

Eliot Freidson

Couverture : Photo © Jacqueline Trichard. Maquette C. Gadea

www.librairieharmattan.com
diffusion.harmattan@wanadoo.fr
harmattan1@wanadoo.fr

© L'Harmattan, 2006
ISBN : 978-2-296-02500-4
EAN : 9782296025004

Knowlegde, Work & Society
Savoir, Travail et Société
Vol 4, n° 2, 2006

Eliot Freidson

*Thematic issue edited by
Mirella Giannini and Charles Gadea*

*Dossier thématique coordonné par
Mirella Giannini et Charles Gadea*

L'Harmattan
5-7, rue de l'École-Polytechnique ; 75005 Paris
FRANCE

L'Harmattan Hongrie
Könyvesbolt
Kossuth L. u. 14-16
1053 Budapest

Espace L'Harmattan Kinshasa
Fac. des Sc. Sociales, Pol. et
Adm. ; BP243, KIN XI
Université de Kinshasa – RDC

L'Harmattan Italia
Via Degli Artisti, 15
10124 Torino
ITALIE

L'Harmattan Burkina Faso
1200 logements villa 96
12B2260
Ouagadougou 12

Knowledge, Work & Society / Savoir, Travail et Société

Editor in Chief

Charles Gadea, Centre Maurice Halbwachs, Campus ENS Jourdan, 48 Bd Jourdan, 75014 Paris, France, E-mail : charles.gadea@ens.fr (Contributions in French)

Directeur de la publication

Associate Editors

Julia Evetts, School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK. E-mail: julia.evetts@nottingham.ac.uk

Mike Saks, Vice Chancellor's Office, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln, LN6 7TS, UK. E-mail: msaks@lincoln.ac.uk (Contributions in English)

Directeurs adjoints

Book Review Editor

Mike Saks, Vice Chancellor's Office, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln, LN6 7TS, UK. E-mail: msaks@lincoln.ac.uk

Responsable des comptes rendus

Editorial Assistant

Sophie Divay, Panthéon-Sorbonne-Economie, Université Paris 1, CNRS, CA-Céreq de Paris / Equipe Matisse, 106-112 bd de l'Hôpital, 75647 Paris cedex 13, Tel. +33 (0)1 44 07 81 59, E-mail : sophie.divay@wanadoo.fr

Secrétaire de la rédaction

Editorial Board

- Steven Brint**, University of California, USA
Claude Dubar, Université de Versailles-Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France
Mirella Giannini, University of Napoli, Italy
André Grelon, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris, France
Ellen Kuhlmann, University of Bremen
Valery Mansurov, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia
Vittorio Olgiati, University of Urbino, Italy
Elianne Riska, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Arnaud Sales, Université de Montréal, Canada
Rita Schepers, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
Lennart Svensson, Goteborg University, Sweden
Evan Willis, La Trobe University, Australia

Comité éditorial

Knowledge, Work & Society / Savoir, Travail et Société is published by the Editions L'Harmattan, 5-7, rue de l'Ecole Polytechnique 75005 Paris, France. Tel +33 (0)1.40.46.79.14, Fax +33 (0)1.43.29.86.20, E-mail : harmat@worldnet.fr

Knowledge, Work & Society / Savoir, Travail et Société est une revue publiée par les Editions L'Harmattan, 5-7, rue de l'Ecole Polytechnique 75005 Paris, France. Tel +33 (0)1.40.46.79.14, Fax +33 (0)1.43.29.86.20, E mail : harmat@worldnet.fr

Annual subscription : 50 euros for three issues in march, june and october.

Abonnement annuel : 50 euros pour trois numéros publiés en mars, juin et octobre.

Knowledge, Work and Society/Savoir, Travail et Société

Vol 4, n°2, 2006

Eliot Freidson

Thematic issue edited by Mirella Giannini and Charles Gadea

Dossier thématique coordonné par Mirella Giannini et Charles Gadea

Introduction

Mirella Giannini and Charles Gadea p. 7

A propos des professions

Eliot Freidson p. 43

Pourquoi je suis aussi un interactionniste symbolique

Eliot Freidson p. 53

The Lay Referral System. The Problem of Professional Power

Howard S. Becker p. 63

The Enduring Relevance of the Professional Dominance

Robert Dingwall p. 77

Saving the "Soul of Professionalism": Freidson's Institutional Ethics and the Defense of Professional Autonomy

