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An important factor in the ability of an organization to achieve its goals is its authority structure. If goals and authority structure are incompatible, goals may be modified to the extent that means become parts of the goals themselves. Several organizational assumptions, such as that staff authority is generally subordinated to line authority, are analyzed in different kinds of organizations to show that, in practice, they must be modified according to the major goals of the organization. In professional organizations, for example, traditional staff and line concepts must be reversed, since the staff "experts" are carrying out the major goal activity, while the "line" plays a service role.\(^1\)

Amitai Etzioni is instructor in the Department of Sociology, Columbia University.

ORGANIZATIONS are co-ordinated human efforts to realize specific goals. But in all organizations there is eternal strain which limits the scope and degree to which organizational goals can be attained. A major interest of the student of organizations is to determine the conditions under which attainment of such goals is promoted or hindered. One important factor determining the degree of goal realization is the nature of the authority structure of the organization. If the orientation of this structure is com-

\(^1\)This paper is part of a larger manuscript now in preparation, tentatively called, *Toward a Comparative Study of Complex Organizations.*
compatible with the organizational goals, the probability that these goals will be achieved is greater than in organizations where this is not the case.\(^2\) In bureaucracies where the goals and the authority structure are incompatible, it is likely that the goals will be modified. Goals originally considered secondary may become of primary importance in the organization's activity; means may become ritualized, that is, conceived of as parts of the goals themselves; and activities which were considered illegitimate when the organization was established may become part of the goal structure.\(^3\)

This paper is devoted to a discussion of this issue in terms of three different perspectives on the authority structure of complex organizations: (a) the relationships between staff and line, (b) the role of the organizational head, and (c) the functions of the authority center.

**AUTHORITY STRUCTURE AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF GOALS**

The study of organizations has proceeded mainly on two levels.\(^4\) Studies are devoted either to case descriptions and analysis or to high-level generalizations and speculations on organizations in general. There is relatively little systematic examination on the middle level, as, for example, the study of various types of organizations.\(^5\) Propositions believed to hold for all organizations have to be tested separately for each organizational type. Such examinations might show that assumed generalizations hold true only for certain types of organizations.\(^6\) In this paper several such propositions will be scrutinized in an attempt to show that they cannot be applied to professional organizations. The three major generali-

---


\(^3\)Studies of police forces will illustrate this point.

\(^4\)The terms organization and institution will be used interchangeably. In all cases the reference is to large and complex organizations which have a formal structure, thus excluding such social organizations as the family and the community.

\(^5\)This point is elaborated somewhat further in the author's Industrial Sociology: The Study of Economic Organizations, *Social Research*, 25 (Autumn 1958), 303–324.

zations to be discussed are as follows: (a) In the ultimate analysis staff authority is subordinated to line authority. (b) Organizational units, especially the organization as a whole, are therefore headed by managers and not by experts. (c) Organizations have one and only one ultimate center of authority.

*Staff and Line*

There are two approaches to the relationship between staff and line. According to one approach the staff has no direct authority whatsoever. It advises the executive (line authority) on what action to take. The staff in itself does not issue orders and is not responsible for action. According to the second approach the staff, while advising the line on various issues, also takes responsibility for limited areas of activity. In spite of important differences between the two approaches both agree that staff authority is subordinate to line authority, and they tend to identify line with managers or administrators and staff with experts and specialists. While it is obvious that there are some staff functions which are not carried out by experts and that there are some experts among the line personnel, it is suggested that there is a high correlation between line and managers and between staff and experts.

What is the relation between these two groups and the organizational goals? Managers are generally considered as those who have the major (line) authority because they direct the major goal activity. Experts deal only with means, with secondary activities. Therefore it is functional for them to have none, or only limited (staff), authority.

Manager and expert are the two major terms used in this paper. Therefore a few lines will be devoted here to some conceptual clarification. Managers and experts may be differentiated from four points of view: (a) role structure, (b) personality, (c) background, mainly in terms of educational and occupational experience, and (d) normative orientations.

The *role* of the expert is to create and institutionalize knowledge. The role of the manager is to integrate (create or maintain) organizational systems or subsystems from the point of view of the insti-

---

tutional goals and needs.\textsuperscript{8} The expert typically deals with symbols and materials (although there are many who disagree with this point of view).\textsuperscript{9} The manager deals with people. The two role types require different personality types. The expert who has intensive knowledge in a limited area, tends to have a restricted perspective. The manager has extensive, though limited, knowledge of many areas, and the resulting broad perspective is essential for his role. Experts are committed to abstract ideas and therefore tend to be unrealistic, whereas managers are more practical. Managers are skilled in human relations; experts are temperamental.\textsuperscript{10}

Managers and experts differ in background. Experts usually have higher educations than managers and tend to enter their first job at a later age and at higher initial salaries. They often start at relatively high positions in the hierarchy but are limited in the range of their mobility. Managers enter their first job at a younger age, with less education, and at lower positions, but they move upward faster than the experts and some of them eventually get higher than any expert.\textsuperscript{11} Whereas many experts remain more or less restricted to the same organizational functions, the typical manager is assigned to a large variety of tasks in what is called the process of broadening.

