development focusing on subject matter competence and on research are being supplemented by efforts to help teachers grow in their teaching roles. This emergent movement rests on three assumptions regarding teaching: that teaching is the principal activity of the faculty; that instructional competence is learned and not inborn; and that faculty can learn those skills, attitudes, and goals to improve their classroom performance (Seldin, 1976:10).

This faculty development effort takes on a number of forms in
individual institutions of higher education. Seldin (1976:10) contrasts four approaches to faculty development: (1) financial incentive programs; (2) lectures and discussion groups focussing on educational issues or common problems; (3) in-service courses and workshops for instructional improvement; and (4) feedback programs. Centra (1977:50-51) lists four categories of faculty development practices: (1) workshops, seminars, or other presentations; (2) analysis or assessment of instructors by students, colleagues, or others; (3) activity involving the increased use of audio-visual materials; and (4) institutionwide practices such as annual teaching awards or sabbaticals. Centra (1977:50-51) contends that perhaps half of all American post-secondary institutions have some type of program. Gaff (1975a:94-96) identifies three types of instructional development program based on their focus: instructional development, which focuses on student learning; faculty development, which focuses on faculty growth; and potentially the most important of all, organizational development, focusing on improving the organizational setting to promote value on instruction. These various efforts are accomplished through centers, divisions, offices, and programs, which vary from small-scale to large-scale efforts (Gaff, 1975b:73-74). However, most faculty development programs are relatively small scale underfunded efforts (Cross, 1977:2).

The impact at this time of this new movement to renew faculty in their teaching roles should not be exaggerated. As Seldin (1976:12) notes, most programs are modestly staffed and budgeted and most professors have not been sufficiently motivated to participate in
such efforts. Yanikoski (1977:604) notes that Gaff, a principal spokesman for the movement, "exudes a level of optimism", which needs to be tempered by a recognition of the level of faculty resistance to such faculty development efforts. Cross' (1977) study of attitudes of University of Nebraska faculty indicates considerable resistance to faculty development. Finally, a recent evaluation of twenty faculty development programs found those focusing on improving teaching techniques less successful than the more traditional research-centered programs (Jacobson, 1980). Nevertheless in the context of the student buyer's market and an increased budgetary pinch, as faculty are forced to pay more attention to students and as the staff of such faculty development programs show increased sophistication, a greater use and impact of these programs may be expected.

A third structural indicator of systematic mediation of organizational personnel policy is the increased institutional attention to tenure policies and the revision of those policies in light of the overall situation of the institution. In the early 1970s, the literature on higher education was alive with discussions, pro and con, of tenure itself. That that debate issued in no drastic change is partially related to the dual meaning of tenure. On the one hand, tenure is a form of job security comparable to that in other sectors of the society; on the other hand, tenure can be said to constitute a special privilege of the academic profession. It is unclear exactly what form tenure in colleges and universities will take in coming years, though its meaning as special privilege can be expected to decline and its meaning as job security can be expected to be
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strengthened. Institutional policies have already reflected the current fiscal situations of colleges and universities, which has made tenure not just a departmental issue of faculty competence but an organizational issue contingent on the availability of future institutional resources. Probably future staff reductions will sidestep the issue of tenure directly and use program reductions to justify staff reductions that might otherwise necessitate a more direct confrontation with the tenure system.

The thrust of these developments in faculty personnel planning is the increasing recognition that personnel policy is an institutional issue, bearing on the survival and prosperity of the organization. Thus the larger accountability of the organization requires that personnel policy and practices not be left alone to work themselves out, but must increasingly become the subject of attention and of conscious policy efforts. Clearly such a development challenges the autonomy of the collegial faculty in its personnel decisions.

Educational Policy

There is little documentation of the extent of changes in educational policy in American higher education which would constitute structural indicators of systematic mediation. Examples of such changes would include new policies reflecting increased attention to such issues as student retention, grading, admissions, and student grievance procedures. For example, in the context of the steady state, problems in retaining students become an organizational problem, not just a student or program problem, and can be expected to
stimulate the consideration and implementation of organizational policies to address the issue. In the context of stable or declining enrollments, admissions policies become even more of an organizational problem than they have been and increased consideration is given to alternative scenarios based on alternative admissions policies. In an era of increased program competition for students, the issue of grade inflation can be expected to stimulate the consideration of organizational policies to mediate between programs in their competition for students and to preserve a credible degree to outside constituencies. Finally, the introduction of new roles, like the ombudsman, or new structures, like Pittsburgh's model grievance structure (El-Khawas, 1977b:177), represent structural indicators of mediation of educational policy, as those roles or structures mediate the claims of faculty and students.

Conclusion

The systematic mediation of professional power through organizational process reveals the changing nature of university organization, as an increasing number of educational issues become organizational issues, not issues to be left to chance or to individual professional judgment. Thus, program, personnel, and educational policies increasingly are viewed as institutional concerns with the development of new structures and roles to attend to those policies. Faculty can be expected, at least at many institutions, to be encouraged to participate in such organizational planning efforts as co-managers in addressing these issues in the context of a turbulent and uncertain
environment. However, in so participating, faculty will be drawn to recognize those same realities of finances and environment that the institutional manager must daily face.

Systematic Mediation and the Curriculum

The analysis of interorganizational and organizational structural indicators of mediation has focused on their emergent impact on program, personnel, and educational policy. While these structural indicators suggest changes in curriculum, that impact has not yet been directly explored. From the perspective of this study, systematic mediation in higher education should promote the development of client-centered educational goals and a client-centered curriculum. Millett (1973:44-45) contrasts two emphases or perspectives, the academic and the career, that have a long history of conflict in American higher education. The academic perspective encompasses two ethical commitments of curriculum, knowledge for its own sake and development of the cultivated or Renaissance man, while the career perspective promotes the principal commitment to knowledge as a social utility and as a practical means to social progress. Systematic mediation gives strength to the career perspective, and the accompanying commitment to professional education, at the expense of the academic perspective and its commitments.

In 1968, Jencks and Riesman devoted part of their classic text on the academic revolution to the emergent triumph of the academic perspective in higher education, a triumph which embodied a commitment
to the development of scholarship and knowledge for its own sake. While noting the pre-eminence of that pedagogical standard, Jencks and Riesman (1968:196) also stressed that only a hundred or so of the most distinguished colleges and universities actively conformed to that standard in performance. However, they suggested that the institutional goals of higher education increasingly accommodated faculty professional goals (Jencks and Riesman, 1968). Hefferlin (1969:63) notes that the dominant trend in curricular development between 1962 and 1967 was "away from service and away from the consideration of the significance, function, and utility of the disciplines" and "toward the analysis of disciplinary issues for their own sake." Gross and Grambsch (1974) identify the dominance of this commitment to the professional ideology in their research on university goals. Blank (1978:23) points out how these developments issued in a "professionalization" model for explaining teaching goals, focusing on the faculty member's association with the academic professional community.

This discipline-centered perspective on the curriculum, with the graduate and professional schools as the most significant public, is challenged with the growing influence of other external groups on the curriculum. Van Geel (1978) and Wise (1979) note a striking centralization of the curriculum of the public elementary and secondary schools, as curriculum and education are more and more determined by the states, the federal government, and by the courts, rather than by the public schools themselves. According to Wise (1979:193), this centralization and "hyperrationalization" tend to reinforce narrowly
utilitarian and instrumental goals. Wise (1979:187) argues that the same processes of "legislated learning" and "the bureaucratization of the curriculum" that he identifies on the level of public elementary and secondary education are in operation "with potent effect on the system of higher education" as well. Nevertheless, higher education has so far been able to escape the efforts to "tighten the relationship" between means and ends that have characterized changes in public education (Wise, 1979:195). Mayville (1980) also analyzes the federal influence on the curriculum and on educational goals in its pursuit of social and political prerogatives and notes its advancement of vocational goals at the expense of the more traditional humanistic goals of the university. In its analysis of the curriculum, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1977) finds those effects of external agents on curriculum so pervasive that it devotes an entire chapter to external forces and the curriculum, with those forces including professional and occupational groups, governmental and accrediting agencies, employers, and the communications media (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977:63). Olscamp, the president of a state college, finds those governmental intrusions so threatening that he sees emerging "the battle of the century, and perhaps longer" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977:49) over control of the curriculum between colleges and the governmental agencies that endeavor to regulate them.

This impact of external forces on curriculum reinforces an already increasing consumer responsiveness of the curriculum, brought on largely by the "buyer's market". In their analysis of pedagogical
goals in education, Liebert and Bayer (1975) note the emergence of a client-oriented perspective on curriculum to challenge the ascendent disciplinary or scholarly perspective. In its study of the curriculum, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1977:4) points out that the curriculum is "more strongly oriented than ever before toward the consumer" in its offerings and in the flexibility allowed. Manns and March (1978) find that, even at an elite private institution like Stanford, the response to relative financial adversity has been to be more responsive to the consumer by, among other practices, making courses more accessible and providing more attractive packaging for courses.

