

**BUREAUCRATIZATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION :
THE DIVISION OF LABOUR
AND OCCUPATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

Jacqueline S. Ismael*

Among the various ways of organizing, articulating and integrating diverse occupations for the attainment of broad social, political or economic goals, the bureaucratic model and the professional model are the dominant types in Western society. In this sense, I am using the concept of occupational models as social mechanisms that coordinate and integrate divisions of labor along some characteristic patterns of authority, power and communication for the attainment of explicit or implicit goals. Professional and bureaucratic models represent explicit goal orientation. These models are, of course, ideal types in the Weberian sense—accentuations of dominant characteristics. The two models abstract the structural and social patterns of occupational organization, while the concepts of bureaucratization and professionalization connote processes of change along the dimensions of the respective model. The two models, and the corresponding processes, have been considered distinct, somewhat antithetical models of occupational organization.¹ This paper will examine the issue of just how antithetical they are by comparing them in terms of the underlying phenomenon of rationalization.

BUREAUCRACY AND BUREAUCRATIZATION

Max Weber posited the concept of bureaucracy to explain the increasing rationalization of administrative practice in Western society. He outlined the attributes of a bureaucracy as : (1) a clear-cut division of labor, (2) hierarchical authority, (3) a system of explicit rules and regulations defining responsibility and standardizing performance, (4) a spirit of "formalistic impersonality," (5) employment based on seniority and/or achievement.⁽²⁾ Most of these are structural characteristics in the sense that they refer to the differentiation of social positions along various

*Professor of Sociology at the Univ. of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

lines.(3) Since Weber's time, the exact constellation of characteristics has been a matter of debate among organizational sociologists. This debate has emerged because ideal types in the Weberian sense represent substantive conclusions rather than methodological tools. Thus, empirical researchers have had to recast Weber's analytical categories as a system of inter-related variables,(4) with the result that emphasis has shifted on various combinations. In reviewing the literature, Richard Hall documented the various sets of characteristics emphasized :

- Hierarchy of authority
- Division of labor
- Technically competent participants
- Procedural devices for work situations
- Rules governing behavior of positional incumbents
- Limited authority of office
- Differential rewards by office
- Inpersonality of personal contact
- Administration separate from ownership
- Emphasis on written communication
- Rational discipline.(5)

Bureaucratization has been conceptualized as the process of moving along a continuum from non-bureaucratic to bureaucratic—as changing structural organization along the dimensions of the above characteristics, or some subset of these characteristics.(6) as an historical process, bureaucratization began with the Industrial Revolution and the growth of large-scale economic enterprises which resulted in the “increasing sub-division of the functions which the owner-managers of the early enterprises had performed personally in the course of their daily routine.”(7) While the phenomena of bureaucratic organization—i.e., of hierarchical authority structure, an administrative staff, and the differential rewards according to office—have widespread historical precedence according to Weber, rationalization of bureaucracy—limited objectives (i.e., explicit goal orientation), segmental participation (participation in an organization based on a mutual limited agreement), a performance emphasis (reward dependent on quantity or quality of work) and compensatory rewards (members of higher authority distribute rewards to members of lower authority in return for participation)—is peculiar to Western society from the period of the Industrial Revolution.(8)

The peculiar form of bureaucratization in the West, posited Max Weber, was the direct result of the process of rationalization of life, particularly economic life.(9) By rational social action (in Weber's terms, zweckrational) Weber meant a mode of action

. . .in terms of rational orientation to a system of discrete individual ends, that is, through expectations as to the behaviour of objects in the external situation and of other human individuals, making use of these expectations as 'conditions' or 'means' for the successful attainment of the actor's own rationally chosen ends.(10)

Talcot Parsons suggests that in Weber's usage of the term zweckrational, an English translation of 'expediency' is adequate.(11)

Zweckrational action weighs the ends, the means and the secondary results. In contrast to the absolute ends of wertrational action, alternative ends can be seen as arranged in order of urgency of subjective wants. Actions based on considerations of pure self-interest, then typify the zweckrational orientation. Devoid of any normative basis, the means are deliberately adapted to situations to achieve the discrete self-interests of the actors. This type of orientation is most evident in economic life where means are oriented to the maximization of individual economic interests, providing a uniformity and continuity to attitudes and actions in economic life "far more stable than they would be if action were oriented to a system of norms and duties.