Managers' orientations differ considerably from those of experts. Managers are more committed or loyal to their specific organization than are experts.\textsuperscript{12} Experts are often primarily oriented toward their professional reference and membership groups. While man-

\textsuperscript{8} The roles of managers will be discussed here only with regard to the internal functions of the organization. Their roles with regard to environment will be disregarded because of space limitations.

\textsuperscript{9} Experts can be arranged in a continuum from the less to the more skilled in human relations. Chemists, for instance, are on the average less skilled from this point of view than labor relations experts. See L. E. Danielson, Management's Relations with Engineers and Scientists, \textit{Proceedings of Industrial Relations Research Association}, Tenth Annual Meeting, 1957, pp. 314–321.


\textsuperscript{12} For a case study which brings out this point, see A. H. Stanton and M. S. Schwartz, \textit{The Mental Hospital} (New York, 1954).
AGERS are often committed to the organization's particular goals, experts are committed to the scientific and professional ethos regardless of the particular needs and goals of their institution.\textsuperscript{13}

Obviously though there is a high correlation among these four variables, they are not inevitably associated. Two major mechanisms explain how the correlation is maintained. First of all there is \textit{selective recruitment}. People with managerial personalities and background are recruited to managerial roles, and those with the personalities and education of experts tend to enter staff positions. The second mechanism is \textit{role adaptation}. People who enter roles which are initially incompatible with their personalities often adjust to their new roles. Whether they had latent tendencies to act in accordance with the new role or whether the new role meant deep changes in their personality structure need not to be discussed here. In both cases the actors will adjust to their new roles. In such adjustment the process of broadening produces managers from initial specialists; a parallel process produces semiexperts from managers who entered managerial roles in professional organizations. These processes explain in part also why there is no perfect correlation among the four variables discussed above. For example, people with the background of experts may fulfill managerial roles.

\textit{Institutional Heads}

It is one of the basic characteristics of bureaucratic organizational structures to have one and only one center of authority. This is often vested in the role of the head of the organization. He is seen as the top of the chain of command, as the ultimate authority in the internal structure and as ultimately responsible for the organizational activity relative to external structures such as the community and the government. Institutional heads are often symbols of identification for members and employees of the organization.\textsuperscript{14} Customers and other outsiders, such as the personnel of other organizations, tend to identify an organization with the organizational head. Institutional heads are in a strategic position


\textsuperscript{14}The University of Liverpool, \textit{The Dock Worker} (Liverpool, 1951), pp. 95–96.
to influence the implementation of proclaimed organizational goals.15

All organizations need to integrate their various activities into one operating whole.16 This function is partially fulfilled by the organizational head. Since integrating is a managerial role, it follows that managers and not experts will head organizations. We shall return to this point.

Organizations Are Monocratic

As noted above, bureaucratic organizations have one center of authority.17 This is one of the important characteristics which differentiate bureaucracies from feudal regimes.18 This does not mean that all activities are directed from one center. Authority is often delegated. Organizations can be compared with respect to the degree to which authority is centralized. But even in decentralized organizations there is one center of authority where final decisions are made and conflicts among lower authorities can be resolved. The monocratic structure is one of the more important reasons why bureaucracies are considered as the most effective form of organization. Such a structure enables the top central authority, which is often strongly committed to the organizational goals, to retain control of much of the organizational activity.

On the basis of existing theory, then, one would hold three expectations: (a) Managers have the major (line) authority whereas experts deal with secondary activities, and therefore have only limited (staff) authority. (b) Institutional heads have to be manager oriented because their role is a role of system integration. If an expert-oriented person were to hold this role, the system would be alienated from its goals and might even eventually disintegrate because some functions would be overemphasized while others would be neglected. (c) Organizational goals can be maintained more effectively in organizations with one center of authority.

15See Philip Selzick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, 1957).
The rest of this paper will be devoted to an attempt to show that these generalizations apply to some organizations but not to others.

**THE PRIVATE BUSINESS: AN AFFIRMATION**

The organizational goal of private business is to make profits. The major means are production and exchange. While experts deal with various aspects of the production and exchange process, that is, with means such as engineering, labor relations, quality control, and marketing, the manager is the one who co-ordinates the various activities in such a way that the major organizational goal will be maximized. Profit making is his responsibility. That seems to be one of the reasons why modern corporations prefer to have people with administrative experience as top executives rather than former specialists such as engineers. In a study of the chief executives of American industry in 1950 administration was found to be the principal occupation of 43.1 per cent; finance the field of only 12.4 per cent; 11.8 per cent were defined as entrepreneurs; and only 12.6 per cent had been engineers.\(^{19}\) People with scientific background such as research workers are even less likely to become heads of private business. Only about 4 per cent of the presidents of American corporations had such a background.\(^{20}\) Corporations have different types of heads at different periods in their life cycle. But the heads are usually not experts at any period.