Steven Brint p. 99

Savoirs professionnels et situations d'expertise

Jean-Yves Trépos p. 131

Medical autonomy: open challenges from consumerism and managerialism

Willem Tousijn, Giovanna Vicarelli p. 157

Biographical notes / Notices biographiques

p. 181

INTRODUCTION

This is a memorial issue of *Knowledge, Work & Society / Savoir, Travail et Société*, for Eliot Lazarus Freidson, known throughout the world as the Father of Medical Sociology and a prominent scholar of the Sociology of Professions. He died in San Francisco on the 15th December 2005, at 82 years old. He was professor Emeritus of Sociology at the New York University, where he was a teacher for over thirty years, and Visiting Professor at the Department of Social and Behavioural Science of the University of California. The long list of academic and professional activities, honours, elections and awards has never changed his generous and amiable character.

Early Career

Freidson was born in the Dorchester section of Boston, the son of a shoe wholesaler with little formal education, having emigrated from Russia to the U.S. when he was twelve, and of a younger émigré mother with high school education. Both of his parents were Jewish, but, as Freidson writes in “a premature autobiographical note” (1978: 115-6), they drifted away from Orthodox Judaism during the course of their lives. As the fortunes of the family improved, they moved from the middle-class, fairly homogeneous, protective Jewish neighbourhood to a place in which Boston “Yankee” norms, including its politely condescending version of anti-Semitism, were dominant. Eliot was ten years old, but this experience of life will produce his attitude to question the authority and virtue of both the Yankee and Jewish institutions. In his words, this determined his position of critical detachment from conventional institutions.

Later he discovered that sociology, too, could sustain this position. In fact, like many sociologists, Freidson has always assumed that legal and political institutions exercise powerful constraints on the negotiations of individuals in concrete settings, and stimulate, limit and direct much

individual action. As he confesses in the paper here translated into French, *A propos des professions* (1998), in the course of studying the organization of work he had been led to violate his taste, which by temperament had been for close description of human interaction in concrete institutions.

It was at the University of Chicago that Freidson drifted into sociology. He met David Riesman, he read the work of Robert Park and, as a graduate student, he did much work with Robert Redfield and W. Lloyd Warner. He was involved in exploring the problem of understanding the effect of mass communication on audiences, and the social character of language and symbolism. After some small jobs, the degree, a two-years post-doctoral fellowship, a one-year research job in Philadelphia, the Russell Sage Foundation supported him in a program dealing with exposing sociologists to professional fields like medicine, law and social work at Montefiore Hospital. Here Freidson seemed to discover his interest in occupations. In effect this interest has been latent since the second year of his post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Illinois. At that time he and his friend and colleague Howard Becker were collaborating on a paper on occupations. Finally, at Montefiore Hospital, Freidson could study the composition and functioning of the professional teams of the *Family Health Maintenance Demonstration*. He could also examine the patients' view by interviewing several of them, both husbands and wives about their response to this experimental program (Freidson 1978: 118-21).

By 1960, he had written some articles on patients and in 1961 his book of *Patients' View of Medical Practice* appeared. Time arrived to study professionals. Freidson became committed to study physicians in the prepaid medical groups and received a grant from the federal government. During the early sixties, he became more and more preoccupied with the issues of social organization in general, and the nature of occupations and professions in particular, while a fortuitous event led him to a renewal of his interest in illness. His friend Howard Becker wrote *Outsiders* (1963), a book, which became famous in America and throughout the world. It had a great influence on Freidson, and allowed him to break away from medical conceptions of illness by focussing on the nature of professions. He "rattled the cage" (Hafferty 2003: 133) of the functionalist interpretation by reformulating Parson's variables in defining the sick role and, finally, came to develop the thesis that medicine was simply the

profession which was accepted as the authority about illness in a given society. Freidson's original intent was to craft a paper on the organization of medical practise for the *Handbook of Medical Sociology*. Instead he wrote a theoretical work, with the title *Profession of Medicine*, which was published in 1970. As Hafferty (2003: 133) efficaciously says, Eliot Freidson became Eliot Freidson with the co-joint publication of his *Profession on Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge* and *Professional Dominance: The Social Structure of Medical Care* (1970a, 1970b).