Nevertheless, the resistance of the collegial professional to these developments has been considerable, and an unbiased assessment would undoubtedly find that the movement toward a systematically mediated curriculum has been more marked by impulses, tendencies, and the foot-dragging of academics than by clearly-defined progress. The themes discussed below as emergent developments in curriculum are more hypothetical than the developments cited in previous discussion. The identification of themes is meant to indicate in what directions systematic mediation will push the curriculum. Some of these directions—toward more pre-professional education—can be well documented. Others represent impulses or tendencies which have not yet crystallized as emergent trends. The discussion then represents a more speculative consideration of the prospective impact of systematic mediation on the university and college curriculum.

First, systematic mediation will bring a greater attention to the
outcomes of higher education. This attention to clear-cut statements of outcomes is one of the core characteristics of instructional improvement or development practices (Schalock, 1976:34-35). The increased specification of outcomes on the instructional level represents a working out of that assumption or principle of university management that goals and objectives can be identified and agreed upon. The advice given by Richman and Farmer (1974) to college managers to operationalize their goal systems illustrates this management imperative. The NCHEMS inventory of educational outcomes represents an attempt to stimulate that examination of outcomes from the management service industry. Finally, one of the principal influences of the competence-based education movement in education has been to stimulate the examination of outcomes of education (Gamson, 1979). However, this argument that educational outcomes will be increasingly specified should not obscure the immense difficulty of the task of agreeing upon and assessing instructional outcomes.

Forces that encourage this increased attention to outcomes are illustrated in earlier discussions of structural indicators of mediation. For example, in the context of state-level performance budgeting, the demonstration of "value-added" through a college education by a college or university represents an institution's claim for a greater share of the state's educational resources, based on its greater accountability and productivity. Within the context of the program review process, the documentation of student learning outcomes by a department represents a claim for survival, for stable resources, or increased resources. Within the context of more formalized personnel
policies, the teacher's demonstration of increased student learning outcomes represents his or her claim for rewards from the organization commensurate with those successes. In order to successfully place its students by providing whatever competitive advantages it can give them, college and university departments and programs will be pushed to give evidence of the work-related outcomes and competences of their graduates. While these examples represent more indirect effects of policies, this specification of outcomes and policies may take on a more orderly or systematic development in the context of an institutional commitment to a management by objectives orientation.

The second prospective trend is toward focus on a particular type of outcome--the competence or competency. In the prologue of an extensive study of the competence-based education (CBE) movement, Grant (1979:6) defines CBE as:

a form of education that derives a curriculum from an analysis of a prospective or actual role in modern society and that attempts to certify student progress on the basis of demonstrated performance in some or all aspects of that role.

A movement toward competence-based education, as defined by Grant, represents the curricular corollary of the greater conscious articulation of higher education with other social, economic, and political institutions that systematic mediation represents. Systematic mediation should push toward such a client-centered curriculum based on prospective or actual roles, whether occupational or others such as the so-called life role competencies. Such a curriculum could recognize the relevance of both work and leisure competencies. Interestingly, competence-based education has been heavily promoted by the federal
government and especially by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-
secondary Education (FIPSE), which has had the promotion of CBE as one
of its principal missions (Wise, 1979:197).

One manifestation of this more general competency movement is the
vocational imperative in higher education. The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching (1977:6) study of undergraduate
enrollment found the surprising figure of 58% of undergraduates enrol-
led in professional school programs as compared to 8% for social
science and 5% for humanities. This pre-professional and vocational
orientation is promoted by a number of circumstances, including the
more career oriented student from a changing social and economic back-
ground (Wagner, 1976:540; Glenny et al., 1976:28); the federal support
for career education (Glenny et al., 1976:28; Wise, 1979:194); the
women's movement which has been oriented toward equal employment
opportunity for women (Glenny et al., 1976:28); the tightening job
market for college-trained manpower (Glenny et al., 1976:20; Millett,
1977b); the increasing competition of colleges and universities with
proprietary and industrial schools (Glenny, 1973:7; Yarmolinsky, 1976:
20); and the funding of "useful" programs by private foundations and
out that the greatest impact of this vocational movement may be indirect,
as more traditional departments vocationalize their courses to attract
students and maintain their current staff and programming.

As Gamson (1979:256) points out, thus far the competence-based
movement has not penetrated "the upper reaches of academe", such as
the research universities, the elite liberal arts colleges, and the
disciplinary associations. However, even there an increased orientation toward professional education can be expected, as students struggle for competitive advantage in getting into the graduate pre-professional program of their choice. Kaysen (1974:183-184) argues that the elite culture of American society--shared by leaders of business, government, the professions, and even many academics--is the culture of rational problem-solving by the application of organized knowledge. Kaysen (1974) argues for the redefinition of the primary purpose of elite college education around that elite culture. This orientation around the rational problem-solving of the professional would constitute the curricular parallel in the elite sector of the vocational imperative in the middle and lower echelons of higher education.

A third prospective trend is toward the greater consideration of cost-effectiveness in instruction and, a related development, the increased concern with the potential of instructional technology. The movement in this direction of increased concern for cost-effectiveness is now illustrated by developments like the Program Effectiveness and Related-Cost (PERC) framework, which tries to link program effectiveness and costs and which has been adapted for use by some institutions of higher education (Palola and Lehman, 1976:75). Schalock (1976) argues that the larger mood of accountability will push state legislators toward greater consideration of instructional cost-benefit analysis in analyzing government expenditures. Fincher (1975:499) points to the increased concern with developments in new technological educational delivery systems, which run full force into academic
traditions. The implications of such technological developments for cost-effectiveness in a labor-intensive field like education have only begun to be explored.

The prospective developments outlined above have effects not only on the content of the curriculum, but on the shape of the faculty teaching role. Based on the national study of competence-based education, Grant (1979) points out how competence-based education tends to create new duties for the classroom teacher, such as translating course goals into measurable outcomes, but it also fosters a more cooperative and collaborative relationship between faculty and students. Besides seeing that course goals are translated into measurable outcomes, the instructional accountability movement also comes to define the teacher role as one of managing the learning environment to facilitate the student's success in mastering those outcomes or competencies (Chronister, 1971:172). This makes the teacher more of an instructional manager or technician than in traditional conceptions of the faculty role. These changes in faculty role mark the routinization of the charismatic authority of the university teacher.

The larger implications of this prospective change in curriculum must also be examined. In his classic study of the Chinese literati, Weber notes how rational bureaucratic and patrimonial structures of domination tend to promote the contrasting educational ideals of the specialist and the cultivated type of man (Karabel and Halsey, 1977:67). This growth of this client-centered and competency-oriented curriculum reflects a further forward movement of that rational
bureaucratic society, as the humanist culture of universal man is further undermined. The acceptance of this new pedagogical ideal of specialist man by American youth is suggested by the findings of a recent survey of attitudes among college freshman that 74.8% consider "becoming an authority in their field" an objective the student considers essential or very important (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1978). The next highest objective draws almost 10% less assent (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1978). Thus cultural changes reinforce the emergent structural changes bringing systematic mediation to the fore.

Conclusion

The portrait of university organization that has emerged from this analysis of the structural indicators of mediation diverges from most previous conceptions of complex organization. The systematically mediated university is quite unlike the static rational bureaucracy, closed to its environment, which is caricatured in current textbooks. Likewise it is a far cry from the autonomous professional organization pictured by Parsons that is equally closed to its environment. Rather the organization is an active bureaucracy that is increasingly required to be innovative and responsive in the face of environmental pressure. The increasing interdependence of work in this emergent organization suggests Burns and Stalker's (1972) organic model or system of organization, which they contrast to the mechanistic system, a necessary condition of which is that the individual works on his own and is functionally isolated. However, private institutions
may more resemble Burns and Stalker's organic system with its shared values, relatively fluid character, and its greater reliance on the use of non-bureaucratic forms of coordination. On the other hand, public institutions—with rules and regulations coming down from "above" and emerging from the collective bargaining process as well—may take on certain characteristics of the more mechanistic system, despite this increasing level of occupational interdependence.

At the same time the systematic mediation of professional power is a concept that addresses themes and concerns prominent in classical sociological theory. For example, the systematic mediation of professional power can be viewed as an advanced form of that emerging organic solidarity which was the principal concern of Durkheim. In the context of Weber's work, the systematic mediation of professional power is an analytic ideal type of social organization that captures the central structural dimensions of change—the increasing formalization of rationality—more adequately than Weber's own ideal type of bureaucracy. From the perspective of a Marxian perspective, the systematic mediation of professional power represents the social structural outcome as a new form of capital, cultural capital, attacks the fetters on the "uneconomical" and "unproductive" structures of traditional bureaucracy and collegial profession. The concept of the systematic mediation of professional power also clarifies that bureaucratization of the professions and professionalization of the bureaucracies which was briefly discussed in Chapter II.