This type, with its clarity of self-consciousness and freedom from subjective scruples, is the polar antithesis of every sort of unthinking, acquiescence in customary ways, as well as, on the other hand, of devotion to norms consciously accepted as absolute values.(12)

As it has been applied in organization theory, the concept of rationalization has been variously used to imply the substitution of particularistic, ascriptive, affectively based decision-making for universalistic, goal-maximization criteria of decision making;(13) the routinization of tasks and uniformity of social relationships through formalization of procedures;(14) the reduction of uncertainty in decision-making through establishment of a hierarchy of authority and formal channels of communication, and through the curtailment of arbitrariness and unpredictability in decision-making by the formalization of roles, rules and procedures and

the institutionalization of explicit limited goals.(15) All these are related, reflecting differences in orientation rather than definition, and all derived more or less from Weber's definition of rational and his typology of a rational bureaucracy. Whatever the orientation, however, it is clear that rationalization is the phenomena underlying coordination of a systematic division of labor based upon functional specialization and structural differentiation. The process by which these elements become rationally coordinated has been dubbed bureaucratization.

PROFESSION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION

Max Weber did not specifically distinguished between the processes of bureaucratization and professionalization—seeing both as elements of the process of rationalization.(16) “The clear and uniform goal, of this (Calvinistic) asceticism was the disciplining and methodological organization of conduct. Its typical representative was the ‘man of a vocation’ or ‘professional,’ and its unique result was the rational organization of social relationships.(17) However, Weber did not give the concept of professions the same concise ideal-type treatment as he gave bureaucracy. Nevertheless, he linked professionalization directly to the rise of capitalism and bureaucracy: “This worldly asceticism as a whole favors the breeding and exaltation of the professionalism needed by capitalism and bureaucracy. Life is focused not on persons but on impersonal rational goals.”(18)

In his own work life, however, Weber adhered to an ideology of professionalism that emphasized a distinction between modes of rationality. This ideology was expressed in a series of journalistic publications on academic affairs appearing in his earlier years as an academic.(19) These articles were concerned with maintaining the autonomy of the academic profession against the encroachment of a growing state bureaucracy. Out of these articles emerges an impression of professional rationality quite different in nature from economic rationality.

Weber offered the conceptual distinction in his formulation of zweckrational and wertrational. Whereas zweckrational is a mode of action that may be considered expediency, wertrational is an

... orientation to an absolute value; involving a conscious belief in the absolute value of some ethical, aesthetic, religious, or other form of behaviour, entirely for its own sake and independently of any prospects of external success.(20)

The distinction between zweckrational and wertrational is an important one for it will ultimately emerge as a major distinction between professions and occupations that has been emphasized in the literature. "Examples of pure rational orientation to values," wrote Weber, "would be the action of persons who, regardless of possible costs to themselves, act to put into practice their convictions of what seems to be required by duty, honour, the pursuit of beauty, a religious call, personal loyalty . . . it always involves 'commands' or demands' to the fulfillment of which the actor feels obligated."(21) The more action is oriented to the attainment of certain values for their own sake, the less the actor is "influenced by considerations of the consequences of his action.(22)

Weber gave a rhetorical delineation of the wertrational orientation—the ultimate value—of the academic profession in his address on "Science as a Vocation":

Without this rare intoxication, ridiculed by others on the outside, without this passion, this feeling that 'thousands of years must pass before you enter into life and thousands more wait in silence'—depending on whether your interpretation was correct, science is not your vocation and you should do something else. For nothing is worthwhile for a human being as a human being which he cannot do with passionate devotion.(23)

Also, indicating the notion that science is an ultimate value is Weber's notion that one is "called to an academic career,"(24) and that the scholar pursues science "for its own sake" irrespective of its consequences.(25) Dedication to science, then, is the end in itself—the "ultimate goal" of wertrational action. The academic profession, according to Weber, makes up a type of "intellectual aristocracy,"(26) membership in which is (or should be) determined by great scientific or scholarly distinction.(27) The academic body, then, constitutes a "moral authority" that exercises power officially through its "moral weight."(28) From this moral authority derives a profession's sense of corporate solidarity.(29)