In general the goals of private business are consistent with managerial orientations. The economic goals of the organization and the bureaucratic orientations of the managerial role have in common the orientation toward rational use of means and development of rational procedures to maximize goals which are considered as given.\(^{21}\) The social and cultural conditions that support modern economic activities also support modern administration.

When people with strong expert orientations take over the managerial role of the institutional head, a conflict between the organizational goals and the expert orientation can be predicted. The case described in *Executive Suite*, where the design engineer with strong craftsman commitments takes over the presidency of a private cor-

---


poration, should be considered atypical.\textsuperscript{22} Usually commitment to professional values runs counter to the economic values of the organization.\textsuperscript{23}

Homans reports an interesting case in which the influence of the experts was greater than it is in most corporations.\textsuperscript{24} He discusses an electrical equipment company, which was owned, managed, and staffed by engineers. Management, which was in the hand of manager-oriented engineers, suffered from pressure toward professional values from the design engineers. The design engineers in the eyes of management were "prima donnas" and "temperamental," terms often used by management to describe experts. Furthermore, they were indifferent "to the general welfare of the company", that is, to profit making, as "shown by their lack of concern with finance, sales, and the practical needs of the consumer and by their habit of spending months on an aspect of design that had only theoretical importance." This caused considerable tension between the managerial and expert-oriented groups, tension to which this company was especially sensitive because of its high dependence on expert work and the special structure of ownership. A power struggle resulted, ending with a clearer subordination of the design engineers (staff) to the managerial engineers (line). This was mandatory "if the company was to survive and increase its sales," as Homans puts it. The treasurer (a nonexpert in this context) became the most influential member of the new management. In short, in a corporation where the experts had a strong power position, the existence of the organization was threatened, considerable internal tension was generated, and finally the organizational structure was changed toward a more usual structure with a clearer subordination of the experts. In other words, the organizational authority structure was made more compatible with the goals of the organization. Manager orientations and the institutional goals of private business seem to match. When an expert orientation dominates, this is dysfunctional to the organizational purposes.

\textsuperscript{23}See Thorstein Veblen, \textit{The Engineers and the Price System} (New York, 1921), esp. pp. 70-81.
\textsuperscript{24}George C. Homans, \textit{The Human Group} (New York, 1950), pp. 369-414.
AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

To sum up, the study of private business as an organization can be seen as an affirmation of the three generalizations of organizational theory presented above. Managers direct the major goal activities and have the major authority; experts deal with means and are in minor and subordinated authority positions. The organizational heads are manager oriented, and there is only one internal center of authority. All business organizations studied, including such decentralized organizations as General Motors and Bata seem to have one center of authority.\(^{25}\)

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: A NEGATIVE CASE

The rest of this paper will be devoted to an examination of the relations between goals and authority structure in professional organizations from the three points of view discussed above. An attempt will be made to show that the three generalizations do not apply and therefore can no longer be seen as valid generalizations of organizational theory. The assumption of universal applicability seems to have been made initially because organizational theory was developed mainly on the basis of observation and analysis of governmental and private business bureaucracies. Although it cannot be demonstrated here, we would like to suggest that it is doubtful whether the generalizations apply to political organizations such as parties and trade unions, to religious organizations such as churches and monasteries, and to many other organizations.\(^{26}\)

Professional Organizations—Definition

Professional organizations are organizations whose major goal is to institutionalize knowledge and to sustain its creation. Knowledge is created in research organizations (such as the Rand Corpo-


ration), spread in schools, created and spread in universities, and applied in hospitals. Knowledge is also created and institutionalized in organizations other than professional ones, but only in professional organizations are these functions the predominant goals.

Staff and Line in Professional Organizations

We would like to suggest that in professional organizations the staff-expert line-manager correlation, insofar as such a correlation exists at all, is reversed. Although manager orientations are suitable for the major goal activities in private business, the major goal activity of professional organizations is, in its nature, expertness. Managers in professional organizations are in charge of secondary activities; they administer means to the major activity carried out by experts. In other words, if there is a staff-line relationship at all, experts constitute the line (major authority) structure and managers the staff. Managers give advice about the economic and administrative implications of various activities planned by the professionals. The final internal decision is, functionally speaking, in the hands of the various professionals and their decision-making bodies. The professor decides what research he is going to undertake and to a large degree what he is going to teach; the physician determines what treatment should be given to the patient.

Administrators may raise objections to planned activities. They may point out that a certain drug is too expensive or that a certain teaching policy will decrease the number of students in a way that endangers the financing of a university. But functionally the professional is the one to decide whether to accept these limitations on his discretion and whether the administrator is right in bringing up his limited point of view. It is of interest to note that some of the complaints usually launched against experts in private business are launched against administrators in professional organizations: they are said to lose sight of the major function of the organization in pursuit of their specific limited responsibilities. Experts in private business are sometimes criticized as being too committed to science, craftsmanship, and abstract ideas; administrators in professional organizations are deplored because they are too committed to their specialties — efficiency and economy.

