

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

This thesis will examine the 'changes within a particular occupational group -- chiropractic. Chiropractors first came to Australia from America shortly after the First World War. Since that time, they have operated as primary-contact health care practitioners, i.e., as practitioners who have had the first contact with the patient for a health related complaint. However, until recently, they have operated outside the orthodox, state supported education and health care systems. In fact medicine, as "the" orthodox occupation in the health care system, has vehemently opposed any attempt to introduce chiropractic into that system. The antagonism towards chiropractic on the part of the medical profession has also prevented, until recently, the incorporation of chiropractic training into the Australian tertiary education system. Since training is an important factor in the legitimation of an occupation, this exclusion has been of significance in the chiropractors' fight to gain public and political

recognition.

Over the last twenty years chiropractors have begun to gain political recognition in the form of State government registration, Federal government funding for their training programmes and access to insurance programmes. The chiropractors have engaged in a project to professionalise their occupation. Because of the rapid changes which the occupation has undergone, chiropractic provides a useful case study for the sociologist interested in occupational change and professionalisation. However, for reasons that will be made clear in chapter two, I will steer clear of the traditional accounts of professionalisation and concentrate on occupational change by examining the legitimation of chiropractic at three levels -- the clinical, the political and the scientific. This process is examined in terms of the changing relations between chiropractic and other related occupations as chiropractors have striven to achieve a defined place in the division of labour in the modern Australian health care system.

Chapter two outlines the approaches to the study of the professions, which sociologists have used. The sociological literature on the professions is distinguished by two factors: the sheer number of publications, and the theoretical and methodological confusions that pervade it. Much of this confusion stems from the failure to explicitly acknowledge the theoretical assumptions upon which the work has been premised. This problem is resolved by examining

the paradigms within which sociologists have worked.

Two paradigms have dominated the field -- functionalism and radical structuralism. The functionalist paradigm has dominated sociological work in this area until the 1960s. Even those authors who might normally be thought of as belonging to radical structuralist camp can be placed firmly within the functionalist paradigm in so far as their work on professions is considered. It is only in the 1960s that the radical structuralist paradigm has emerged as a viable theoretical framework. The latter has raised important questions about the functionalist assumptions which need to be answered in order to develop adequate explanations of the position of the professions in modern society, and of occupational change. The radical structuralist authors have pointed toward the need to emphasise the political aspects of the process of professionalisation by questioning the functionalist assumption that the professions place the interests of society before their own occupational interests. (I might add, at this point, that I use the word "radical" in its etymological sense, that is, as "going to the root" in order to provide an adequate explanation of social phenomena.)

In the third chapter I concentrate on sociological accounts of chiropractic and deal with some of the difficulties which the assumptions of the functionalist paradigm have presented for an adequate understanding of chiropractic as an occupation. Particularly important here

are two themes which were neglected by most functionalist accounts, i.e., the medical domination of sociological work, and the role which professional rhetoric has played in sociological accounts of the professions. The conceptual framework which is used to guide the substantive analysis is elaborated here.

The fourth chapter examines the issue of medical dominance in more detail. The development of the occupational territory of medicine is outlined briefly. The mechanisms by which medicine has controlled this territory -- subordination, limitation, co-option and exclusion -- are examined. The strategy of exclusion is the one which has been applied to the chiropractors and is, therefore, examined in more detail than the other modes of domination. The attacks of medical practitioners upon homeopathy and bone-setters are used to elucidate the mechanisms of this strategy and the role of the occupation of physiotherapy in co-opting some of the skills used by unorthodox manipulators is outlined.

The fifth chapter examines the early influences on Australian chiropractic. The emergence of two distinct groups of chiropractors is of particular importance in this context. The first consisted of those persons who travelled to America in order to train as chiropractors. The second, consisted of those persons who learnt their skills in Australia, often with little formal training. This chapter also examines the early relationships between chiropractors

and other unorthodox practitioners. The concept of occupational identity is elucidated here and the connection between that identity and the formation of occupational associations is outlined.

Chapter six deals with the first Australian legislation which directly affected chiropractic. This was the South Australian Physiotherapists Act of 1945 which threatened the existence of chiropractic as an occupation by forcing chiropractors to register as physiotherapists and preventing any new chiropractors in that State from so registering. Soon after, in Western Australia, legislation was proposed which would have registered chiropractors as natural therapists. The chiropractors' effective opposition to both types of attack upon their occupational identity is examined. This is followed by an examination of the unsuccessful attempts by their colleagues in the eastern States to get legislative recognition as an autonomous health care occupation. The intra-occupational conflict between Australian-trained and American-trained practitioners becomes important in the development of the occupation at this stage, as does the emergence of more overt medical opposition to any political recognition of chiropractic than had hitherto existed.