At the same time, under the influence of Berger and Luckman's book (1966), Freidson began looking at illness as a particular meaning ascribed by a physician and at health as a kind of ideology asserted by an organized profession, looking at both as problems in the Sociology of Knowledge. He also began to use Mannheim's idea of "mentality" (1936, American edition 1968) as a way of studying normative elements of a profession in a historical perspective. From this point of view, both the knowledge and the ethicality of the profession became ideologies. As we can read in Freidson's autobiography (1978: 129-31), he began to develop the idea of social organization of the division of labour, and to study relationships of occupations as a matter of authority of expertise. The notion of "clinical mentality" was analysed as a kind of orientation carried by men who are involved in practical action and perceive a successful action as dependent on special insight, knowledge, skill and judgement, while failure as due to chance or anomalous conditions. The notion of "administrative mentality" was found among executives and policymakers, who assume the formal administrative structure as created and sustained independently of the participants.

Freidson thought that social organization was a way of referring to the world of other people around the individual whose reactions have a great deal to do with what the individual himself is able to do. In other words, social organisation is something which is continuously created by its participants, it is not something which some legislation or set of administrative directives can create. In Freidson's early work we can easily see Hughes's legacy and Becker's influence. Later, Freidson seems to have abandoned the approach of the so-called Chicago School. Actually, in the paper here translated into French, *Pourquoi je suis aussi un interactionniste symbolique*, issued from a conference held in Nancy in 1997 and presented in a lightly different version at Versailles-Saint-

Quentin en Yvelines in 1998, he recognizes that in his career he has been quite eclectic, having used in each of different cases the methods and the advanced concepts, which he has considered as appropriate to the questions being asked. Nevertheless, he claims to be “also” a symbolic interactionist.

Professional Dominance

In the 1980s and early 1990s in Freidson’s work, the institutional paradigm seems to be dominant. He analysed particularly the professional institutions, which sustain *Professional Powers* (1986). He did not wish to be considered as a theorist of professional dominance, but as an analyst of the institutions that sustain an occupation – the main example is the profession of medicine – which presents two dimensions of control, control of work and control of other occupations.

“The professional control is based on the connection between tasks, training provided by the educational system, and the privileged access of trained workers to the market” (Brint 1993: 265). On the occasion of Freidson’s retirement from his long-standing association with New York University, Brint underlines that the socially constructed link between tasks, advanced training and labour market is a turning point in approaching professions, especially in that it connects phenomenological accounts of cultural labelling with concrete processes of occupational organization. In this context, he sustains that “all other powers of the professions flow from the institutions that grow up in support of or in opposition to these links”. The powers and privileges that grow out of specific market shelters, as well as the occupational authority and collective organization that are found in “ideal typical professions”, are characteristics that Freidson considers advantages conferred by knowledge monopolies, and gate-keeping. Knowledge monopoly includes the control over work, or technical autonomy, gate-keeping means institutionalised control over other occupations (Brint 1993: 265-67).

Regarding the changing regulatory environment, which has mainly increased stratification within the professions and augmented the influence of administrative and academic elites in the professions, Brint notes that in Freidson’s view (particularly expressed in Freidson 1984), the new forces of regulation change the traditional hypothesis that economic security and regulatory autonomy ensured professional ethics and competences, , and “change the structure of control but not the scope

of control" (Brint 1993: 270). As Brint points out, Freidson minimized the direct impact of external regulation on the scope of control. Although in his latest work Freidson analyses the effect of economic and political changes on professions, his theoretical basis did not change. Therefore, he provides criticism both of theorists of professional decline who underemphasize the powers of professionals and of theorists of professional dominance who overemphasize the powers of professionals. Two contributions to this volume, particularly Tousijn-Vicarelli's and Dingwall's papers, take sides in the decline vs. maintenance of professional power debate, by examining Freidson's concept of professional dominance in our complex society.

Tousijn and Vicarelli observe that it may be helpful to supplement the two dimensions of professional control in the medical field that Freidson privileged – control over work and control over other occupations – with control over the market and control over policy making. They maintain that a partial decline of medical dominance could be found today, only if some of the professional dimensions are emphasized and a reduction – and not the disappearance – of professional power is considered. Moreover, changes in the system of health care, under the effect of new economic liberalism and the guiding idea of freedom of choice of individual-consumers, put the dimensions of medical dominance within a wider attack on professionalism in general. In other words, the professional logic rooted in autonomy and self-regulation is under attack from consumerist logic and managerial logic, as Freidson himself writes in his latest book, *The Third Logic* (2001). Nowadays, what is requested from professionals is accountability, a new form of responsibility that involves the external control of performances and results. But Tousijn and Vicarelli notice that consumerism and managerialism face some limits in reducing some dimensions of professional control, thus forcing medical autonomy rather to find a new basis. Results of surveys on a large and representative sample of doctors in Italy, as well as other medical research in European countries, support their thesis.