\textsuperscript{27}Spreading and applying knowledge are the two major dimensions of the process of institutionalization of knowledge.
Many of the sociological characteristics of experts and managers in private business cannot be found in professional organizations. Experts enter professional organizations younger and at lower positions (namely, as students, research assistants, or interns) than managers do. Although the range of mobility of managers is usually relatively limited, a professional is more likely to reach the top position of the institutional head.

In private business overinfluence by experts threatens the realization of organizational goals, sometimes even the organization's existence. In professional organizations overinfluence by the administration is considered as ritualization of means, undermining the goals for which the organization has been established, and endangering the conditions under which knowledge can be created and institutionalized (as for instance, academic freedom).

_Institutional Heads—A Role Conflict_

The role of the institutional head in professional organizations constitutes a dilemma. It is a typical case of institutionalized role conflict. On the one hand the role should be in the hand of an expert in order to ensure that the orientation of the head will match organizational goals. An expert at the head of the authority structure will mean that expert activity is recognized as the major goal activity and that the needs of professionals will be more likely to receive understanding attention. On the other hand organizations have functional requisites that are unrelated to their specific goal activity. Organizations have to obtain funds to finance their activities, recruit personnel to staff the various functions, and allocate the funds and personnel which have been recruited. Organizational heads must know how to keep the system integrated by giving the right amount of attention and funds to the various organizational needs, including secondary needs. An expert may endanger the integration of the professional organization by over-

---

On this concept, see N. Gross, W. S. Manson, and A. W. McEackern, _Explorations in Role Analysis_ (New York, 1958); Melvin Seeman, Role Conflict and Ambivalent Leadership, _American Sociological Review_ , 18 (1953), 373–380; S. A. Stouffer and J. Toby, Role Conflict and Personality, _American Journal of Sociology_ , 56 (1951), 395–406.


emphasizing the major goal activity, neglecting secondary functions, and lacking skill in human relations. Thus the role of head of professional organizations requires two incompatible sets of orientations, personal characteristics, and aptitudes. If the role is performed by either a lay administrator or a typical expert, considerable organizational strain can be expected.

So far the organizational needs have been discussed. The severity of the dilemma is increased because of the motivational structure of typical experts. Most successful experts are not motivated to become administrators. Some would refuse any administrative role, including that of university president or hospital chief, because of their commitment to professional values and professional groups and because they feel that they would not be capable of performing the administrative role successfully. Even those professionals who would not reject the distinguished and powerful role of organizational head avoid the administrative roles that are training grounds and channels of mobility to these top positions. Thus many academicians refuse to become deans and try to avoid if possible the role of department chairman. Those who are willing to accept administrative roles are often less committed to professional values than their colleagues.31 The same can be said about administrative appointments in hospitals. Thus, for instance, in the mental hospital studied by Stanton and Schwartz the role of administrative psychiatrist is fulfilled at the beginning of the training period. It is considered an undesirable chore that must be endured before turning to the real job. Psychiatrists who complete their training tend to withdraw to private practice. From other studies, especially those of state mental hospitals, it appears that those who stay are often less competent and less committed to professional values than those who leave.32

Institutional Heads—Some Functional Solutions

There are various functional solutions to this dilemma. By far the most widespread one is the rule of the semiexpert. The semi-expert is a person who combines an expert background and education with a managerial personality and role. Goal as well as means activities seem to be handled best when such a person is the insti-

31Gouldner, Cosmopolitans and Locals.
32Ivan Belknap, Human Problems of a State Mental Hospital (New York, 1956).
tutional head. Because of his personal characteristics he is likely to be skilled in handling the needs and requests of his former colleagues as well as those of the administrative staff.

There are two major sources of semiexperts. One is the experts themselves. Some professionals feel that they have little chance of becoming outstanding experts in their field. Often the same people find that they are relatively more skilled in administrative activities. Thus they gravitate toward administrative jobs by participating on committees and taking minor administrative roles, and some eventually become top administrators. In contrast to the popular belief, most university presidents seem to be former experts. Wilson found that out of the 30 universities he studied 28 had presidents who had been professors, albeit none a very eminent scholar. It seems that academicians who are inclined to take administrative jobs or are organization oriented, not only publish less in quantity and quality after they have entered administrative positions, but also tended to publish less before they accepted such jobs.

Of the heads of mental hospitals cited in a recent study, 74.2 per cent are physicians. Although there is no study on their professional eminence as compared to that of private practitioners, there is reason to believe that the heads of mental hospitals do not include the most successful psychiatrists. Only about 22 per cent of the heads of general hospitals are physicians. Where these are full-time jobs, the statement made about the heads of mental hospitals seems to apply here also. Although about 90 per cent of elementary and high-school principals have been teachers, it has been pointed out that a poor teacher who occupies himself with administrative action is more likely to be promoted than a successful, child-focused teacher.