Weber defined a "corporate group" as a "social relationship which is either closed or limits admission of outsiders by rules."(30) The rules of membership in the academic profession, as pointed out above, were scientific or scholarly distinction. The chief characteristic of the corporate group is the existence of "a person or persons in authority whose action is concerned with carrying into effect the order governing the corporate

group.”(31) Although no organization of university teachers existed in Germany at the time of Weber’s writing, and therefore no constituted authority directed to enforcement of the terms of its order, Weber makes it clear that out of the traditions of German universities there arose the “probability that certain persons will act in such a way as to tend to carry out the order governing the group.”(32)

In fact, there were attempts at Weber’s time to establish an organization of university teachers. Weber himself strongly supported these efforts, considering that “an organization of university teachers with

. . . intelligent leadership could reawaken the sense of corporate pride of the next academic generation to offset the ‘practical point of view,’ and it could thereby contribute to the gradual reestablishment of the diminishing moral weight of the universities.(33)

‘The practical point of view’ that Weber saw as damaging the academic profession was the increasingly zweckrational orientation of professionals—of “persons, who, because the ‘market situation’ was ‘favourable’ to them, infringed on those self-evident rules (of collegueship and colleague evaluation) in order to ‘get ahead’ academically.”(34) This orientation to self-interest (for which Weber even uses the economic terminology of the market place) was not only endangering the moral authority and corporate solidarity of the academic profession, but was also compromising its autonomy and independence. The profession’s ability to control entrance into its ranks, its ability to define the criteria of entrance, and its monopoly over higher education through control of professional appointments and control over standards of competence was being lost to the state bureaucracy by the growing ranks of academic “operators”—those who put their self-interests above the interests of science and scholarship for purposes of professional advancement(35)—and by the growing system of patronage (both bureaucratic and professional) in academic appointments that was displacing objective standards of achievement.(36)

All of Weber’s major themes discussed above in relation to the academic profession subsequently emerge in the literature on the sociology of the professions as distinctive characteristics of professional occupations. To summarize them here briefly, what emerges from Weber’s journalistic articles on the academic profession is :

1. The profession as a moral community regulated by ultimate goals rather than self-interest.
2. Professional organization as a means of awakening professional consciousness, upgrading professional standards, enforcing professional ethics, and organizing professional pressure. (37)
3. The regulation of entrance into and promotion within the profession based on objective criteria of professional competence and achievement through colleague evaluation.(38)
4. The establishment and maintenance of professional autonomy and independence—i.e., the profession as a self-governing self-regulating body.(39)

Carr-Saunders and Wilson analytically, through a comparative, historical study, examined both structure and process in certain occupations to delineate the emergence of professions, to define those characteristics typical of a profession and to examine the role of professions in society. The occupations they chose to study were those that had not organized on the trade unions model, but were organized in terms of professional associations.(40)

The term profession is “no mere sociological abstraction” noted Carr-Saunders, but has been in use for many centuries to denote “certain vocations with peculiar characteristics.”(41) Law and medicine have long been recognized as the traditional professions, and these two vocations were examined in great historical detail to trace their emergence from the Middle Ages and their common characteristics. They are set forth as the “typical professions” whose complex of characteristics comprise the professional model of occupational organization(42)—ideal types in Weberian terms. Other occupations are then examined in the light of this model. What emerges is a view of a dynamic process in occupational life whereby diverse occupations are transforming in terms of the professional model. This process Carr-Saunders and Wilson call professionalism (and I shall call professionalization, the term used in current literature to denote the process). There emerges what we may consider a continuum of professionalization ranging from law and medicine, the typical professions which “exhibit all or most of these features (complex of characteristics)” (43) to non-professions which exhibit none of them (which Carr-Saunders and Wilson imply, but never explicitly state, are occupations which are

organized on the trade union model). All occupations, then, fall somewhere on this continuum on the basis of the possession of certain characteristics.

What is the "complex of characteristics" which connote a profession? The most important, according to Carr-Saunders and Wilson, is "the existence of specialized intellectual techniques, acquired as the result of prolonged training.