In chapter seven the emergence of the Australian-trained chiropractor is traced in detail, concentrating upon the development of colleges and associations. At this point the shift in orientation of

many Australian-trained practitioners from naturopathy and osteopathy to chiropractic raised fears in the minds of many of the American-trained practitioners that the identity of the occupation would be lost. They feared that this would result in the failure of the occupation to get political recognition. They felt that such a failure would result in the occupation being subsumed by medicine or some other occupation. The conflict between the two groups is examined in detail. This conflict is important in analysing the relationship between technical expertise and political legitimisation, focusing attention upon the importance of political recognition of training programmes.

In chapter eight the role of the inquiries into chiropractic and other unorthodox health care practices by the New South Wales, Victorian and Federal governments is examined. These inquiries provided a forum for the debates between the various occupational groups supporting or opposing the political recognition of chiropractors. The debates are examined in detail. The inquiries paved the way for legislation registering chiropractors in all Australian States and Territories, a process which is almost complete at the time of writing.

Registration effectively consolidated the identity of chiropractic as an autonomous health care occupation and paved the way for the establishment of an occupational territory. The final chapter examines further aspects of this territory: the role which X-ray technology plays in

the chiropractors' practice, the importance of access to insurance provisions, repatriation benefits for patients, and the hospital system, as well as the control and development of training programmes.

CHAPTER 2  
SOCIOLOGICAL ACCOUNTS OF THE PROFESSIONS

As stated in the introduction this work is concerned with a single occupation: chiropractic. The changes which have taken place in the occupation over the last seventy years will be the main focus of the study. The chiropractors can be said to have engaged in a project to professionalise their occupation by striving to raise their status from a position of marginality in the health care system to one of legitimacy. Emphasis is placed upon the relationship of the occupation to the broader social structure rather than on individual actors when the process of occupational change is examined.

Because of the focus on a particular occupation, the discussion will be located at what Merton has described as middle range theory,<sup>1</sup> drawing out some salient points about occupational transformation but not attempting to formulate an all-embracing theory of occupational change in Australian society. Such a project would require analysis of a far broader range of occupations than can be satisfactorily

dealt with here. In order to clarify the theoretical orientation of this work, it is necessary to begin by examining the paradigms which have dominated this area of sociological discourse. I will follow Burrell and Morgan's use of the term paradigm, i.e.,

. . . [a set] of metatheoretical assumptions about the nature of social science and the nature of society. . . With . . . each paradigm [generating] theories and perspectives which are in fundamental opposition to those generated in other paradigms.<sup>2</sup>

## 2.1 TWO PARADIGMS.

Studies of the professions have been marked by diverse and often contradictory statements. Johnson has claimed that social scientists view the professions in "two lights": as "a structural basis for a free and independent citizenry in a world threatened by bureaucratic tyranny" while, at the same time, as representing a threat to freedom.<sup>3</sup> He suggests that such an ambivalent formulation is a result of the neglect of large-scale problems by sociologists, together with their attempts to operate within a value-free framework.<sup>4</sup>

More recently, Black has outlined two distinct approaches which have been used by sociologists to analyse professional associations.<sup>5</sup> He claims there is one school of thought which emphasises the positive contribution of such associations to the maintenance and development of the

social order. In a different vein is a more critical train of thought which stresses monopolistic practices, elitism and self-interest on the part of professionals. For Black, the first of these approaches is based upon a model of the professions which stresses the ideals of service held by people engaged in such occupations. The second stresses their market orientation and tends to see the professional association as being more akin to a trade union than to a service organisation. In other words, the political role of the association as an organisation protecting occupational interests is made more explicit than in functionalist approach.

While this is an apt characterisation of the current state of the sociology of the professions, especially since the early 1960s, it is a mistake to read the earlier writings on the professions in terms of this dichotomy. To be sure, some of the earlier authors were openly critical of professional groups, indicating an awareness of their potential Janus-headed nature. However, while there were some specific criticisms levelled at professional groups, these were weakened by an underlying assumption about the generally positive role which the professions play in maintaining and improving the social order. A careful reading of this literature indicates a congruence, rather than a divergence, of views about the role, or potential role, which the professions and professional associations have to play in the social order. These views correspond to

the functionalist paradigm. The remainder of this chapter examines accounts of the professions by sociologists and, to a lesser extent, by other social scientists. These studies can be located within two paradigms: the functionalist and radical structuralist paradigms.