This emergent social organization, the systematic mediation of professional power, is Janus-faced both in its apparent meaning as a
social type of organization and in its significance for the professional worker. On the one hand, this emergent organization constitutes a new community of workers innovating together to more effectively and efficiently serve social needs. This community can be seen as the new structure of organic solidarity, promoting both moral integration and regulation, that Durkheim considered the prospective role of the occupational groups or associations.

On the other hand, in the context of scarce resources, this community is marked by pervasive struggles for resources to serve those needs and over which needs to serve. These struggles—between academic departments, programs, divisions, colleges, men and women, whites and minorities—continually challenge the integrative and regulative functions of the new community.

This systematic mediation of professional power also has an ambiguous meaning for individual workers. On the one hand, the organization encourages and supports the needs of professionals by supporting those projects to make them more technically effective professionals. Increasing professional effectiveness promotes increased organizational effectiveness. Planning and program review serve to assist professionals by allowing them to make a more visible and orderly claim on the resources of the organization to increase their professional effectiveness.

On the other hand, the organization, and the interorganizational network in which it is embedded, demand effectiveness and efficiency as part of the accountability function. Planning and review serve to identify duplication and promote the process of squeezing every last
ounce of productivity out of the professional workers. The professional workers are proletarianized. This emergent organization also further "disenchants" professional-client relationships, as the social service orientation of systematic mediation prevails over the personal service orientation of classical professionalism. In addition, as the analysis has made clear, systematic mediation foils the larger ambitions and horizons of the professional project.

There are, of course, strong conservative forces within institutions of higher education that, interpreting the rise of systematic mediation as proletarianization and frustration of the professional project, resist these developments. Ironically, one form this resistance takes, the collective organization of the faculty for bargaining, tends to strengthen and promote those very principles it resists. It may be that the resistance of the individual professor in his or her classroom best defends the anarchical element in university organization associated with collegial professionalism. But the forces of systematic mediation are also powerful, and the control over organizational resources, in the context of environmental turbulence, is a powerful tool for organizing the anarchy of university life.
In her analysis of the rise of professionalism, Larson (1977) examines the professional success of medicine that has provided a model for the efforts of other occupations. She concludes that the success of medicine depended largely on factors peculiar to medicine, such as its potentially limitless market and its service to the sacred value of life (Larson, 1977:38-39). Other occupations, she argues, were and are unlikely to "get the prize at the end of the road" (Larson, 1977:38). And even medicine's success is precarious.

In concluding her discussion of medicine, Larson (1977:39) remarks:

The contradiction between the use value and the market value of the service renders the profession of medicine particularly vulnerable to challenge, if ever the lay clienteles could overcome their characteristic atomization and attack medicine's corporate power politically, with the strength of a social movement. This potential for challenge is particularly significant today: the general demystification of the professional model and of its ideological functions may, indeed, begin with the attack on the archetypal profession of medicine.

The discussion of developments in medicine in this chapter identifies emergent challenges which represent such a demystification of the professional model. This examination of changes affecting the medical profession, the quintessential profession, reveals significant parallels between emergent structural changes in higher education and medicine. These parallels indicate the significance of the emergence of structures of systematic mediation beyond higher education and point to the need to more thoroughly examine developments in
other institutional spheres from the perspective of this study.

Besides Larson (1977), who has extensively examined the case of medicine, Freidson (1970a), Berlant (1975), and Starr (1978) document the distinctive historical, political, and social conditions that have promoted the professional successes of the American medical profession. In an extensive survey of current social and political developments affecting the profession of medicine, Starr (1978:177) notes that the "sovereignty" of the American medical profession has rested on its distinctive cultural, political, and economic authority. The confluence of these three types of authority dates back only to the beginning of this century (Starr, 1978:179). Starr (1978:179) contends that the most serious current challenge to the medical profession centers on the sphere of political and economic authority: the rapid inflation in the cost of health care that, according to Marshall (1977:9), "economists and budget planners now regard...as a kind of good soldier gone berserk." This continuing pressure of health care costs on government budgets, corporate profits, and union members' take home pay splits the community of interest between the medical profession and the economic and political leadership of American society (Starr, 1978:181). The decentralized and fragmented medical care system that parallels the professional power of the medical profession provides no way to effectively control those spiraling costs. The controlling of costs, Starr (1973:176) suggests, will mean redrawing the contract with the medical profession on terms much less favorable to physicians. While it is unclear exactly what form future developments will take, Starr (1978:191) points to the
"gathering determination, as yet unrealized, to impose on medical services the rationality of bureaucratic organization, of market competition, or of democratic control." Starr (1978:191) argues that, while none of these three principles now governs, the bureaucratic trend is the strongest.

These current problems of political economy do not initiate, but only support, a continuing shift of power from individual medical professionals and the organized medical profession to large scale organizations, whether governmental, hospital, insurance, or research (Ermann, 1976:167; Starr, 1978:181). Out of the enormous growth of the medical industry in the last two decades have emerged interests as powerful as, but with aims quite different than, the medical profession (Starr, 1978:178). For example, medical schools and hospitals have often encouraged increased federal spending on medicine; it has not been imposed against their will. Even more significant is the growing involvement of the state: public funds now account for over 40% of present health expenditures (Starr, 1978:182). This rising investment has brought growing federal involvement in the form of support of prepaid group practice, health planning, and the monitoring of physician performance. Starr (1978:190) points out that measures that were once proposals dismissed out of hand as socialistic now receive considerable conservative support in the legislative and executive branches of government.

A number of separate, though related, developments might be cited and examined as structural indicators of the emergence of systematic mediation in medicine. These include: the growing network of health
systems agencies active in health care planning (Starr, 1978:189); developments resulting from the malpractice crisis (Ritchey, 1977); the growth of health administration occupations (Beauchamp, 1975: 513); and the emergence in the division of labor of other specialized health care occupations (Zola and Miller, 1973:157-158; Stewart and Cantor, 1974:354). Rather than an extensive laundry list of indicators, however, a few political and social developments have been chosen for discussion in this chapter that relate principally to the crisis of political economy in medicine. These include: the growth of explicit rationing in medicine; the introduction of Professional Service Review Organizations (PSROs) and accompanying developments; the growing interest in the relative value of medical technologies; and the future developments of technological medicine. Each of these emergent developments will be briefly examined as an indicator of the growth of mediating structures affecting the professional power of physicians.

Mechanic's (1977) identification of changes in the social structure of medicine in advanced societies broadly illustrates the emergence of systematic mediation in medicine. Mechanic (1977:63) argues that in response to the continued escalation of demand for medical services and to increased medical expenditures, societies shift from rationing by fee, to a stage of implicit rationing through resource allocation, to a final stage of explicit rationing. Implicit rationing involves setting limits on health care expenditures; explicit rationing brings the development of mechanisms to arrive at more rational decisions about health care investment such as facilities,
manpower, and medical technology, as well as the establishment of minimal uniforms standards (Mechanic, 1977:67). This trend toward explicit rationing occurs despite difficulties in making such rational decisions based on real evidence of differences in health care outcomes (Mechanic, 1977:67). The restriction of options of health care practitioners, either through the exclusion of certain services by health care providers or by an insurance system's insistence on use of the most cost-effective technique, illustrates this practice of explicit rationing. While Mechanic (1977) recognizes that such restrictions may lead to an improved practice of medicine, he also notes that physicians resist such guidelines as intrusions on their professional autonomy and can be expected to try to subvert them (Mechanic, 1977:67-68). Nevertheless, governmental and non-governmental insurance programs intrude with increasing boldness into areas considered by physicians as part of their professional discretion (Mechanic, 1977:69).

In exploring the meaning and significance of these emergent developments, Mechanic notes their momentous implications for the role of the physician. He suggests that as rationing moves from fee to implicit to explicit, the type of influence on the physician changes from client control to colleague control to bureaucratic control (Mechanic, 1977:72). "Similarly, the nuances in the physician's role shift from 'entrepreneur' to 'expert' to 'official'" (Mechanic, 1977:72). Mechanic (1977:75) argues that such bureaucratic medical settings, guided by principles of explicit rationing, tend to put the physician under pressure to put the needs and interests of the
organization above the interests of the individual patient. Such bureaucratic settings also have the effect of segmenting medical responsibility and diluting the personal responsibility of the individual physician (Mechanic, 1977:75-76). This parallels the shift from the personal service orientation of collegiate control to the social service orientation characterizing mediated control. Mechanic expresses his profound worries about the ramifications of these developments on physician-patient relationships.

The Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSROs) can be viewed as one American development in the general direction of change identified by Mechanic. PSROs are part of a major federal program to control medical expenditures and to assure quality care in medical services financed under Medicare, Medicaid, and Child and Maternal Health programs. PSROs are non-profit associations of practicing physicians under contract with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, charged with assuring the necessity of individual medical services and assuring that specified standards of performance are met (Wisten, 1976:213). The components of the PSRO quality assurance program include: utilization review, medical care evaluation, and profit monitoring (Palmer, 1976:61). In the initial stages of this program, we can expect these PSROs to be relatively ineffectual, given both physician resistance and the lack of any established and validated criteria to monitor physician performance. Probably more important is the accompanying movement of federal funds into the development of such methods for assessing physician performance and determining standards for adequate medical care (Starr, 1978:189).
This movement toward quality assurance would then entail a change from acceptance of the conventional wisdom of health care toward the development of empirically tested, effective, and cost-effective health care practices (Greene, 1976:4-6).