60L. Block, Ready Reference of Hospital Facts, Hospital Topics, 34 (April 1956), p. 23. From statistics quoted by E. A. Kennard one seems warranted in concluding that out of 39 mental hospitals studied the heads of 35 were psychiatrists. See M. Greenblatt, D. J. Levinson, and R. H. Williams, eds., The Patient and the Mental Hospital (Glencoe, 1957), p. 45.
63This point has been made by J. Ben-David in private communication with the author. Some indirect evidence is supplied in J. Ben-David, "The Professions and the
The second source of semiexperts is special training agencies. In recent years there has been a movement toward developing more and more specialized administrators, such as hospital administrators and educational administrators, and lately it has been suggested that research administrators be trained. Twelve per cent of heads of short-term general hospitals, 10.9 per cent of long-term general hospitals, and 6.5 per cent of mental hospitals are graduates of such courses. Furthermore, a considerable number of teachers return to universities to take courses in administrative education before they become school principals.

The advantages of specialized administrators over lay administrators are obvious. They are trained for their peculiar role and have considerable understanding of the organization in which they are about to function before they enter it. They are sensitized to the special tension of working with professionals, and they share some of their professional values. On the other hand they are less prepared for their role than semiexperts from the first source, who have a deeper indoctrination with professional values, command more professional respect, and have more social ties with professionals than the semiexperts produced in university courses. It is therefore of interest that the first type of semiexpert is much more common than the second type. This may be due to the fact that such administrators have been trained only recently and that it takes time for these new trainees to work their way up in the various organizations. But it could also be explained partially by the fact that the first type is more functional.

A third way of solving the dilemma is found when an expert board nominates and supervises a lay administrator who runs the organization. Thus expert and managerial goals are taken into account, yet segregated with reference to individuals. The arrangement, which is the way most proprietary hospitals are run, seems to function relatively more effectively when those who are on the board constitute a large proportion of the professional staff of the organization. The major reason why this arrangement seems to be quite rare is that it means that the professionals must take financial

---


Block, op. cit.
and administrative responsibilities for the organization — responsibilities which they often are not in a position or not inclined to take.

It is important to distinguish between an institutional head and an institutional figurehead. Since the institution needs legitimation in the eyes of the personnel, clients, and community, and this legitimation has to be of a professional type, there is a tendency to nominate as institutional head a well-known expert. Although this means in some cases that an expert takes over control of the organization, much more frequently it means that an expert is lost and becomes a semiexpert (see the discussion of role adaptation) or that the expert is the figurehead and some other person actually has primary authority. In this analysis we are referring to the real and not the nominal institutional head.\textsuperscript{40}

\textit{Lay Administrators}

Although most professional organizations are controlled by experts or semiexperts of one type or another, some professional organizations are controlled by lay administrators. By lay administrators we mean administrators who have no training in the major goal activities of the organization. This holds for 2 out of the 30 universities studied by Wilson, for less than 10 per cent of schools, for 20.5 per cent of the mental hospitals, and for about 38 per cent of the general hospitals.\textsuperscript{40}

The strain created by lay administrators in professional organizations has been discussed above. When the hierarchy of authority is in adverse relation to the hierarchy of values, there is always a danger that the hierarchy of values will be reversed. Of course there are many other factors which may have such a distorting influence; all that is suggested here is that lay administrators are more likely to cause strain than are other administrators.

The major function of mental hospitals is to cure the patient; however, mental hospitals are often custodial institutions which serve as places to keep the patients so that they will not endanger

\textsuperscript{40}For an interesting case of such a situation and its consequence for the problems discussed here, see M. Greemblatt, R. H. York, and E. L. Brown, \textit{From Custodial to Therapeutic Patient Care in Mental Hospitals} (New York, 1955), pp. 42–43.

\textsuperscript{40}See notes 34 and 35.
or disturb the society. Although some custodial activities are an essential part of the means that the mental hospital has to apply in order to fulfill its therapeutic function, there is a constant danger that the means will become a major focus of its activities. Thus a mental patient will be transferred from closed to open ward, not when it is best for his recovery, but when it is most convenient for the staff or when he will be the smallest nuisance to the community if he escapes. As has been pointed out in a number of studies, the therapeutic goals seem to be what Selznick termed "precarious values."

A similar strain seems to exist in some general hospitals. Overmanagement can occur when the administrator forgets that the chief purpose of the hospital is to care for the sick. Some hospitals are so bound down with "red tape" that professional care is handicapped by multiplicity of documentation, compilation of unimportant statistics and unwarranted restriction upon the discretion of the professional and technical staff.

A similar distortion of the relation between goals and means seems to occur in some vocational schools. These schools are established in order to train pupils in vocations which they will pursue in later years, but the predominant function of the institutions is often to keep teenagers off the street. As long as they fulfill this function, little attention is paid to the quality of the teachers, the adequacy of the equipment, and the relation between the vocations which the school teaches and those which the market can absorb.