Burrell and Morgan maintain that the discourse of the social sciences takes place within four paradigms.<sup>6</sup> They suggest that these paradigms can be delineated by two dimensions. The first dimension is determined by an orientation toward either an objectivist or a subjectivist approach to the material. The objectivist approach is mainly concerned with analysis of social structure, while the latter focuses upon the subjects within that structure. The second dimension is defined by the polarised assumptions about the nature of society, namely, a division between those approaches which emphasise regulation and those which posit radical change as the primary focus of any social analysis. The four paradigms are: functionalism, radical structuralism, radical humanism and interpretative sociology. The first two are located within the objectivist dimension and constitute the theoretical base of the present discussion.

This is not to say that the work done in the subjectivist paradigms is trivial or irrelevant. The work of radical humanists, such as Illich and Laing, together with interpretive work, such as that undertaken by Becker, have been important influences both within the occupations

themselves and within the sociology of occupations.<sup>7</sup> Nor should it be assumed that an objectivist study totally ignores the subject of the social world. Burrell and Morgan's schema does not give a dialectical account of the relationship between subject and object within this dimension. Instead they opt for a linear continuum which tends to categorise works as being on one side or another of one point of the continuum. While this is a weak point in their construction, their schema remains a useful heuristic device which can be used to clarify some problematical issues in the sociology of work and occupations. The development of the occupation of chiropractic will be analysed in the context of the overall structure of the division of labour in the Australian health care system. Consequently, the emphasis is on the objectivist dimension, although the part played by individual actors is given just acknowledgement. I will, therefore, restrict the present discussion to the objectivist dimension.

Within the objectivist dimension, Burrell and Morgan describe the two relevant paradigms as follows. The functionalist paradigm emphasises:

. . . the essentially objectivist nature of the social world and a concern for the explanations which emphasise "regulation" in social affairs.<sup>8</sup>

It is concerned with explanations of "the status quo, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction

and actuality".<sup>9</sup> The radical structuralist paradigm, on the other hand, emphasises "structural conflict, modes of domination, contradiction, and deprivation."<sup>10</sup> The functionalist paradigm when applied to the professions, and the organisation thereof, has focused upon the central role which professional groups have played in the maintenance of the social order. Themes such as conflict and domination have not been ignored by the functionalists but they have not been emphasised.

## 2.2 DOMINANCE OF THE FUNCTIONALIST PARADIGM.

Studies of the professions have been dominated by a functionalist paradigm. This paradigm assumes that the professions play an essential and unique role in the maintenance and development of modern society. Earlier authors, even those who took a more critical stance toward the emerging capitalist society, agreed that the professions were an elite group playing a positive and constructive role within that society. While some authors did raise doubts about the motives of the professionals themselves, it was not until the 1960s that the critical stance became a significant force in Anglo-Saxon sociology, and a viable and coherent alternative to the functionalist paradigm emerged in the form of what Burrell and Morgan have termed the radical structuralist paradigm.

The key difference between the two paradigms lies in the importance given to themes such as conflict and self-interest. That is, the debate between the two camps has been concerned with whether themes such as the interest of occupational groups are to be used as key conceptual tools in analysis or whether the crucial integrating function of the professions should set the guidelines for analysis of these occupations. The functionalist tendency to discuss the development of the professions in terms of the potentially positive contribution they can make to the social order has led to an emphasis on questions such as: "which occupations are really professions?" or "in what way can they best contribute to the well-being of the social whole?". This has meant that an explanation of occupational change has not been given the attention it deserves.

The radical structuralists, on the other hand, have been more concerned with how the structures of domination and power are used by professionals to enhance their social position. Also important has been the emphasis placed upon the role of professional rhetoric and the class location of professional groups when assessing their social position. The development of this approach has resulted in a shift of focus from relations of integration to relations of power and domination.

This newer paradigm moved away from a position which assumed that the role of professionals and professional associations was necessarily beneficial to society toward analyses which relied heavily upon power, domination and self-interest as the constructs for their theoretical models. These, writers had begun to question the privileged position of those occupations which claim the title "profession" which was taken for granted by functionalist writers. This has entailed a critical account of sociological analyses which have accepted the rhetoric espoused by professionals.