A related development involving the federal government is the increasing interest in the value of medical technologies (Inglehart, 1977). This increased interest follows the growing recognition of the importance of the diffusion of technology as a primary element fueling medical care inflation and a concern that technologies developed through public funding are increasing at an uncontrollable rate. Inglehart (1977:54) points to the increased interest in some government-sponsored mechanism which would assess the relative merits of technologies and treatment practices, perhaps a set of public bodies which would not only engage practicing physicians, but would also involve academic researchers, medical specialists, and other experts. The decisions of such bodies would then provide criteria for health care providers which identified what technologies and treatment practices would be paid for, based on these government-sponsored judgments about the medical practices that are judged most effective and cost-effective.

While Mechanic explores one dimension of the role shift of physician related to current social developments, Avorn (1974) and Maxmen (1976) probe the implications for physicians of a related development, the increasingly technologically based character of medicine. Avorn (1974:71) points to the increasing growth of information technology in medicine, which finds its two most important
manifestations in the application of computers to diagnosis and therapy and the development of step-by-step medical protocols to guide paramedical workers in the investigation and treatment (management) of various complaints. As Avorn suggests, the underlying assumption of such developments is that there is nothing arcane or "extra-rational" about medical care.

Little by little, the specialness of the shaman is stripped away: his interviewing technique can be replaced by a branching electronic sequence, his diagnostic acumen is nothing more than a collection of thresholds and logic trees, his therapeutic decisions simply programmed probabilities. (Avorn, 1974:77).

Maxmen (1976:vii) suggests that during the 21st century, doctors will be made obsolete by such technological developments, and he predicts the demise of the physician and the development of a medic computer model of medical care. Under such a system, computers would perform the technical diagnostic and treatment decisions presently performed by physicians, while medics, a new type of health care professional, would provide support and elementary technical tasks that currently doctors perform. Maxmen (1976:7) argues that such a model of medical care for the post-physician era is "feasible, desirable, and inevitable."

While developments in medicine and higher education can be expected to diverge somewhat, these developments in medicine suggest striking parallels in structural change between medicine and higher education. From the perspective of this study, the most important implication of these developments is that increasingly the responsibility for effective and efficient health care is vested in governmental and health care organizations, rather than in the medical
profession itself. This responsibility becomes structured in policies that attempt to assure the effective and cost-effective use of medical resources to serve the medical needs of society. While the developments of structures like PSROs indicates that physicians will participate in the shape of future developments, this involvement will be at the direction of, or at least accountable to, government and corporate organizations. It can also be expected that this growing organizational responsibility will lead to more systematic examination of the relative benefits of curative and preventive medicine.
CHAPTER V

TOWARD A THEORY OF THE SYSTEMATIC MEDIATION OF PROFESSIONAL POWER

Introduction

Chapters III and IV attempt to clarify the nature and significance of the rise of structures of systematic mediation in higher education and in medicine. The major purpose of that clarification was to sight the main structure, to identify the central changes structuring the exercise of professional power. The analysis in the previous two chapters has been descriptive in the broadest sense of that term. The description has involved articulation, clarification, delineation of interrelationships, and identification of the larger significance of these changes, so that they are viewed not as isolated dimensions of change, but as a coherent set of developments structuring the exercise of professional power in similar ways.

The analysis in Chapters III and IV has sidestepped a genetic explanatory approach to these developments. Several factors account for this relative neglect of the causes of these changes. First, the principal concern of this study has been in clarifying the nature and dimensions of these changes. This task, which is the basis for any explanation of change, requires principal attention to the content and structure of changes, rather than a careful examination of the dynamics of the change process—as is required to fully justify an explanatory theory of change. This description and classification of...
qualitative dimensions of change, though of crucial importance in the study of social change, has been badly neglected (Smelser, 1968). This type of description, in the broadest sense of that term, is and must be a respectable sociological task if the study of social change, in all of its dimensions, is to be advanced. Needless to say, this delineation of the qualitative dimensions of change is no simple task.

Second, this development of mediating structures is just now beginning to work itself out since these changes are only emergent changes. This makes it more difficult to identify the causal network than for an already completed process of change--whose explanation is itself a difficult task.

Third, the concept of the systematic mediation of professional power is meant to identify structural changes affecting not just the older professions, but also other occupations in change. As the professions are bureaucratized, so the bureaucracies are professionalized. If, as it is contended, these changes are centrally important, even decisive, social structural changes in American society, then such an explanatory theory would be the core of a theory of advanced industrial society. Clearly such a theory is beyond the scope of this study.

Despite these difficulties, the importance of the explanatory task makes it imperative to seek an understanding of these changes that goes beyond the more descriptive analysis presented in previous chapters. Later in this chapter a theoretical model of structural change is put forward which, though exploratory in nature, may prove
useful to future research on occupations and organizations. This theoretical model is an attempt to identify and to interrelate the social conditions under which structures of independent professional power are transformed into structures of the systematic mediation of professional power, based on the case of American higher education and, to a more limited extent, American medicine. Such a model should parallel in several respects a model to describe the process by which the independent power of professions serving corporate clients is transformed into structures of corporate patronage. This theoretical model should represent a sound first effort toward understanding the emergence of the systematic mediation of professional power, though ultimately this theoretical model must be placed within the context of a larger theory of the dynamics of change in advanced industrial society.

The first section of this chapter reviews themes and perspectives in the literature on social and organizational change with potential relevance to an understanding of the rise of structures of systematic mediation. It complements an earlier section on the theory of the professions and occupational change. This section includes a brief discussion of (1) selected perspectives on organizational change; (2) the role of technology; (3) the role of government in social change; and (4) values or culture and the change process.

The second section identifies adequate criteria for a theory of social change. The writings of Smith (1976), Smelser (1968), Mouzelis, (1974) and Giddens (1977) are gleaned for guidelines for the theoretical model of change advanced in the following section.
The third section draws themes and perspectives on this change process together into a theoretical model that may explain how independent structures of professional power are transformed into structures of the systematic mediation of professional power. A research agenda that is suggested by this theoretical model is also put forward.

Social and Organizational Change--Themes and Perspectives

In Chapter II, the relevant literature on occupations and social change was reviewed and summarized. This critical review suggested the importance of a perspective integrating an internal and external dynamic in the analysis of occupational change. In addition, four challenges to current patterns of professionalism were identified: the client challenge, the governmental challenge, the technological challenge, and the organizational challenge. This consideration of perspectives and themes on social change, relevant to a theory of the rise of structures of systematic mediation, complements that earlier discussion. Many of the same themes will be analyzed, within a more general consideration of social, rather than occupational, change. Those perspectives and themes to be reviewed include: the political economy or resource dependence perspective on organizational change; the "nutcracker" theory of change in modern organizations; the dialectical, neo-Marxist perspective on organizational change; technological developments and social change; government and social change; and values and social change. In each case, a brief assessment is made of the potential contribution of that theme or perspective to a theory of the rise of structures of systematic mediation of professional
In a review of literature on organizations and environments, Aldrich and Pfeffer (1976:79) identify an organizational change model which has been variously called a political economy model, a dependency exchange approach, or a resource dependence model. They contrast this model to the natural selection model of organizational change, which gives decisive importance to the environment in determining organizational survival (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976:79). The resource dependence model argues for much greater attention to internal organizational decision-making processes, especially as they reflect an attempt to manage or strategically adapt to organizational environments (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976:84). While calling attention to the importance of environmental contingencies and constraints, this model also indicates that many possible actions and structures are consistent with organizational survival and that a range of choices or strategies is available (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976:84). The power and influence of organizational subunits becomes an important factor, within the context of environmental contingencies and constraints, in determining final outcomes (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976:84). However, organizational environments, by affecting the distribution of influence within organizations, come to influence structures and decisions (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976:89).

This perspective, or a variant of it, is reflected in the writings of several organizational theorists. Zald's (1970) examination of the radical transformation of the YMCA reveals the interplay between political processes of goal formation and economic processes...
of resource allocation in organizations, in contrast to the more one-directional impact of external resource allocation upon internal goal formation in Selznick's change model (McNeil, 1978:83). In identifying new directions for organizational change theory, Marcus (1976:830) identifies a model of competition and cooperation, wherein organizational change results from pressure to obtain resources for survival. In this model he considers competition for resources between organizational subunits as an important dimension of that change process (Marcus, 1976:826). Finally, the most complete discussion of this perspective is in a monograph by Pfeffer and Salancik (1977) that develops a perspective on organizations around the centrality of resource dependence.