If we ask what are the characteristics of the techniques practised by the typical professions, we may perhaps say that they are founded upon a basic field of inquiry. In the academic world these fields are universally recognized, at least on the scientific side. Doctors, dentists, and veterinary surgeons study not merely the methods derived from biological inquiry but biology itself or at least certain of its branches. Dentists, for instance, do not merely learn how to put in fillings and make false teeth; they study general biology and in particular the structure, physiology, and pathology of teeth. Nurses and midwives, on the other hand, are concerned with the applications of science.(44)

Another important aspect of technique, however, apart from its quality or quantity which distinguishes a profession is the extent to which it arouses a sense of responsibility. "Practice which involves direct and personal relation to clients," noted Carr-Saunders "evoked a special feeling of responsibility, and on that account nurses and midwives make an advance."(45)

Other important characteristics of professions are :

1. Fixed fee remuneration where 'the amount paid for the service is known to, or is at least ascertainable by the client.'(46)
2. Professional associations that have as a main objective the testing of competence and maintenance of an ethical code.(47)

The significance of these characteristics is not readily apparent in isolation from the total social context. How they function as occupational determinants of the professional model, inter-relate with each other in the social environment, and relate to the social environment delineates the occupational and social roles of the professional model of work organization. I shall investigate these aspects here for each.

Specialized Intellectual Technique

The possession of specialized intellectual techniques was the earmark of the ancient professions of divinity, law and medicine. As Carr-Saunders and Wilson note, however, "some half-dozen professions provided all those skilled intellectual services upon which the day-to-day functioning of society depended."(48) This situation rapidly changed with the application of science to practical problems. The rapid emergence of new professions, professions organized around new specialized intellectual techniques, since the industrial revolution, has resulted. The process by which research facilitates the emergence of new professions has been summarized by Carr-Saunders and Wilson :

The interest in pure research, once aroused, does not fade away, and scientific investigation proceeds by its own momentum, making possible from time to time the origin of new professions. Chemistry began to be applied about the middle of the last century and physics within the present century; professional chemists and professional physicists thus came into being. Veterinary surgeons and dentists also arose to apply new arts made possible by the progress of research, and the sub-crafts in the engineering world originated in the same fashion.(49)

Science not only provides the specialized intellectual techniques of professions, but also is the basis of the changes in social and industrial organization which permit their application. "The engineers made possible large-scale industrial organizations."(50) Similarly, industrial reorganization results in large-scale social organization, and around government services are organized special intellectual techniques—merchant navy, mine managers.

The rise of institutional training is directly related to the development of specialized intellectual techniques and the concomitant proliferation of professional occupations. The change in the education of professionals from the guild-type apprenticeships of the Middle Ages to institutions of higher education occurred in the 19th Century. Professional education was first introduced through professional institutes—often institutes sponsored by the various professional associations in their attempts to upgrade professional competence. Institutionalized medical training, for example, originated in association with certain hospitals that offered demonstration techniques and instruction.(51) Out of this professional instruction grew new universities. As Carr-Saunders and Wilson point out :

Medical schools arose in the first half of the century; colleges of science, including chemistry and engineering, grew up in the second half; amalgamation took place, departments of dentistry and architecture were added—before or after incorporation as a university, which is the final step.(52)

The basis of this relationship between professional instruction and the rise of new universities is the professional need for theoretical instruction. The introduction of the modern examination system about mid-century as a method of insuring professional proficiency catalyzed the need for theoretical training in the subjects of examination.(53) The old apprenticeship methods, which emphasized practical training, proved inadequate to provide theoretical instruction. With the rise of universities as centers of professional training, some apprenticeship functions of practical training also became institutionalized—as in medicine. By the turn of the century, attendance at an approved place of instruction had become obligatory in most professions(54) and with few exceptions, the places of instruction were universities. Thus, institutionalized professional education, and the growth of modern universities, is intimately connected with the relationship between profession and theoretical knowledge.

Fiduciary Relationship

The professional-client relationship is based on the assumed competence of the professional and incompetence of the client to diagnose the nature of the required service and technical application of skills. Thus, it is in marked contrast to the supplier-customer relationship in business where the customer diagnoses his needs and selects the techniques for their satisfaction. In the professional-client relationship, the client must trust in the competence and integrity of the professional for he “places his health and his fortune in the hands of his professional advisers, and he entrusts them with confidences of an intimate and personal kind.”(55) Thus, the client is particularly susceptible to exploitation, and the professional bears a special responsibility to maintain high standards of skill and integrity.

Remuneration

The fiduciary nature of the professional-client relationship places restrictions on the method of charging. “It requires that the practitioner shall be financially disinterested in the advice he gives; or, at least, that the possibility of conflict between duty and self-interest shall be reduced to a minimum.”(56) The ideal of a profession, it is held, is devotion to calling

and not profit-making, as in business occupations. Thus, the commercial attitude is generally condemned in professions. "The mental attitude associated with profit-seeking," note Carr-Saunders and Wilson, "is felt to be incompatible with single-minded devotion to a professional calling." (57) This is similar to the basic distinction Weber makes between *zweckrational* and *wertrational* orientations in the academic profession.