Universities constitute a more complicated case. Whereas in the two cases discussed above the legitimate function is neglected and emphasis is put on means, here the dilemma is different. A secondary goal threatens to become the major goal. Although there is some controversy as to what constitute the primary and what the

---

41 See Greenblatt, York, and Brown, op. cit., and M. Greenblatt, D. J. Levinson, and R. H. Williams, eds., The Patient and the Mental Hospital (Glencoe, 1957), esp. p. 320.
42 Selznick, op. cit., pp. 119–133. For an interesting case study which deals with this problem in another professional organization, see B. R. Clark, Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity (Berkeley, 1956).
44 A nonscientific but quite insightful discussion of this problem in vocational schools is included in E. Hunter's novel, Blackboard Jungle (New York, 1956).
secondary goals of outstanding universities, it seems fair to conclude that a majority of the members of professional communities would see research as primary and teaching as secondary. This is well reflected in the prestige and promotion systems. But there is constant danger that the university will respond to pressures to give more money and attention to teaching and less to research.

There are many sources for these conflicting strains. Some values seem to be more precarious than others to begin with. Professionals themselves may generate such pressures; for example, some physicians see in the hospital a research institution and try to refuse or to discharge uninteresting cases. The community in the form of the alumni association, the chamber of commerce, and the board of trustees is another source of these strains. But the head of the institution has a strategic position in this important institutional conflict. If he is in sympathy with the primary institutional goals, he can do much to neutralize the conflicting pressures and to mobilize the forces that support the primary institutional goals. If he himself joins those who try to give primacy to secondary goals, or ritualize means, or introduce illegitimate goals (as when, for instance, profit making becomes the primary goal of a hospital or patients who are mentally or physically ill are made to do the aides' work), the probability that the institutional goals will be distorted becomes very great indeed. Professional institutions are characterized by the fact that they cater to values which are usually upheld by the professional. Hence a lay administrator with a strong bureaucratic orientation seems to be more likely to endanger the professional goals than a semiexpert or an expert-oriented institutional head.

Center of Authority

Line and staff analysis as well as bureaucratic theory assumes that there is one major structure of authority (the line). It may be very complicated and have many branches but it always has one

---


"For a case study of such a pressure, see Hans L. Zetterberg, "A College for Adults" (forthcoming).

center of authority where final decisions are made and conflicts can be resolved. The main authority line is directly related to the primary goal activity of the organization and only indirectly to secondary (means) activities.

In professional organizations there seems to be no line in such a sense. This has been pointed out before, and it has been suggested that this means that professional organizations have a functional structure of authority. As Moore has pointed out, this concept is far from being a clear one. It usually refers to the fact that low-level actors are subordinated to two or more authorities at a time, each authority being responsible for a limited area of action. The hospital, for instance, has been cited as an organization with two lines of authority, one professional and one administrative, and therefore it is suggested that it be seen as a functional organization.

We would like to suggest that in professional organizations there are indeed two types of authority but only the nonprofessional one is structured in a bureaucratic way with a clear line and center of authority. Various department heads (office, custodians, campus police, hospital kitchen, and the like) are subordinated to the administrative director and through him (in smaller institutions, directly to) the head of the organization. This line is responsible mainly for secondary activities. Thus we suggest that in professional organizations the staff, or personnel performing secondary activities, are administrators, clerks, and laborers and that this is the only part of the organization which has a clear line structure. The professionals who conduct the major goal activity do not form an authority structure in the regular sense of the term.

As far as research is concerned, each faculty member is to a very large extent free from any direct control by superiors. This holds to a large degree for the substance of his teaching as well. The physician's absolute authority over the treatment given to his

---


50 H. L. Smith, Two Lines of Authority Are One Too Much, Modern Hospital, 84 (1955), 54–64. See also J. Henry, The Formal Structure of a Psychiatric Hospital, Psychiatry, 17 (1954), 139–151.
patient is a well-known fact. Teachers in elementary and secondary schools are more closely supervised than university professors. There are visits in the classrooms and prescribed textbooks. But this supervision is far more lax and limited than any line supervision in industry, for instance. It is of special interest to note that principals try to avoid as much as possible their obligation to supervise the teachers. Principals devote, according to one study, 57.7 per cent of their time to administrative work, 26.6 to clerical work, and only 13.3 to supervision. In short, while there is an administrative line in professional organizations for secondary activities, there is no clear line in the major goal activities and to a large degree each professional is left to rely on his judgement, that is, he has final authority.

Of course, there are many other sources of control than line orders and direct supervision of performance. For example, a great variety of rewards and sanctions encourage conformity; informal pressures are exerted by peers and others. But most of these mechanisms function also in nonprofessional organizations in addition to supervision, so that one can say that there is less control in professional organizations than in other organizations. Moreover, as far as the major goal activity is concerned, such control does not take the form of a clear hierarchy with superiors who issue orders and require performance reports. This does not hold to the same extent for students, research assistants, and interns who have a status similar to semiprofessionals and are not part of the collegiate organizational structure.