A second organizational change model, the "nutcracker" theory of modern organizations, is put forward by Rosengren (1975) as an alternative to equilibrium models like bureaucratic or open systems theory. The theory is intended to identify and clarify issues of conflict surrounding modern formal organizations, which are increasingly expected to perform commonweal functions for publics-at-large and are also increasingly threatened with the withdrawal of monetary and non-monetary resources and other supports (Rosengren, 1975:271). It is the social organization of the environmental forces of the formal organization that produces the "nutcracker" effect: "commonweal oriented publics, general resource pressure, and resource providers as product consumers" (Rosengren, 1975:271).

Rosengren (1975:276) argues that in the near historical past organizations, through varying buffering units, have been able to
neutralize the environment and avoid the impact of the "nutcracker" effect. However:

recent maturations of and developments in the extension of concepts of civil rights and participatory democracy have brought about a transformation of these organization-environment relationships in a way which assembles the heretofore separated and isolated pressure inducing external agents into an institutionalized array of collectivities and publics which, together, are now capable of exerting continual and concentrated influences upon the principal structures of modern organizations--means and ends, core technologies, and, more importantly, the sustaining structures of charter and justification. (Rosengren, 1975:276)

Rosengren (1975:277) stresses the central role of changing expectations about the commonwealth function of organizations and of new views of organizations as general resources "which may legitimately be re-oriented--by force if necessary--to serve the goals and purposes of multiple external publics."

Heydebrand's (1977b) dialectical, neo-Marxist conception of organizational change, while consistent with several themes in the resource dependence perspective, differs from that perspective principally in its greater attention to historical dynamics and in its reliance on the central concept of contradiction. Heydebrand (1977b:89) contends that organizations, like other social structures, must be analyzed in terms of the historical processes that gave rise to them so that potential contradictions between established organization and alternative organizing processes become visible. He stresses that organizations must be examined as part of a larger political economy, which in important ways structures the contradictions of those organizations (Heydebrand, 1977b:89-90).
Heydebrand (1977b) is especially concerned with the identification of developing contradictions between new, emergent productive forces and established organizational control structures and models of work organization. Heydebrand's (1977a) own research focuses on the emerging contradiction between the rise of administrative rationalization as a new productive force and the traditional collegial professional control structure of the American federal judiciary. He considers the conflict between the authority structure of the professional elite and the forces of administrative innovation as a central contradiction in modern organizational life (Heydebrand, 1977b:194-201). Furthermore, he points out how this contradiction takes on particular significance in the current "fiscal crisis of the state," where the demand for governmental services generated by the economic social structure of the society is accompanied by a relative decline in the economic resources of the state (Heydebrand, 1977a, 1977b). This fiscal crisis manifests itself in particularly acute problems for the federal judiciary, as increased demands on the federal courts are not coupled with increased resources for the courts to meet the increased caseload (Heydebrand, 1977a). Out of this organizational contradiction, several competing organizational responses emerge to attempt to deal with these acute problems (Heydebrand, 1977a). The forces of administrative rationalization are, of course, among those competing organizational responses.

Several themes drawn from the resource dependence model, from the "nutcracker" model, and from Heydebrand's dialectical model are relevant to a theory of the rise of structures of systematic mediation.
The contribution of the resource dependence perspective rests on its recognition of the critical significance of the struggle for scarce resources and of the interaction of factors internal and external to the organization. Attention must also be directed to the ideological function of the resource dependence perspective in legitimating the efforts of the new organizational managers. Rosengren's "nut-cracker" model points to the primacy of the organizational environment, to the centrality of changing expectations by the publics of organizations about the commonweal and service functions of those organizations, and to an increasingly organized environment of the formal organization—an environment which increasingly unites resource providers and resource consumers. Heydebrand's insistence on attention to the socio-historical context of the organization is also a theme consistent with the general orientation and findings of this study. His attention to developments similar to those described and analyzed in previous chapters, the conflict between administrative and collegial professional control structures, makes his contribution of special importance.

The fourth theme or perspective, technology and the process of social change, is prominent in the change literature, and an examination of the structural indicators of mediation in higher education and medicine suggests its importance for the theory of social change to be presented later in this chapter. The earlier discussions of occupational change point to the importance of technological developments in professional technique which may alter prevailing structures of occupational control. Developments in one type of
professional technique, techniques of organizational management, play a central role in the systematic mediation of professional power. As Bates (1974) points out, technological developments in management are central to the spread of the visible hand type of social structure. Chandler's (1977) analysis of the development of the visible hand structure in the economy documents the decisive importance of advances in management and other technologies. The lack of such organizational technology makes the development of such visible hand structures only a promise and not a reality.

A closely related issue is the importance of government as an agent of social change. While individual case studies may show the importance of governmental action in producing or accelerating change in certain institutional spheres, nevertheless this work is not integrated into the theoretical social change literature. Lauer (1973:153-154) points out that "books on change generally have little to say about the effect of government unless the focus is on political change or modernization." Lauer (1973), Hirsch (1975), and Marcus (1976) all urge greater attention to the role of governmental policies in the change process.

The discussion of systematic mediation in the previous chapters makes clear the diverse ways governmental action has strengthened the movement toward mediating structures of professional power. These include: the development of more systematic budgetary and management processes in state government; affirmative action; support for student consumer rights; funding of research and development on educational management; and the role of court decisions. Obviously this
role of government must be given prominent attention in a theory of occupational and organizational change.

With the exception of Rosengren's consideration of the maturation of rights of citizenship and participatory democracy, the discussion of themes in social change has largely neglected the issue of cultural and value changes. This neglect is not meant to depreciate the importance of cultural dimensions and changes in this process of structural change. Rather it is attributable to the principal task of the study: describing central dimensions of structural change. However, powerful cultural forces are tightly interwoven with these structural changes and can be said to have an elective affinity with these changes. Two dimensions of modern individualism, which are analytically distinguishable, are considered below because of their importance in an explanation of the emergence of systematic mediation. These two dimensions roughly parallel the variants of individualism which McCloskey (1978) has clarified in his reinterpretation of Durkheim. In McCloskey's (1978) understanding, these two variants, egoisme and anomie, are stimulated by the presence of cultural sanctions which "absolutize individualism" and drives for "progress and perfection". The two paralleling dimensions of individualism relevant to the explanation of the emergence of systematic mediation are egalitarianism and autonomy, self-direction, or self-groundedness.

The tremendous force of egalitarian values and norms in American life impressed the French visitor de Tocqueville in the mid-1800s, and he became convinced that this would become the general direction
in which European societies would be moving (Beteille, 1969:367).

Beteille (1969:366) argues that this rise of egalitarian values is not just a Western movement, but a worldwide movement. He contends that, for students of social stratification, "the decline in the legitimacy of social inequality is perhaps the most important feature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries," despite the continuing presence of vast social inequality as a fact (Beteille, 1969: 366). The modern American expression of this egalitarianism is what Bell (1976:233) has called "the revolution of rising entitlements." This revolution of rising entitlements may take the form of a demand for a basic minimum family income, "educationaldrawing rights" for each person for a minimum number of years, or employment guarantees (Bell, 1976:233). Bell (1976:233) notes that the claims for these entitlements are not just made by the poor or the disadvantaged, but by all groups in the society.

Bell (1976:233) points out how this revolution of rising entitlements has translated into an enormous expansion of human, professional, and technical services in the society. Health, education, and government employment have been the fastest growing of these sectors in Western societies in the last decades. These demands for entitlements convert once privileges to the citizenship rights that Johnson (1972) finds the concomitant of state mediation. Furthermore, the pressure for increased services to accommodate these rights generates increased pressure to further rationalize the organization of these services to serve more human needs. This works itself out as challenges to the fetters of the relatively "unproductive" or "uneconomic" modes
of organizing the social services, including higher education, and fuels the organizational contradiction between the alternative control structures of administrative rationalization and the collegial professional group. The cultural pressure of egalitarian demand thus strengthens the forces of systematic mediation.

The other dimension of individualism, autonomy or self-direction or self-groundedness, represents a principle of cultural rationality that parallels the organizational rationality of the visible hand or of systematic mediation. This rationality has as its forebear the ethic of Protestant asceticism, which demanded "a total control of action by thought" (Swidler, 1973:39). The modern variant of this ethic, which secularizes the religious ethic and sanctifies the actualizing and self-directed self, is represented by Kohn's (1969) concept of self-direction and Gouldner's (1979) concept of self-groundedness or autonomy. In Kohn's work, self-direction represents a commitment to the self identifying its own goals or standards and a belief in the possibilities of rational action to achieve those goals. The vast American self-help literature can be said to illustrate that commitment to the structure of self-direction. Self-groundedness or autonomy, clarified in Gouldner's (1979) recent treatise on the rise of the New Class, commits itself "to that which is capable of self-movement and self-direction rather than to that which is externally driven" (Gouldner, 1979:33-34). This self-groundedness is clearly expressed in the New Class's grammar of discourse, where speech and action are viewed as rule-oriented rather than controlled by external forces (Gouldner, 1979:34). Conclusions
(or actions) are selected and constructed reflectively in the light of rules, rather than imposed by tradition, force, or impulse (Gouldner, 1979:34).