Professional Associations

Carr-Saunders and Wilson laid great stress on the importance of professional associations in : (1) awakening professional consciousness, (2) raising professional standards, (3) regularizing professional services, (4) routinizing professional roles and relationships, (5) institutionalizing professional education. Indeed, according to them, "a profession can only be said to exist when there are bonds between the practitioners, and these bonds can take but one shape—that of formal association." (58) Among the original aims of professional association discussed by Carr-Saunders and Wilson are : (1) to promote study activities of the specialized technique which he identifies as the "incentive to association" (2) to distinguish the competent from the incompetent, (60) (3) to raise the standards of competence and improve the methods of testing them, (61) (4) to distinguish the honourable from the dishonourable—"hence the formulation of ethical codes." (62) These objectives all bear upon status and respectability of the occupation; in short, the attempt to make such occupations "gentlemanly" pursuits. In time, as Carr-Saunders and Wilson point out, however, "the emphasis changes from respectability and status to protection of interests. It became obvious that a relatively high level of remuneration implies a public recognition of status, and that the most certain way of attaining the latter is to press for the former." (63) The ultimate protective function was achieved in the form of a monopoly. In those professions where unrecognized practitioners are prohibited from practice—as in law, medicine, dentistry—the profession is closed to competition and encroachment. Even where closure has not been achieved—as in the case of architects, engineers, accountants—certain monopolistic advantages accrue in the maintenance of a professional register where it signifies the attainment of a certain level of qualifications to clients. Even where there is no register, the association may be so prestigious that membership in it attains recognition as a qualification. (64)

Carr-Saunders and Wilson conclude that the professional model of occupational organization is likely to spread as more and more occupa-

tions segregate out as applications of 'an intellectual technique to the ordinary business of life, acquired as the result of prolonged and specialized training.'"(65) The model, they contend, will even invade the business world as management itself becomes a professionalized occupation.(66) Professional influences and professional associations, then, will moderate competitiveness and self-interest, will imbue a sense of service and responsibility in the conduct of business, will imbue occupations with a sense of identity and pride through professional association, will stabilize society through the democratic process and egalitarian principles of professional association, will facilitate effective social participation through occupational groups, and above all, will bring knowledge to the service of power.(67) Carr-Saunders and Wilson, then, echo Weber in their considerations of the normative superiority of professional work. They imply, like Weber, that the fundamental difference between professional and business occupations is that of altruism versus self-interest.

Since Carr-Saunders and Wilson, much of the work on sociology of the professions has been primarily concerned with the attributes of professions (reworking the complex of characteristics offered by Carr-Saunders and Wilson), with professional socialization (particularly the many studies on medical socialization); or the institutional orders which have grown up around professional activities. Geoffrey Millerson, in reviewing the literature on the profession, identified 23 elements which have been included in various definitions of professions. The most essential, or recurrent, features of the definitions appeared to be : (a) A profession involves a skill based on theoretical knowledge; (b) The skill requires training and education; (c) The professional must demonstrate competence by passing a test; (d) Integrity is maintained by adherence to a code of conduct; (e) The service is for the public good; and (f) The profession is organized.(68)

These attempts to isolate the critical or core characteristics of a profession have been prompted, more or less, by the coinage of the concept of professionalization whereby occupations "come to exhibit a number of attributes which are essentially professional."(69) Vollmer and Mills suggest that 'the concept of a profession be applied to an abstract model of occupational organization, and that the concept of 'professionalization' be used to refer to the dynamic process whereby many occupations can be observed to change certain crucial characteristics in the direction of professions.'"(70) The continuum inferred by Carr-Saunders and Wilson is made explicit here and the task of isolating these "crucial characteris-

tics" of a profession is a contingency of the definition. The object of the concept of professionalization, of course, is the attempt to understand how occupations achieve professional status. The high status of professional occupations — both historically, and in modern society, as pointed out by Carr-Saunders and Wilson — has given rise to interest in how occupations enhance their status and prestige.