There are three areas of activity in professional organizations: (a) major goal activities carried out by professionals and almost completely under the authority of the professional who performs the activity or directs the semiprofessionals and nonprofessionals who perform it, (b) secondary activities performed by administrators and nonprofessional personnel under their control, and (c) secondary activities performed by the professionals. The latter include writing reports, preparing statistics, participating in public relations activities, and allocating facilities. In this third area there is sometimes a clear hierarchy and administrative predomi-

nance, and therefore there is room to misunderstand the nature of the professional organization and to see the professionals as part of an administrative line structure. But as far as a hierarchy exists in this realm, it is limited to what are primarily secondary activities; as far as the main goal activities are concerned, there is considerable autonomy. In other words the professional organizations are service organizations for professionals, who follow in the organizational contexts the values which as professionals they are committed to, namely, professional autonomy and immunity.

It is of interest to note that Weber suggested that the basis of bureaucratic authority is technical knowledge.\textsuperscript{52} Parsons distinguished two types of authority: power authority (the power of a clerk over a subordinated clerk or over a client) and authority of knowledge (the authority of the professional private practitioner over his client).\textsuperscript{53} There seems to be a basic incompatibility between expert orientation and bureaucratic orientation. This is circumvented in private business and in some other organizations by giving the expert functional autonomy in a limited area while subordinating him in major goal activities and decisions. In professional organizations this solution would be dysfunctional to the organizational goals. Therefore a different authority structure is constructed. Professional organizations are turned into service organizations to individuals and teams of professionals. The limited lines of authority which exist are mainly devoted to secondary activities involving service personnel and the service (nonprofessional) activities of the professionals.

STAFF AND LINE IN DIFFERENT PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Goal Structure

Professional organizations also differ considerably from the point of view of the relationships between goals and authority structure. One important factor is the goals themselves. The creation of knowledge seems to require more institutionalization of professional values than does the spreading of knowledge. This is one reason why academic freedom is more institutionalized in univer-

\textsuperscript{52} Weber, op. cit., pp. 335, 337.

sities than in other schools. The application of knowledge seems to enjoy as much, if not more, institutionalized protection than the creation of knowledge, but for different reasons. Creation requires freedom in order not to limit the inquiry. Application requires immunity in order to protect the practitioners from the consequences of unsuccessful applications. Thus from the point of view of goals, universities and hospitals are closer to the ideal type of professional organization than schools.

There are interesting differences among general and mental hospitals in this respect. The general hospital's status as a therapeutic organization is well established and therefore in general it has the required freedom and immunity. It can afford to have laymen as its head, semiprofessionals as its major personnel, and professionals imported from the outside. The mental hospital legitimation is less established for the clientele as well as for the semiprofessional staff.\(^4\) Therefore the incorporation of the professional into the structure of the organization itself is functionally required.

**Externalization versus Internalization**

Another important differentiating factor is the division of labor between the professional organization and other organizations. All organizations rely to some degree for the fulfillment and regulation of some of their functions on other organizations and collectivities.\(^5\) The point of interest here is which functions are handled by the professional organization and which are externalized. The more that professional functions are internalized, and administrative functions are externalized, the closer the organization comes to the ideal type of professional organization. Thus the school is from this perspective a highly professional organization. It has few administrative problems to begin with because it is not a total institution.\(^6\) It relies considerably on families, community, social workers, police, and others to administer most of the nonprofessional needs of its clients. Hospitals, on the other hand, have to take care of most of the nonprofessional needs of their patients.

---


\(^5\)See March and Simon, *op. cit.*, pp. 70–76.

Most of the professionals (physicians) are not part of the staff. Hospitals therefore have a much higher percentage of nonprofessional staff and many more administrative problems. Universities are from this viewpoint similar to schools. Boarding schools, on the other hand, are very different in their personnel structure and administrative problems because they are total institutions.

Research organizations are highly professional considering their goal of creation of knowledge. Their structure differs considerably in terms of the externalization versus the internalization of nonprofessional functions. Some research organizations are incorporated into university structures to a high degree, as for instance the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California. These research organizations usually serve mainly as service organizations to professionals (supply space, secretaries, and statistical clerks) with only a limited research policy of their own. Other research organizations are relatively more independent and have to finance their activities themselves, as for instance the Stanford Research Institute. This type usually has a stronger administrative policy.

On the other end of the continuum are research organizations that are incorporated in nonprofessional and even authoritarian organizations such as the armed forces. As several interesting studies show, there seems to be considerable confusion in the structure of these research organizations. Military principles of organi-

---

57In a study which compares two types of hospitals we see that English hospitals under local authority which employ medical staff are administered by medical superintendents, whereas voluntary hospitals which do not employ any full-time medical senior personnel are administered by lay administrators. See C. Sofer, Reactions to Administrative Change, Human Relations, 8 (1955), 291–316.