The concept of professional dominance, as expressed in Freidson early publications, is focal in Dingwall's contribution. The author intends to demonstrate its relevance even in a world where professional dominance has, in significant respects, been replaced by a managerial system. He starts by pointing out the impressive turn that Freidson puts on Parson's understanding of the sick role as conditionally legitimated deviance, by

investigating the conditions of legitimation, the activities of legitimating agents and the cultural and material environments in which they operate. The point is that Freidson explores a number of dimensions of the physician's powers and privileges but never quite explains the sources from which they are derived. Differently from Weber's analysis of authority or Hughes' analysis of science, Freidson's analysis of the physician's authority is based mainly on persuasion and deference. So, the rise of professional dominance is endorsed by the organized autonomy and independence of the division of labour in health care, and not the status and prestige of physicians in the wider society. But, since the 1970s, the situation of the medical profession has changed and especially in the last thirty years the changing organizational and market context have had an effect on professional dominance in the division of labour, as Freidson himself acknowledges in the *Third Logic* (2001).

Dingwall's refined analysis of changes in society develops each of the headings Freidson set out at the end of *Professional Dominance*: administrative accountability, accountability to the patient and the rise of competitors, in the US and UK contexts. It is in Freidson's latest book and issues of state/profession relations in socio-historical contingencies, that Dingwall finds a shift from the early meaning of professional dominance, away from the analysis of privileged positions in the division of labour to a much broader exploration of the status and authority of professions in contemporary societies.

Beyond the Folk Concept of Profession

After the 1970s, and following Freidson's work and other major theoretical contributions – most notably from Johnson (1972) and Larson (1977) – the sociology of the professions seemed to stand at some kind of “a turning point”, and as Dingwall (1983: 11-2) wrote, “established traditions were seen to have reached the limits of their original paradigm”. Some important statements received quite common consent. It was clear that professions needed to be analysed as part of a network of social and economic relations, the division of labour as a division of knowledge with consequential implications of reciprocal dependence between participants, knowledge being a social product reproducing and constituting a particular order. At last, comparative empirical work should be stressed.

Among the papers opportunely collected by Dingwall and Lewis in 1983, the Freidson's contribution (1983: 19-37) examined the state of the art of the theory of professions, and pointed to the ambiguities, which have arisen between talking about professions as a social stratum and a subcategory of occupations. Freidson noticed that there had not been any coherent advances in theorising in spite of the marked change in the tone of literature because the basis for theorising had not been changed. For him, if professions were distinguished by specific criteria as "folk" (not analytical) concept, the research strategy appropriate to it could be phenomenological in character, but, in a complex society, this does not prevent sociologists from attempting to move beyond the "folk" concept (Freidson 1983: 27). Freidson was convinced that "in analysing processes through which occupations, including professions, develop, maintain themselves, grow and decline, one could distinguish theoretically significant grouping or types of occupations" (Freidson 1983: 31). The conceptualization should be able to order and explain the circumstances of a variety of historical occupations, thus going beyond their labelling in a particular country or at a particular time. A flexible set of concepts about occupations among which are to be counted the historic professions could be formulated. For Freidson, this is "the only way to remedy the conceptual poverty that stems from the use of a parochial and simplistic dichotomy or continuum" (Freidson 1983: 31-2).

It was in a paper presented at the Nottingham Workshop in 1996, in front of an attentive audience that Freidson most clearly presented his own project to conceptualize profession and professionalism. This paper was almost simultaneously published in 1998 (in Giannini & Minardi eds: 51-66) and 1999 (in Evetts ed: 117-29). We will give a brief statement of the main points of this paper. For Freidson, profession is an officially recognized occupation distinguished from dependent and craft work by being theoretically based discretionary specialization. Differently from specialized works, functionally related to others, in social organization as analysed by Smith, professionalism represents one logically distinct method of organizing a division of labour in which occupations negotiate jurisdictional boundaries between themselves, establishing and controlling their own division of labour. This requires control of a labour market by throwing up barriers to the freedom of individual consumers as well as the capacity of executives and managers to rationalize tasks as they wish. This kind of control of a labour market that Weber called social closure, and Freidson preferred to call a labour market shelter, is

sustained by the strategic importance of professional training and credentials. The attachment of professional training to higher education provides some ideological justification for basic or pure research that allows development of knowledge and skill, and the pursuit of ideas independently of the practical commercial and political world.