Rationalizing the Division of Labour

The over-emphasis on the uniqueness of professions as occupational groups, together with the lack of theoretically relating the characteristics of professions(as has been so systematically pursued in organizational sociology) has resulted in many insightful studies of professions but has not systematically related the professions to the division of labor in modern society. Since bureaucratization and professionalization are both phenomena associated with industrial society, to view them as antithetical may obscure their inter-relationships. By viewing both as mechanisms that rationally coordinate a systematic division of labor based upon functional specialization and structural differentiation, and seeking the explicit goals and characteristic patterns of authority, power and communication in each, we may better understand how both arise out of the rational division of labor—as Weber originally posited.

Most of the sociology of the professions has tended to focus on the very apex of authority, power, and prestige in the professional model of the division of labor — the professionals — viewing the attempt by other groups to gain status as the process of professionalization. However, as a coordinating mechanism I propose that we view professionalization as the process by which functional specialties and status differentiations are worked out in the professional model to reduce uncertainty both in areas of speciality and in lines of authority (which effectively establish status differences). While bureaucracies use the mechanism of internal rules and regulations, and a structuring of offices as a hierarchy of authority to coordinate functional specialties and establish lines of authority, the professional model uses the mechanism of socially sanctioned monopoly to both delineate its area of functional specialization and to establish the authority of the profession at the very apex of status differentiation — which is more directly related to role differentiation in the professional model than in the bureaucratic model.

Role differentiation in the bureaucratic model arises from explicit responsibilities of an office and can be horizontal as well as vertical. It does not necessarily imply status differentiation in the sense of hierarchical distinction in social position. This might be exemplified by an academic bureaucracy where the academic vice president and the finance vice president may share the same status structurally (although perhaps not the same power) but perform different roles as defined by the duties and responsibilities of their respective offices. Since in the bureaucratic model, roles and statuses are organizationally defined, and generally functionally specific to a particular organization, these may vary from organization to organization.

In the professional model, however, roles have been occupationally defined and socially sanctioned (where the profession has been successful in achieving this), with the result that definitions are generally not flexible. They imply differences in both status and authority in the division of labor coordinated to achieve a particular goal. This is exemplified by Carr-Saunders and Wilson's discussion of the history of medical professions in England. "At the beginning of the last century the medical profession was organized in a hierarchy with the physicians at the top, and below, in descending order of prestige, the three inferior grades of surgeons, apothecaries and even druggists." (71) The physicians were drawn from the upper classes and served these classes. It was the apothecaries, drawn from lower social ranks, who brought medical care to the population. In this case, and a similar struggle in the legal profession, Carr-Saunders notes that "the associations of these specialists, having attained great power and prestige, attempted to inhibit the development of general practitioners of law and medicine of whose services the public had need. When they could not prevent their appearance, they tried to keep them subservient"(72) In the end, the physicians were forced to compromise their exclusive position by admitting the apothecaries to their ranks. Together the apothecaries and physicians successfully closed the occupation to other encroachers through the Medical Act of 1858 which created a General Medical Council to "ensure that the unfit shall not get on to the register and to expunge the unworthy from it."(73)

Role definitions, then, have been important mechanisms in establishing lines of authority in the division of labor in the professional model. A more contemporary example of the importance of role definition has been provided by William Goode over the question of who defines the

role of the social psychologist — sociologists or psychologists ?(74) The point is that whoever defines the role sets the standards of qualifications to practice that role and the position of that role vis-a-vis related roles—in other words, it establishes power relationships. To return briefly to the example of medicine, the ability of the medical profession to define the role of a doctor has effectively resulted in establishing the medical profession at the apex of health-care oriented occupations, with all other health-care occupations ordered in a hierarchy of authority as essentially defined by the medical profession.

Of course, role differentiation occurs horizontally in profession, too, as the result of increasing specialization, particularly that associated with technological and scientific advances. Generally speaking, however, role specialization is occupationally controlled in the professional model and therefore socially diffused, while it is organizationally controlled in the bureaucratic model and therefore organizationally specific. What I mean is that a brain surgeon and a kidney surgeon have essentially the same role content wherever they go in a given society, while the role content of president of a company may be quite different from company to company for it is defined by the rules and regulations of any given organization (even for companies that perform the same functions). Role content is related to occupational expertise in professions and is socially sanctioned, while it is related to the functions of an office in bureaucracies and is organizationally specific.