By claiming that power, domination and self-interest were the fundamental elements in the process of change, it became necessary to direct more attention than the earlier authors had to the role of the state. The analysis of the manner in which the state mediates between different occupational groups, gave "power relations" a concrete form. Also, because social change became an integral part of the analysis, the methodology of this paradigm began to utilise more historical components than had been used in most functionalist accounts of the professions. However, two points should be noted. First, the studies undertaken in the functionalist paradigm can still be considered as useful guidelines for empirical research, even if there are some fundamental problems with their mode of explanation. Secondly, much of the radical structuralist work has emerged out of criticisms of the functionalist paradigm. An

examination of the functionalist paradigm, then, will enhance our understanding of the theoretical framework used in the analysis of chiropractic in this thesis.

#### 2.2.1 Spencer.

One of the earliest accounts of the professions by a sociologist was that by Herbert Spencer.<sup>11</sup> Spencer distinguished the professions from other occupations in terms of the "functions they subserved". Intellectual capacity, political loyalty, and divine worship were considered to be among the most important of these functions.<sup>12</sup> Spencer held that professions evolved according to a natural process whereby each profession eventually exhibited the same traits.<sup>13</sup> He argued that elements such as incorporation, licensing, schools, and communication through journals were important elements of the modern, unified profession.<sup>14</sup> However, he did not develop any explanation as to how such factors contributed to the evolution of professions. Further, his notion of a profession was extremely broad, including dancers, musicians, poets, actors, dramatists and philosophers together with scientists, doctors, judges and teachers.<sup>15</sup>

#### 2.2.2 Durkheim.

Durkheim's work on professions or, more precisely, on professional associations, was a part of his broader concern with the problems associated with social change. He was

especially concerned with social change which was associated with the emergence of industrial societies where the business and commercial spheres were beginning to dominate social life. He saw these spheres as characterised by a state of moral and juridical anomy.<sup>16</sup> The professional association or corporation, based upon similar lines to the earlier guild, was posited as being capable of providing a mechanism whereby morality could be maintained in a society which was becoming dominated by egoistic economic interests.<sup>17</sup> Thus, rather than using social change as a theoretical construct in an explanation of the "social facts" called "professions", Durkheim saw social change as "the fact" which had to be analysed. The professional mode of organisation served the function of mediating between the state and the individual in a manner which could maintain a stable social order.

Durkheim's analysis of the professions differed from Spencer's. While Spencer's account of the professions made some reference to the changes they were undergoing, his reference to such social change was put in terms of a "natural history". This notion, which underlies some of the later functionalist accounts, saw any change as resulting from traits inherent in this particular type of occupation.<sup>18</sup> Durkheim, on the other hand, did not argue for a set of characteristics which was intrinsic to the concept of a profession. While he did claim that those professions closely connected with the state had a more developed

professional ethic than other occupations, this was because they were more stable and better organised, and not because of any characteristics inherent in the occupations per se.<sup>19</sup> The important point is, as Nisbet has noted, that Durkheim did not see the morality of the professional organisation as being restricted to elite or privileged groups, but rather, as a mode of organisation which would be beneficial to all social strata.<sup>20</sup> Thus, the Mechanics' Institutes that were established in Australia around the turn of the century fit into his schema just as well as the Medical Associations of the same period.

Pemberton and Boreham have claimed that:

Durkheim saw the professions as the major avenue for subjugating individual motives of self-interest to the needs of the community in a manner which was functional for society.<sup>22</sup>

This is misleading in that it implies his primary concern was with the professions as a distinct group, rather than with a particular mode of organisation. The importance of the professional associations, for Durkheim, lay in their "incorporation of social, moral and psychological functions"<sup>21</sup> together with the economic functions of such associations. The professional corporation, not professions per se, could give some moral guidance to the economic order, by mediating between the state and the individual. Durkheim distinguished those occupations classified as professions from all other occupations in so far as they

were characterised by a distinct mode of organisation. He saw this mode of organisation as being conducive to the maintenance of a stable social order.