Kohn (1969:193-194) argues there is an historical trend toward an "increasingly self-directed populace", based on increased education and the increased complexity of occupational work. Coser (1975) also stresses the role of complex social structures in supporting the development of the self-directed orientation. The work of Yankelevich and Clark (1974:45-46) suggests that self-directed orientations have moved beyond the middle class youth and have increasingly spread to working class youth as well. Gouldner (1979) argues that the value of self-groundedness grows in importance through the vehicle of the growth of formal educational systems and as the New Class play a more central role in modern society.

The impact of this growing self-directedness makes itself felt in the demand for equality of opportunity within the educational system--elementary through higher--for individuals to develop their unique talents, to successfully realize their "dreamed of ideal" to become professionals--with all the power that implies. Self-direction also makes demands for participation within the organization which must then adjust to the individual as the carrier of those social values. The growth of self-direction or autonomy, as a demand in the workplace, represents a democratization of professionalism as value that ultimately issues a challenge to any occupational autonomies, even of the old privileged elite. Furthermore, self-direction or self-groundedness emerges to challenge the old
bureaucratic ideology of conformity and its accompanying system of control and to replace them with the new structure and ideology of the professionalized bureaucracy. The concrete expression of these challenges to bureaucracy and to the privileged professions is the complex interdependence of work within and between organizations that constitutes the systematic mediation that has been the principal subject of this study.

Both egalitarianism and self-direction or autonomy reflect the rational spirit of this modern age. In his classic examination of capitalism and socialism, Schumpeter (1950) argues that this rational spirit, which capitalism has largely fostered, eventually comes back to attack even those structures and values that originally sponsored it.

We have finally seen that capitalism creates a critical frame of mind which, after having destroyed the moral authority of so many other institutions, in the end turns against its own; the bourgeois finds to his amazement that the rationalist attitude does not stop at the credentials of kings and popes but goes on to attack private property and the whole scheme of bourgeois values. (Schumpeter, 1950:143)

The findings of this study indicate that the rationalist attitude goes beyond the credentials of kings and popes to attack the credentials of university teachers, doctors, and other collegial professionals. And this spirit or attitude pushes toward the systematic mediation of professional power clarified in this study.

The Criteria for a Theory of Change

This section identifies criteria for an adequate theory of social change—criteria which can be used both to shape and evaluate the
theory of the rise of structures of systematic mediation of professional power which is presented in the following section. This section examines the issues which a theory of social change must address, general assumptions of theories of change, and frameworks for the presentation of a theory of change. The works of Smith (1976), Smelser (1968), Giddens (1977), and Mouzelis (1974) are drawn upon to provide guidelines for the organization and presentation of this theory of structural change. The criteria that emerge from this review of literature on theories of change are consistent with the general themes of power, environment, and history that provide the organizing framework for this study.

In a short treatise on social change, Smith (1976:14) identifies three issues which any analysis of social change must address: the origins of the change (the source), the mechanisms by which the events produce the change (channels of diffusion), and the form its effects taken in the unit under consideration (repercussions of change). According to Smith (1976:14), the efficacy and utility of a model or theory of change is largely dependent on how it addresses these three issues of the change process. Furthermore, Smith (1976:12) emphasizes that change is "pre-eminently historical" in nature and cannot be studied apart from the historical record. Social change should not be opposed, as it frequently has been, to historical sequences (Smith, 1976:12). Smith (1976:123) argues that, given this historical dimension of change, a single theory or framework that would be applicable to all change processes is both undesirable and unlikely--undesirable in that it is likely to lead to a vacuous theory...
of social change.

As his own preferred orientation to social change, Smith (1976: 133) puts forward the transunit orientation, which he suggests as an alternative to either the endogenous model of change, which centers of an internal dynamic, or the exogenous model, which focuses on an external dynamic of change. The transunit orientation focuses on the origin and course of change in the interaction between a given unit and other units which surround it. This orientation, entirely compatible with the review of literature on organizational and occupational change, would integrate internal and external factors in exploring the dynamics of the change process.

Smelser's (1968) work represents one of the most detailed expositions of the requirements of a theory of social change. He stresses that a simple list of the variables that may influence the course of social change is insufficient to form a theory of social change (Smelser, 1968:209). Rather, the variables must be organized into some sort of explanatory model (Smelser, 1968:209). Smelser (1968) argues that a complete theory of social change must include: (1) the nature of the change; (2) the causes, both active and passive, of that change; (3) the general principle, mechanism, or model that can be used to interpret the sequences of change; and (4) the general assumptions about men and society upon which the explanation is based. Smelser (1968:205-207) lists four categories useful for organizing the discussion of the causes of change: (1) the structural setting for change; (2) the impetus to change; (3) the mobilization for change; and (4) the operation of mechanisms of social control.
In addition to identifying these four categories for a theory of the causes of social change, Smelser recommends the use of the concept of equilibrium as a central organizing assumption in the study of social change. A careful examination of Smelser's four categories and their use in studying social change and collective behavior indicates that they tend to incorporate this equilibrium bias, which is not compatible with the more dynamic changes described in this study. Heydebrand's concepts of dialectical change and contradiction seem much more appropriate to the structural changes under consideration.

The final structuring concepts for a theory of social change are taken from the work of Lockwood (1964), as elaborated upon by Mouzelis (1974) and Giddens (1977). Lockwood (1964) distinguished between system and social integration in identifying different approaches to explaining social changes, and Mouzelis (1974) and Giddens (1977) clarify this important distinction. Mouzelius (1974:395) points out that the two concepts together provide the kind of guideline that tell researchers what questions to ask and what to look for as they study the development of change in some specific social system.

Both Mouzelis (1976) and Giddens (1977) conclude that an adequate treatment of social change must address both issues of system integration and contradiction and social integration and conflict. Change theories often deal with either the system level or the social level, but not both. Functionalists tend to emphasize the system processes, like differentiation, at the expense of social processes. Conflict theorists, on the other hand, tend to emphasize social conflicts between groups.
at the expense of those system contradictions that underlie these conflicts. Theories thus fail to avoid either the Scylla of structuralism or the Charybdis of voluntarism.

An adequate theory of social change, following Giddens (1977: 125-129) and Mouzelis (1974), would focus upon both social integration and conflict, where the "parts" are social actors, and system integration and contradictions, where the parts are collectivities or systems of social systems. According to Giddens (1977) system contradiction entails a disjunction between two or more principles of organization governing the connection between social systems within a larger collectivity. Heydebrand's (1977b) control structures represent examples of such principles of organization. Conflict, on the other hand, involves the "conscious struggle" between individuals or collectivities, where confrontation enters into the "rationalization" (or justification) of at least one of the parties to the conflict (Giddens, 1977:126). A theory of social change must address both these levels, examining conflicts between structural principles and conflicts between social actors. As an illustration, Mouzelis (1974:402) contrasts Marx's successful linking of institutional contradictions and collective actors with the functionalist's failure to pass from the system to the social level of integration and conflict.

The theoretical model advanced in the following section draws upon the criteria for a theory of social change identified by Smith, Smelser, Mouzelis, and Giddens. This model, coupled with the description of systematic mediation in Chapter III, follows Smith's criteria by addressing the three issues that a change theory must address, by
focussing on an historical dynamic of change, and by using a transunit orientation to the change process. Following Smelser's concerns, the model organizes the variables or themes into a systematic framework and considers issues of structural setting and impetus to change. This model also attempts to deal with both systems and social levels of analysis, as Mouzelis and Giddens require.

Systematic Mediation and Higher Education: Toward a Theory of Structural Change

The previous sections in this chapter have pointed to themes or elements relevant to a theory of structural change and to criteria for a theory of change. The challenge faced in this section is to draw together those themes or elements into a coherent theoretical model. This model would show how these elements are interrelated as structures of independent professional power are transformed into structures of the systematic mediation of professional power. The theoretical model presented in this section is primarily based on the experience of American higher education, though it is presented on a level of abstraction that makes clear its applicability to other systems of higher education and to other professions. The contrasting example of American medicine was considered in the process of constructing this model. The caveat stated in the introductory section of this chapter must be heeded in the interpretation of this theoretical model: It represents only a first effort toward an understanding of and explanation of these changes.

The problem posed for a theoretical model is to identify important
variables, to classify them by type, and to indicate their relative importance. Table 1 classifies the important themes and elements identified in earlier sections into four general types: structural setting factors, contingent factors, enabling factors, and catalysts.

Table 1
An Analytical Typology of Elements for the Theory of the Systematic Mediation of Professional Power

A. Structural Setting Factors
1. The academic profession's lack of resource self-sufficiency
2. The dependence of faculty professionals on complex organizations
3. Faculty fragmentation into specialized disciplines

B. Contingent Factors
1. The external dynamic of increased demand and entitlement
2. The internal dynamic of developments in organizational technology

C. Enabling Factors
1. A relatively open and potentially strong political structure

D. Catalysts
1. Enrollment steadying and decline
2. Fiscal crisis of the state

The classification also implicitly stratifies these factors by importance. The contingent and enabling factors can be viewed as the crucial necessary causes. The structural setting factors are factors that make the profession—in this case, the academic profession—vulnerable to change. The catalysts should be viewed as factors which quicken or hasten their changes by their influence on either the contingent or
enabling factors. Figure 1 attempts to diagrammatically illustrate the relationships between these factors.