Thus, to return to the original definitions of rationalization, we may posit that both the bureaucratic and professional models rationally coordinate a systematic division of labor based on functional specialization and structural differentiation through :

1. The substitution of particularistic, ascriptive, affectively based decision-making for universalistic, goal-maximization criteria of decision making. The bureaucratic model achieves this through the routinization of tasks and uniformity of social relationships through formalization of procedures; the professional model achieves it through an extensive system of socialization of professional incumbents and through elaborate codes of ethics that in effect formalize social relationships.
2. The reduction of uncertainty in decision-making through the establishment of a hierarchy of authority and formal channels

of communication. The bureaucratic model achieves this through the creation of a system of structured offices and delegated responsibilities that channel communications upward for decision-making and policy-planning, and downward for directives that in effect centralizes planning and direction. The professional model achieves this through a system of socially sanctioned monopolies that define levels of authority, and a system of qualifications and certifications that channel communication downward for implementation.

3. The reduction of uncertainty in decision-making through the curtailment of arbitrariness and unpredictability and the institutionalization of explicit limited goals. The bureaucratic model achieves this through the formalization of roles, and procedures, the routinization of tasks, and the explicit delineation of duties and responsibilities. The broad goal-orientation may be conceived of as efficiency — the maximization of rewards for the minimum expenditure of resources. The professional model achieves this through an extensive system of training that relates the hierarchy of authority to degree of theoretical education and bases decision-making capability on extent of theoretical education. The broad goal orientation of the professional model may be conceived of as effectiveness-fidelity to role definition.

We understand some of the differences in mechanisms that arise between the bureaucratic model and the professional model as arising from the fact that the first has been associated with recurrent events and traditional knowledge (in the sense that it is knowledge formalized in rules, regulations, etc.), while the latter has been associated with uncertainty situations—"ever developing, non-recurring events involving new knowledge." (75) Also, differentiation that occurs as the result of the fragmentation of responsibilities into simple assignments with routine duties that require minimal skills has been generally associated with bureaucracy, while differentiation based on the subdivision of an overall task into specialized responsibilities has been more associated with professions. (76) On these characteristics and many others, however, the two models have been tending toward convergences — as exemplified by the movement of professionals into organizational work contexts and by the professionalization of business occupations. Perhaps it is that the continuing process of rationalization of an ever-increasingly complex division of labor is obliterating some of the major distinctions between the two models.

FOOTNOTES

1 George Ritzer, "Professionalization, Bureaucratization, and Rationalization : The Views of Max Weber," in **Social Forces**, pp. 622-634, Vol. 53 (June 1975), p. 632.

2 Peter M. Blau and Marshall W. Meyer, **Bureaucracy in Modern Society** (2nd ed., New York : Random House, 1971), pp. 18-21.

3 Peter M. Blau, Wolf V. Heydebrand and Robert E. Stauffer, "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies," in **American Sociological Review**, pp. 179-191, Vol. 31 (April 1966), p. 179.

4 Stanley H. Udy, Jr., "Bureaucracy and Rationality in Weber's Organization Theory : An Empirical Study," in **American Sociological Review**, pp. 791-95, Vol. 24 (December 1959), pp. 791-92.

5 "The Concept of Bureaucracy : An Empirical Assessment," in **The American Journal of Sociology**, Vol. 69, pp. 32-40 (July 1963), p. 34.

6 Ibid., pp. 32-34

7 Reinhard Bendix, "Indexes of Bureaucratization," in W. A. Faunce and W. H. Form, eds., **Comparative Perspectives on Industrial Society** (Boston : Little, Brown and Company, 1969), p. 245.

8 Udy, pp. 792-93.

9 Ritzer, p. 638.

10 Max Weber, **The Theory of Social and Economic Organization**, tr. Talcott Parsons (Glencoe : The Free Press, 1947), p. 115.

11 Ibid., 38n.

12 Ibid., pp. 122-123.

13 S. N. Eisenstadt, "Bureaucracy, Bureaucratization, Markets, and Power Structure," in W. A. Faunce and W. H. Form, eds., **Comparative Perspectives on Industrial Society** (Boston : Little, Brown and Co., 1969), pp. 261-263.

14 Bendix, pp. 245-249.

15 Peter M. Blau, Wolf V. Heydebrand and Robert E. Stauffer, "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies," in **American Sociological Review**, pp. 179-191, Vol. 31 (April 1966), p. 179; Paul D. Montagna, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization in large Professional Organizations," in **The American Journal of Sociology**, Vol. 74, pp. 138-145 (1968), pp. 143-145, and Udy, pp. 792-793. These definitions are implicit in these writings rather than explicit.