Freidson noted that the occupationally controlled labour market shelter introduces stratified relations into the organization of the profession, so also does the occupational control of vocational schooling, thus creating a problematic division between institutionalized positions of cognitive authority and practitioners. At the beginning of the paper, Freidson told the legend of the Tower of Babel, to manifest once more (see also Freidson 1983: 32, 34-7) his preoccupation about the development of a theoretical model of professionalism, to distil the essence of professionalism out of the empirical characteristics of occupations called professions by their own members, by the public, by official classifications or by scholarly analysts. An abstract theoretical rationale, which should be elaborated on a logical rather than an empirical basis, frees discussion from concrete and parochial perspectives. Of course, as Freidson himself underlined, such a theoretical model is not entirely free of its own time and place, but unlike "essentialist" conceptions, it provides criteria abstracted from concrete national or historical circumstances that can be used to analyse the entire range of empirical data from every time and every place. In 2001, Eliot Freidson accomplished his project and wrote *Professionalism. The Third Logic*.

Professionalism as the Third Logic

This book has been presented as the first treatise on professionalism, considered as a method of organizing work. Differently from the logics of free market and bureaucracy, professionalism requires different kinds of knowledge, organization, career, education and ideology, a third logic, just as the title of the book emphasizes. In the Weberian tradition, the book develops an ideal-type analysis of professionalism that transcends the particular circumstances of specific occupations. For Freidson, the ideologically inspired assaults on professionalism pose less danger to professional privileges than to their ethical independence to resist use of their specialized knowledge to maximize profit and efficiency without also providing its benefits to all in need.

Most of contributions to this special issue refer to the theses that Freidson defends in his latest book, and make them the focus of discussion. But, we will remind some of the reactions to this book in the scientific world, before briefly reporting on the contributions. Commentaries from Sarfatti Larson and Giannini (2002, *Preface* to the Italian translation of the Freidson's book), and the Symposium organized by the *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* (vol.28 n. 1, 2003) will be here mentioned.

Sarfatti Larson (2002: 10-1) does not completely agree with Freidson and has her doubts whether criticism would weak the credibility of the professional ideology, and make the institutions that support professions more vulnerable to market and bureaucratic forces and less able to resist pressures toward the maximization of profit and the minimization of discretion. She evokes the Enron days in America, the scandal of the powerful book-keepers, to demonstrate that in the real world, criticism is addressed more to real professions than the ideal-type, more to concrete practices and increasing deviations from the ideal-type. Nonetheless, she continues, Freidson's book offers a parameter and puts the most difficult questions: "if we rid the auto-control of professionalism, how could we control and who will be controllers? And more, how a democratic society could control knowledge and skills if those involved do not find force and decision to save a mandate that ought to be *public*?"

For her part, Giannini (2002: 17-8) appreciates the Freidson's model in that it has offered a theoretical guide for the analysis of contemporary contingencies of professionalism. She focuses on the connection between institutional ethic codes, and legitimation and credibility of professions in serving socially shared values, to point to some questions about the static character of the model and the lack of institutional reflexivity. In truth, since the first articles about the project and at the beginning of the book, Freidson explicitly admitted that his model appears quite static, but later, in his comment (Freidson 2004: 133- 4) to Giannini's note (2003: 140-2), he emphasizes the significance of the epigraph with which the book begins. The epigraph recalls Italo Calvino's *Cosmicomics* and the bet of one protagonist Qfwfq, to tell about his long time efforts to evaluate those occupations which are often called *professions* in English-speaking nations and which have existed for more than a century in all industrialized nations. To create such a rationale is what he had tried to do in this book, and his ideal-type was static only in that it has a logically conceived framework, but it could be a fruitful method for winning bets

on the varied and changing outcomes of the organization of work in the real world.