![Diagram of Figure 1: The Relationship of Key Elements in the Theory of the Systematic Mediation of Professional Power]

Three structural setting factors in the theoretical model are listed in Table 1: the academic profession's lack of resource self-sufficiency; the dependence of faculty professionals on complex organizations—colleges or universities; and the fragmentation of faculty into specialized disciplines. Each of these factors constitutes a condition which promotes the vulnerability of the academic profession to systematic mediation or to some form of external or imposed control. The first factor, the academic profession's lack of resource self-sufficiency, it shares with other occupational groups, and this constitutes a central weakness of collegiate control as a control structure. The
dependence of faculty on complex organizations, the second structural setting factor, makes faculty vulnerable to the internal dynamic of organizational technology which constitutes a contingent factor in the model. The increasing reliance of other professions on complex organizations makes those professions also increasingly vulnerable to the systematic mediation of professional power. The fragmentation of the faculty into separate disciplines constitutes a condition which makes difficult a unified response of resistance by faculty professionals to these developments.

One of the three central elements in the theoretical model is the external dynamic of demand and entitlement—a dynamic which flows from the cultural changes identified and briefly clarified in an earlier section of this chapter. In American society, higher education has come to be seen as an important, and often crucial, institution for the realization of certain personal values, such as social or occupational mobility. Paralleling this change in perceived importance in higher education is the emergence of the view that higher education is not a privilege but a citizenship right. The expansion of access to higher education both reflects and contributes further to this conception of higher education as citizenship right. Such changed perceptions about higher education—from the standpoint of students, potential students, or their sponsors—fuel the demand for a responsive, accountable, and cost-effective educational system. The demands of minorities and women for full citizenship rights—which has culminated in legislation on equal employment opportunity and affirmative action—represent another dimension in this external dynamic.
of demand and entitlement.

The second contingent factor in the theoretical model is the internal dynamic of organizational technology. It is understandable that developments in organizational technology are so central because systematic mediation is an organizational mediation. In Chapter III the development of new management tools and techniques and the professionalization of academic management received prominent attention in the discussion of the structural changes toward the visible hand system and the systematic mediation of professional power. This force of organizational technology is an aspect of the force of cultural capital or the dynamics of new knowledge as a productive force. This cultural capital should be viewed as a dynamic not reducible to the external dynamic, yet also not developing independently of it. For example, the professionalization of academic management is, in part at least, a response to increased environmental pressure on institutions of higher education. This internal dynamic both promises a greater responsiveness of the organization through mediation of goals and promotes innovation in professional technique toward a more cost-effective delivery of professional services.

The third type of factor in the theoretical model is the enabling factor, though this term cannot capture the multifaceted aspects of the role of the political structure in the emergence of the systematic mediation of professional power. On the one hand, the role of the political structure can be viewed as a form of "mediation" of the two dynamics: The government organizes the heterogeneity of increased consumer demand—becomes a consumer representative—and links this
organized consumer demand to resource pressure to increase organizational innovation. To mediate between higher education and its client's, the political structure must be open enough to have some demands to mediate, but also potentially strong or vigorous enough to become a mediator.

On the other hand, this view of political structure as consumer representative and as enabling factor does not capture the independence of that political dynamic, which takes up and goes beyond the external dynamic of demand and entitlement. For example, the role of administration agencies enforcing affirmative action and of coordinating agencies in higher education can be seen as illustrating a more independent political dynamic of change. It should be noted that both the enabling role and the more independent political dynamic represent an ironic reversal for the government: Earlier in American history the American government had sponsored an independent professional power for certain occupations.

The final elements in the theoretical model for structural change in American higher education are two catalysts that hasten these developments. The most visible of these two catalysts is the steadying and decline in the number of the traditional youth clientele for higher education, a trend which will continue into the 1980s. This steadying or decline of enrollment poses a severe resource crisis for many colleges and universities and thereby strengthens the forces of the internal dynamic—the professional managers—in colleges and universities. The number of issues that become organizational issues proliferates rapidly, and the anarchical dimensions of university organization are increasingly less tolerable. The fiscal crisis of
the state, the second catalyst, represents the larger dimension of
the political economy that intrudes on higher education. However,
this fiscal crisis is itself only a larger manifestation of the
external dynamic of demand and entitlement in a society of scarce
resources. The fiscal crisis results in steadied or declining (in
real dollars) resource allocations for higher education, thus strength­
ening the forces of organizational rationalization on the institutional
level. The fiscal crisis also promotes an increased appropriation
of that "internal dynamic" by the government itself as government
agencies attempt to systematically integrate information and resource
allocation decisions to advance policy objectives.

The key argument in this theoretical model is that each of the
two contingent factors and the enabling factor must come together—at
some as yet undetermined level of strength—to transform structures
of independent professional power to structures of the systematic
mediation of professional power. The catalysts are factors which in­
fluence one or more of these three central factors and thereby promote
the development of systematic mediation. The external dynamic, with
an appropriate political structure, but without the internal dynamic
of organizational technology, can issue only in some form of repres­
sion that is not systematic mediation. The internal dynamic can only
become effective with the social conditions of demand that promote
its importance or value. The external dynamic of demand that lacks a
structure through which demand can become more sustained and organized
also does not bring the systematic mediation of professional power.
While the three factors are all necessary conditions, only together do
they constitute sufficient conditions. This type of theoretical model which identifies a combination of conditions which together produce a given effect is the type of theory prominent in Weber's comparative work (Smelser, 1976:142-144).

This model does not identify any of these three factors as central or decisive or more crucial than the others. This reflects the relative independence, yet mutual interdependence, of each of these three factors. In this change process each of the three factors—the external dynamic, the internal dynamic, and the political factor—at times take the lead in pressing forward these changes. It is tempting to identify the external dynamic of demand as central to this process, but this would be to ignore the ways in which the external dynamic is itself shaped by the social, political, and economic structure, which includes the two other dimensions or factors.

This theoretical model can recognize dimensions of both system contradiction and social conflict. On the system level, this structural change represents a confrontation of structures of independent professional power by structures of systematic mediation. On the social level, these changes reveal a conflict between those advocates of traditional collegial values and the new organizational and governmental managers with their claim to represent the larger public interest. This system contradiction and social conflict closely parallel and mutually reinforce one another in this change process.

This theoretical model to explain how independent professional power is transformed into the systematic mediation of professional power represents an advance over most other work in the field of
occupations and organizations which either avoids critical issues of
the dynamics of structural change or couches explanations in the form
of generalizations that are not interrelated. Nevertheless this model
is still presented at a relatively low level of formalization, and it
does not constitute a theory from which clearly defined hypotheses
can be drawn and tested. The theoretical model does not and cannot
now address the issues of critical values of key variables, of measur­
ing the systematic mediation of professional power, or of the causes
of the varying values of those key independent variables. Clarifica­
tion of the first two issues awaits further empirical work from the
perspective of this study; the third issue illustrates how this
theoretical model ultimately must be linked to a more general theory
of structural change in advanced industrial societies. This theore­
tical model should be seen primarily at this time as a model to sensi­
tize the researcher to central research issues and questions which,
on the basis of future research, can be further clarified and specified.

Despite the looseness of this theoretical formulation, the
theoretical model does attempt to articulate the key factors in the
dynamic process by which independent professional power is transformed
into systematically mediated professional power. The model identifies
two contingent and one enabling factor, all of which must come together
in the successful challenge to independent professional power. This
key thesis would suggest the importance of creating a comparative
research agenda around these key factors in the theoretical model.
For testing such a theoretical argument, Smelser (1976:142-143) sug­
gests the use of Mill's "indirect method of difference" or the "joint
method of agreement and difference."

It consists of a twofold application of the method of agreement, as follows: A number of instances having a common effect are also found to share in the same cause (first application); a second number of instances lacking the common effect are also found to lack the cause (second application); the proofs for each application should be established independently from one another. If the two applications yield consistent results, a presumption in favor of the suspected cause is established. (Smelser, 1976:142-143)

Such a research agenda would require systematic studies of the change process in other relevant higher education systems or other occupations, like Berlant's (1975) historical sociological study of the British and American medical professions or the study by Jamous and Peloille (1970) of structural changes in the French University-Hospital system. These studies would address a number of complex and complicated questions: Does the emergence of systematic mediation of professional power in American higher education or other spheres, over former patterns of independent professional power, confirm the convergence of these factors? Can frustrated or slowed movements to mediate professional power, or no challenges at all, be understood as the failure to have mobilized one or more of these three factors? How do these factors come together and how are they interrelated? Can one or two of these three factors bring about the systematic mediation of professional power without the third? For example, could the internal dynamic of organizational technological innovation, coupled with enrollment decline (resource crisis), produce the systematic mediation of professional power in higher education without the external dynamic of increased demand and entitlement. Research to address these questions could constitute both a general test
of the theoretical model and a contribution to the elaboration of the model based on the comparative data of other occupations and of other higher educational systems.