16 Terence J. Johnson, **Professions and Power** (New York : The Macmillan Press, 1972), p. 15.

17 Quoted in Ritzer, p. 638.

18 Ibid.

19 Ed. and Tr., Edward Shils, **Max Weber on Universities : The Power of the State and the Dignity of the Academic Calling in Imperial Germany** (Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1973).

20 Max Weber, **The Theory of Social and Economic Organization**, tr. Talcott Parsons (Glencoe : The Free Press, 1947), p. 115.

21 Ibid., p. 116.

22 Ibid., p. 117.

23 In Weber on **Universities**, p. 59.

24 Ibid., pp. 57, 58, 62.

25 Ibid., p. 52.

26 Ibid., p. 58.

27 Ibid., p. 5.

28 Ibid., pp. 6—7.

29 Ibid., p. 7.

30 **The Theory of Social and Economic Organization**, p. 145.

31 Ibid., p. 146.

32 Ibid., p. 146. See page 6 of **Max Weber on Universities** for a discussion of the "of strong character who continue the proud tradition to academic solidarity and independence."

- 33 **Max Weber of Universities**, pp. 7-8.
- 34 Ibid., p. 4.
- 35 Ibid., p. 4-5, 6-7 11, 18, 19-21.
- 36 Ibid., pp. 5-6, 7.
- 37 Ibid., pp. 7-8, 13-14.
- 38 Ibid., pp. 14-22.
- 39 The autonomy of the academic profession from political and religious interference and the necessity that it regulate itself on strictly professional criteria are the major themes of the articles in this book.
- 40 A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, **The Professions**, 2nd ed., (London : Frank Cass & Co., 1964), p. iii.
- 41 Ibid., p. 1.
- 42 Ibid., p. 3.
- 43 Ibid., p. 285.
- 44 Ibid., pp. 284-285.
- 56 Ibid., p. 285.
- 46 Ibid., p. 287.
- 47 Ibid., p. 286.
- 48 Ibid., p. 295.
- 49 Ibid., p. 297.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 315-316.
- 52 Ibid., pp. 315-316.
- 53 Ibid., pp. 316-317.
- 54 Ibid., p. 368.
- 55 Ibid., p. 394.
- 56 Ibid., p. 426.

- 57 Ibid., p. 431.
- 58 Ibid., p. 298.
- 59 Ibid., p. 298.
- 60 Ibid., p. 301.
- 61 Ibid., p. 301.
- 62 Ibid., p. 302.
- 63 Ibid., p. 303.
- 64 Ibid., p. 358.
- 65 Ibid., p. 391.
- 66 Ibid., pp. 491-492.
- 67 Ibid., pp. 391-503.
- 68 Geoffrey Millerson, **The Qualifying Associations : A Study in professionalization** (London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 4.
- 69 Johnson, p. 22.
- 70 ed., H. M. Vollmer and D. L. Mills, **Professionalization** (Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. vii-viii.
- 71 Carr-Saunders and Wilson, p. 75.
- 72 Ibid., p. 304.
- 73 Ibid., p. 84.
- 74 "Encroachment, Charlatanism, and the Emerging Profession, Psychology, Sociology and Medicine," in **American Sociological Review**, pp. 902-14, Vol. 25 (Dec. 1960), pp. 904-5.
- 75 Montagna, p. 149, fn. 8.
- 76 Blau, Heyderbrand, Stauffer, pp. 186-187.

التبقرط والاحتراف في تقسيم العمل

جاكلين اسماعيل

يعرض المقال الى ظاهرتين هامتين ضمن نموذج واحد ، في موضوع تقسيم العمل ملابسات كل منها . ويشير المقال الى أهمية التفريق بين الظاهرتين .

ورغم أن المقالة تتميز بطابعها النظري إلا أنها تعتبر قد تناولت واحدا من أهم مشاكل التغير الاجتماعي حيث التبقرط والاحتراف في تصارع وتطابق في نفس الوقت .

وقد ركز المقال على الموضوع في الدول الصناعية بوجه خاص . الأمر الذي يدعو الى دراسات أوسع تتناول بالتحليل هذه الظاهرة في الدول الأخرى .