In the *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, Hafferty (2003: 133-58) opens the Review Symposium on Eliot Freidson's latest book by considering it as an extension of his socio theoretical legacy to further extending our understanding of the ever-evolving nature of professionalism. He illustrates how Freidson's three ideal types – free market, bureaucratic, and professional – can function as a conceptual “trigger”, allowing insights into elements of medical work and medical professionalism that might otherwise escape critical attention. To this end he examines the recent rise of professionalism as an ideology within organized medicine, the shift towards more “egalitarian” models of physician-patient relationship, the rise of evidence based medicine (EBM) along with attempts to redefine the interface between scientific evidence and clinical medicine, and the social dynamics that underscore credentialing coupled with the problematic and anti-professional values evidenced within the current generation of medical trainees. In conclusion, Hafferty, as a sociologist (2003: 153), Havighurst (2003: 159-64), as a jurist, and Relman (2003: 164-8), as a physician, who are all well-known experts in their professional disciplines and practices and legal aspects of medicine, have directed sceptical remarks about the Freidson discussion of the current state of American Medicine.

There is evident disappointment in Freidson's return comments (2003: 168-72). He has repeated once more that it is impossible to find the professional ideal-type in reality, as one can see in American Medicine, which has never conformed fully to the ideal-type that he calls professionalism. He accepts the Hafferty, Havighurst and Relman's analyses of deviation from the ideal-type, but he rejects their solutions about the health care policy, particularly the ideology of the free choices of ordinary consumers, as Havighurst appears to propose. Commenting other issues raised in the Symposium, Freidson repeats that the fundamental nature of the doctor-patient relationship is predicated on unequal knowledge and experience, credentialing is testimony of competence even if allows exclusive access to professional practice, but health care and other professional products and services as essential public goods that should be available to all, irrespective of ability to pay. Expertise and Ethics are in his mind the ideal-typical characteristics of professions.

Professional Expertise

In Freidson latest book, expertise is treated in a masterly way. Expertise is the professional characteristic, which allows us to distinguish professional, lay people and amateur. It legitimises the cognitive authority of professions and their position in the division of labour in society. In this volume, this issue is analysed in Becker and Trépos's contributions.

Howard Becker, whose persona seems to accompany Freidson's career since the beginning, now does his friend homage by returning to the early years. It seems as if recalling Freidson's initial and interactionist work could renew their common itinerary. Becker analyses one of Freidson's articles published in 1960, *Client Control and Medical Practice*, to discuss the distribution of expertise authority between organized professionals and less organized lay community.

In the paper *The Lay Referral System*, he informs us of a problem, which preoccupied Freidson continuously from then on: how can the professional tendency to monopolize power in medical settings be controlled? And how can the lay community best protect itself from medical monopoly and the resulting possible abuse of power? Two conditions in particular seem to affect people's ability to preserve some independence of action: (i) a shared and congruent culture in the professional and lay communities; (ii) a high number of lay consultants. Becker considers two different examples of recreational drug and learning to use a computer. It is easy to see how Freidson's framework can push us to new discoveries about other kinds of social behaviour, and Becker points out interesting questions and opens up new research perspectives.

Trépos also tries to embed Freidson's concept of expertise in a variety of current situations. Particularly, he deals with continuities and fractures in the process of passing from lay knowledge to professional knowledge. He questions whether the highest status of some professional groups relies on their success in the competition for the control of markets or whether there are some natural differences between professional expertise and other actor's knowledge, such as "amateurs", which could be considered as "challengers" (eg as political adversaries) of the "experts". In referring to Freidson's theses, also to demonstrate the resources that can be drawn from his work, Trépos tries to articulate original answers to topical questions in terms of sociology of knowledge and political sociology.

Professionalism is founded on special knowledge requiring authority to be discretionally employed. But, the competences recognized as professional expertise, like any other kind of specialization, combine different kinds of knowledge. Therefore, the professionalism is not distinguished by the nature of the knowledge included in this combination, it is the knowledge certified as provided by credentialing institutions that distinguishes professionalism. Consequently, these institutional shelters make up as a political issue, thus concerning the State policy. The institutional shelters of professions can also bring out a process of “deprofessionalization” when the recognized special status of expert lead professionals to employ expertise as legal or scientific missions in “extraterritorial” fields, thus becoming involved in conflict with people equipped with other forms of knowledge and legitimation, be those managers or consumers. Trépos identifies one kind of deprofessionalization emerging in the current society, and that could be seen as a “forth logic”. It is related to the rise of the amateurs’ common knowledge, which is strengthening again and becomes in some cases a kind of claimed counter-expertise, illustrating in a very typical way the late modernity rationality conflicts and ethic dilemmas.