While a research agenda that examines the process by which independent professional power is transformed into the systematic mediation of professional power follows from this theoretical model, the larger and more important question a research agenda should address is the social conditions under which the systematic mediation of professional power arises—regardless of the previous form of control over the occupation. This agenda would address larger questions of the causes of occupational change in advanced industrial societies. As the review of literature on professionalism makes clear, independent professional power is a relatively unique and unstable form of occupational control, most highly developed in England and the United States. A larger comparative perspective, which this study cannot substantiate, might find, for example, that in higher educational systems the chief competitor to systematic mediation is some other variant of mediation or some type of patronage structure. Given this larger comparative perspective, the nature of the political structure—which itself reflects a balance of social forces—may be an especially important or key factor in determining where systematic mediation of professional power emerges. In many modernized nations, the political structure may be so central, dominant, and closed that the state does not mediate higher education, but rather controls it. Higher education then would serve the interests of a dominant political, economic, or social elite.

This potential relationship of political structures and forms of
occupational control in higher education raises the possibility of an interesting and important research agenda in the comparative sociology of higher education. This agenda would examine types of occupational control as they are shaped by the political structure of the society. Such an agenda would address important issues of autonomy and control in higher education and should make possible a clearer understanding of the social conditions that promote the systematic mediation of professional power in systems of higher education.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Summary and Review

This study has touched far and wide in its quest to sight and to clarify the main structure of change in American higher education. Between the critique of trait and functional models of professionalism and the development of a theoretical model to explain these changes, the argument has ranged over theories of professions and organizations, theories of change in occupations and organizations, the relationship of profession and bureaucracy, and the nature of emergent changes in medicine. Throughout the study several themes have provided structure and continuity for that discussion: power, environment, history, and the growing importance of the complex organization.

The major argument of this study has centered on the emergence of structural change in higher education, a systematic mediation which represents a new form of control over the professional power of university teachers. The nature and significance of this systematic mediation was clarified in both the general discussion of the concept and the discussion of structural indicators of systematic mediation in Chapter III. This systematic mediation mediates between the interest of university faculty educators in effective competent teaching practice and the interests of the colleges and universities clients in service to client-centered goals. The
complex organization, with its new management tools and techniques, becomes the agency of this systematic mediation. While taking somewhat different forms in the different sectors of college and university life, private and public, elite and mass, nevertheless it promises to affect all sectors but especially the public sector.

On the basis of this identification of these qualitative dimensions of structural change, a theoretical model was advanced which attempts to explain how independent professional power is transformed into the systematic mediation of professional power. This theoretical model, based on changes in American higher education, identifies and interrelates those social conditions judged as necessary or important factors in this emergence of the systematic mediation of professional power in American higher education. These social conditions include: an external dynamic of increased demand and even entitlement to social services like higher education; an internal dynamic of the development of organizational technology; and a relatively open and potentially vigorous political structure which channels these factors toward the systematic mediation of professional power.

This major argument has obvious implications for various other areas of sociological thought and controversy. The development of patterns of systematic mediation of professional power suggests the need to reexamine traditional concepts of profession and bureaucracy and their interrelationships. The identification of the importance of the complex organization indicates that sociological research on organization should attend to organizational significance and importance, rather than sidestepping this issue in the quantitative study of what
makes organizations effective. Finally the argument suggests the need to reexamine higher education as trends draw the university toward the center of social and political life and make of the university more of a typical, than a unique, organization.

General Assessment

Contributions of the Study

An examination of the themes and central argument developed in Chapters II through VI suggests several important contributions of this study to the field of sociology. First, this study gives renewed impetus to the sociological task of systematically examining social structural change and of reckoning with qualitative, as well as quantitative, dimensions of change. This taking up of Smelser's (1968) challenge to examine qualitative dimensions of change has been impeded by the fact that there are few models for such systematic sociological research other than in the sociological classics. Though there are guidelines for interviews, experiments, and participant observation that ease the task of the contemporary sociologist, there are no such guidelines for analyzing qualitative dimensions of structural change. This is despite their central importance to the field of sociology. Thus this study represents both a contribution to the method and theory in examining social change.

A second contribution or strength of this study is that the problem it addresses has considerable relevance both to the sociological and the larger social community. Mills (1959) counsels
sociologists to advance the sociological imagination by clarifying the relationships between private troubles and public issues. The works of Weber on rationalization and bureaucracy and Durkheim on organic solidarity and the division of labor meet the criteria of the sociological imagination. In taking up their themes again, in the context of current changes in the complex organization, this study supports a direction in sociology which explores issues of wider relevance than to narrow and specialized groups within the sociological community. This study of structural changes in the workplace can at least indirectly help to clarify private troubles surrounding work and demonstrate their relationship to larger public issues.

In *The Sociological Imagination*, Mills (1959) also counsels sociologists to move beyond the sterile extremes of abstracted empiricism and grand theory. This study seeks such a middle ground by examining developments in one institutional sphere, higher education, in the light of concepts and theories taken from the sociology of occupations, organizations, and change. The developments in higher education examined as structural indicators of mediation represent the tie to the empirical world, while the insistence on putting these developments into theoretical perspective identifies the larger ambitions of this study.

This study, then, in both content and approach makes a claim as a contribution to sociological theory and research which deserves notice in the sociological and the larger social community. The study's careful development of the concept of the systematic mediation of
professional power and its development of a theoretical model to explain the dynamics of these changes illustrates its contribution to sociological theory and research. The study's examination of issues with larger social relevance indicates its contribution to the potential clarification of issues in the larger social community. These contributions indicate the importance of future sociological research which examines the qualitative dimensions of structural change in other institutional spheres which are similarly shaped by the developments described in this study.

Weaknesses of the Study

The weaknesses of this study follow from its ambitions and its strengths. In its insistence on clarity and in sighting the main structure, this study has blurred many complex details. The relative lack of attention to systematic differences in the nature and characteristics of systematic mediation within different institutional sectors can be viewed as a principal weakness of this study. However, there is probably not enough information available in the type of documents used for this study to systematically identify those differences at this time. This would require case studies of different types of institutions and the systematic collection of data from different types of institutions in higher education.

This study has also not attended closely to the pattern of response by university teachers to these emergent developments. Certainly informal structures of avoidance have emerged and will continue to emerge to try to subvert the development of systematic mediation in
higher education. For example, Rubin (1976) notes the distortions in the decision-making processes resulting from introduction of some of those structural indicators of mediation. The neglect of this pattern of professional response is not intended to ignore its reality nor deny its significance.

Third, this study has proceeded without a comparative national perspective which might have brought greater theoretical sophistication to this study, though its importance was acknowledged in Chapter V. However, the comparative study of systems of higher education is in relative infancy and the data for such a comparative perspective are not readily available. Nevertheless, certain work suggests similarities between emergent developments in the United States and in other Western European nations. McConnell (1971:120) points to the changing balance of power and influence in British higher education as the government gains power at the expense of academics and laymen. Burns' (1973:99-101) study of changes in Western European higher education reveals the declining power of the collegial professor in selected elite German, French, and British universities, as elitist notions crumble in the face of new demands on the university. Finally, Trow (1975:114) notes the broad movement in almost all industrial societies toward greater political direction of higher education as postsecondary education has become too important and too costly to be left alone. These works suggest the profitability of comparative research around the theoretical perspective of this study.
Toward Future Research

Chapter V has identified a comparative research agenda which would focus on patterns of occupational control in higher education as they are related to national political structures. However, this study also suggests a more general research agenda to examine occupational and organizational relationships and change, within the context of the larger social structure. The work of Heydebrand (1977a; 1977b) is the closest other model and guide for this future research, as it combines both theoretical and methodological sophistication with a recognition of the importance of both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of change. Such research on occupations and organizations would attempt to identify similarities and differences between the structural changes in different institutional spheres and clarify and explain the main dimensions and aspects of structural change.

Future research must also attend to types of studies on organizational and occupational change which would add detail and comparative perspective to the theory of systematic mediation. Case studies of organizational and occupational change should focus on qualitative and quantitative dimensions and dynamics of institutional changes that could clarify both how these changes affect institutions of higher education differently and the nature of that dynamic of change. Further research should also focus on the social psychology of occupations like university teaching--its role, self-image, identity--in the context of these emergent structural changes.
As Chapter V makes clear, further comparative research and communication between researchers of different nations are also needed so that these structural changes might be more systematically related and placed within a more comprehensive theory of advanced modernization. This requires attention to and examination of both similarities and differences in emergent structural changes in light of the larger political, social, and cultural context in which they develop. Such comparative research would move sociology toward the fulfillment of its promise as both a generalizing, scientific discipline and as a discipline whose findings are addressed to issues of larger social relevance.
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