58The hospitals discussed here are “regular,” cure-oriented hospitals. The more the hospital serves additional professional goals—as, for instance, teaching and research—the more it will tend to internalize professionals and become administered by M.D.s. See Burling, op. cit., pp. 76–77.

59On the organizational structure of boarding schools, see the author’s The Organizational Structure of “Closed” Educational Institutions in Israel, Harvard Educational Review, 27 (1957), 107–125.


zation and behavior are mixed with professional ones.\textsuperscript{62} Strict observation of the protocol of the military hierarchy is demanded in some situations, and professional collegial relations are encouraged in others. The heads of many research organizations in the United States armed forces are experts or semiexperts. This can be explained in part by the fact that, although these research units are total organizations on the one hand, they rely to a large degree on other military units for supply and regulation of many of their nonprofessional needs on the other hand.\textsuperscript{63} Thus administrative problems are minimized.

Of special interest from this point of view is a study which examines the effect of nationalization on the organizational structure of hospitals in England.\textsuperscript{64} The study shows that, when administrative responsibilities were taken over by higher-level administrative units, the heads of single hospitals became more professionally oriented. This can be compared to the relationships between the superintendent's office and the school principal. As more administrative tasks are taken over by the superintendent, the principal can devote more time and energy to his professional function: improving the quality of teaching.

\textit{Mono versus Multiple Professions}

A third factor which impinges on the balance between professionals and administrators and on the relationship between this balance and the process of goal implementation is the number of professions co-operating in one organization and their mutual attitudes. The greater the number and the stronger the tensions among the various professions, the greater is the need for a neutral administrator as final authority. The grammar school is from this point of view on one end of the continuum, with one professional group, the teachers. The university is on the other end, with a large number of professions. When there is strong rivalry among various


\textsuperscript{63}It is reported that of 20 laboratories studied all the heads were expert oriented. See H. Baumgarten, Leadership Style as a Variable in Research Administration, \textit{Administrative Science Quarterly}, 2 (1957), 347; see also C. Shepard and P. Brown, \textit{ibid.}, 1 (1956), 345--346; and McEwen, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 220--221.

\textsuperscript{64}See Sofer, \textit{op. cit.}, esp. p. 299.
groups of faculty, as for instance between humanities and natural sciences, a layman is often more functional as a university president than a professional. In general the university administrator functions often as an arbitrator among different professional groups (departments). There is of course the danger, as in the political realm, that the administrator will create an alliance with one "party," but this seems to be rare because there are usually many small "parties" rather than two camps and alliance with one of them would not give the administrator too much help.

Hospitals are in the middle of the continuum. General hospitals are closer to the school from this point of view because they are dominated by one profession. Mental hospitals are closer to the universities because of their multiprofessional nature, with an uneasy dominance by psychiatrists. The overlapping functions of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and physical therapists, as well as the different schools of treatment, make a neutral administrator and administration highly functional in some mental hospitals.

Private versus Public Organizations

One of the most important dimensions along which further study of the problems discussed here has to be developed is the question of the ownership of the professional organizations and the ways they are financed. Many professional organizations are financed partially through contributions or from tax money, and clients' fees play very different roles in the various organizations. In some cases they have no role at all; in others they are dominant criteria for action. Another aspect of the same problem is the way the professionals are rewarded. In some cases they are paid salaries, in others fees, by the organization or by the clients. These factors impinge on the relationships between the administrators and the professionals because they determine to a considerable degree who is representing the profit goal of the organization.

From the viewpoint of professional goals, the distorting potentials of a lay administrator seem to be highest in those "private" organizations where professionals are salaried. On the other hand,

---

in those public organizations where the professionals are not salaried and the administrators represent public interests, the distorting potential may be minimized. Between these two poles exists a whole gamut of alternatives, which have yet to be explored.

CONCLUSION

The relationship between organizational goals and authority structures has been discussed from the standpoint of the influence of authority orientations on goal implementation. The application of three generalizations of administrative theory to professional organizations has been examined: (a) It has been suggested that in professional organizations staff and line concepts, to the degree that they can be applied at all, have to be reversed. The major (line) goal activity is carried out by experts. Managers have staff functions, that is, serve the major goal activities. (b) Institutional heads are either experts, semiexperts (former experts or specialized administrators), or lay administrators. It seems that the most functional heads from the point of view of organizational goals are the semiexperts. Whether former experts or specialized administrators are preferable has to be determined by further research and experience.

Professional organizations are monocratic organizations only with regard to service activities. The authority structure of the major goal activities is highly dispersed. To a large extent the final authority over research, substance of teaching, and therapy is in the hands of the individual professional. Thus professional organizations are either service institutions to professionals who are not an integral part of the organization, or service organizations in which professionals function with a high degree of self-determination.