Professional Ethics

The question of ethics arises as crucial in Brint’s refined analysis, which contributes enormously to our understanding of Freidson’s defence of professional autonomy. Brint emphasizes that since early 90s the focal concept of Freidson’s analysis has changed. Where he previously focused on the social structure of professions, he now focuses on professionalism, as a culture based on a set of values and commitments that serve as an orientation to thought and action. Professionalism is associated with and supported by the social structure of profession – market shelters provided by credentialing that allows social closure and power –, but not directly derivable from it. Particularly in Freidson’s essay *Professionalism as Model and Ideology* (Freidson 1992), Brint sees the beginning of a full-scale defence of professionalism that culminated in his latest book *Professionalism. The Third Logic* (2001). Here Freidson shows how far he has moved from his criticism at the time when he wrote *Profession of Medicine*.

There can be little doubt that Freidson’s change of heart was based on his observation of the American context where the most powerful of

professions, medicine, provided an instructive example of professional vulnerability in the face of the power of the state and capital. At the time of his latest book, Freidson was convinced that the most important problem for the future of professionalism is neither economic nor structural but cultural and ideological. His main preoccupation seems to be saving the soul of professionalism. In Brint's contribution this concept is deeply analysed, and it is important to observe that he points out some crucial topics for discussion. In fact, he argues that the soul of professionalism can simply be defined as occupational autonomy, which depends not only on technical skills that are accessible to practitioners through formal training, but also on a distinctive moral position that judges the use of knowledge and skill in the light of values that transcend time and place.

In fighting off the incursions of market and bureaucracy, professions, for Freidson, should reinforce ethical norms that help them to protect their autonomy. Two forms of normative reinforcement are distinguished: practical ethics and institutional ethics. Brint recognizes that Freidson's comments on institutional ethics are sketchy, but he regards three principles as fundamental. First, professions should seek to make certain that their services are available to as many people as need them. Second, professionals should control the terms of work far enough to ensure high quality service. Third, professions should renew their commitment to the "transcendent values" that provide professionals with the moral authority from which to resist and even to refuse to obey the dictates of the consumer market or state and organizational officialdom. Brint makes a link between the results of professional performances and the moral authority of professions, which strengthens them in fighting the two logics of consumerism and managerialism.

This is what Brint draws from *The Third Logic* as the features and soul of the ideal-typical profession in our socio-historical context. But the soul of professionalism seems to us to still remain vague. Freidson himself had recently replied to this question in commenting on the reactions of some scholars: "...There is the matter of what I called, perhaps too dramatically, the soul of professionalism. Soul is what is ascribed to human beings and that makes them something more than just another kind of animal. Occupations could be said to have soul when they act as something more than just a technical enterprise at the service of the state, employers, and consumers. ...It is not represented by general ethics, which can be asked of

all human beings, including physicians. Rather, it is represented by what I call institutional ethics, which is concerned with a technical craft's integrity of purpose..." (Freidson 2003: 172).

In a note in his contribution, Brint suggests that in choosing the phrase "soul of professionalism" Freidson seems to stand close to the non-sociological tradition of character ethics. Here the fundamental idea is of an animating spirit capable of "right action". If the soul is lost, the person lacks the capacity to follow a path of dignity and purpose, and falls instead into a path of superficiality, reflex conformity, and disorientation. There is also another suggestion: given the substantial representation of the soul in what he calls institutional ethics, Freidson could have in mind the concept of soul in Foucault's metaphor of the *assujettissement* of the body. In *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault 1979: 33) the soul is an institutional feature of individual bodies, a kind of regulatory principle of discursive production of individual identities. It would have been good to be able to ask Eliot himself about this aspect of the Foucault's work, which is found in the bibliography of his *Professionalism. The Third Logic* (2001: 230). It is so sad to know that we can never discuss with him.

Mirella Giannini
University of Napoli "Federico II"
Facoltà di sociologia
Vico Monte di Pietà, 1
80138 Napoli, Italy
migianni@unina.it

Charles Gadea
Centre Maurice Halbwachs
Campus ENS Jourdan
48, Bd Jourdan
75014 Paris, France
Charles.gadea@ens.fr