### 2.2.3 The Fabian Socialists.

The work of the Fabian Socialists, such as the Webbs, Tawney and G.B.Shaw was concerned with overcoming the maldistribution of wealth and the suffering of the poorer classes. It can therefore, be placed within the radical structuralist paradigm since it was geared to instigating fundamental social change and not to preserving the status quo. However, while the main body of their work might well conform to this paradigm, that which was specifically related to the professions did not. The point is that while they used images congruent with the paradigm, their analysis of the role of the professions in society was not a radical structuralist explanation.<sup>23</sup>

A close reading of the New Statesman supplement on the professions<sup>24</sup>, a work on which Shaw co-operated with the Webbs, supports this view. Here, the emergence of the professional organisation of "brainworkers" was seen to result in an improvement of the services offered to the community and thereby to contribute to constructive social change. They did not see it as:

. . . a matter of complaint if, coincidentally, there is also a raising of the status of the profession in public consideration and even an

increase in its aggregate emoluments and privileges.<sup>25</sup>

The support of the professions as an elite and autonomous group was, for the Webbs, crucial to the establishment of a proper system of social welfare.

They were more critical of the negative aspects of state intervention in professional affairs than of the role of professions in society.<sup>26</sup> The implementation of the Poor Laws, in particular, was the focus of a scathing attack was directed towards the failure of these laws to come to terms adequately with the very real needs of the poor as well as the gross inefficiency that resulted from the cumbersome administrative apparatus established by this legislation. They saw the Poor Laws interfering with the ability of the professions to construct a better society.

The aim of the Poor Laws was to make the receipt of any benefits as unpleasant as possible, thereby ensuring that only the "truly needy" would take up any benefits offered. The Webbs maintained that this approach did not take into account the way illness, poverty and unemployment reinforced one another. They stressed the need for more comprehensive preventative, as opposed to palliative, measures. However, any notion of the poor controlling the professional process or choosing their own doctors was firmly rejected:

Any such system would lead, not only to a most serious inroad upon the emoluments of the private practitioner but would also lead to an extravagant

expenditure of public funds on popular remedies and "medical extras", without obtaining in return for this enlarged "Medical Relief" greater regularity of life or more hygienic habits in the patients.<sup>27</sup>

In fact the tactics they suggested were almost military in nature:

. . . searching out disease, securing the earliest possible diagnosis, taking hold of the incipient case, removing injurious conditions, applying specialised treatment, enforcing healthy surroundings and personal hygiene and aiming always at preventing either recurrence or the spread of disease.<sup>28</sup>

Thus while the intention of the Webbs might have been to redistribute the wealth of society and ensure that the poor had access to resources whereby they could be assured of an adequate standard of living, this was not to be achieved by undermining the position of the professions in society.

Like many of those who were more explicitly functionalist in their approach to the professions, the Webbs did not give a blanket endorsement to all professional practices. They were critical of elite elements within the professions whose intention it was to restrict the entry of women and members of the wage earning classes.<sup>29</sup> They were also critical of those professionals who were reluctant to admit new knowledge.<sup>30</sup> The latter restriction, enforced by castigating either students or practitioners who received training from unorthodox sources, was seen by the Webbs to be a threat to the development of knowledge whereby the

brainworkers could make their positive contribution to the social order.

They cited the example of medical practitioners learning from bone-setters as an example of the problems generated by the elite elements of the professions. This was probably a reference to the case of Herbert Barker. Barker was a famous bone-setter who aroused the ire of the British medical orthodoxy in the late nineteenth century by treating, and successfully curing, many cases that medical practitioners were unable to treat effectively. He was subject to constant criticism by medical practitioners and a medical practitioner who worked with him was de-registered for unprofessional conduct, at the instigation of the British Medical Association.<sup>31</sup>

The criticisms of the professional groups which were discussed by the Webbs did not constitute the core elements of their analysis of the professions. Rather, the discussion of such issues was more akin to the attempts by some of the more sophisticated functionalists to deal with the problems of conflict and social change within functionalism.<sup>32</sup> As such they cannot be said to be working within a paradigm which is separate and distinct from functionalism.

Writing somewhat later than the Webbs, Tawney made a distinction between the professions, on the one hand, and business or industrial life, on the other.<sup>33</sup> He did this in

terms of the respective motives for organisation, an argument not dissimilar to that used by Durkheim. Tawney maintained that the motivation for the organisation of the professions was "for the performance of duties" while those engaged in business were motivated to organise in order to protect their rights, specifically the right to pecuniary gain.<sup>34</sup>

While Tawney recognised that professional organisations were also concerned with the protection of their members' rights, he claimed that any such concern was subsumed under the motivation to improve the performance of their members for the benefit of the public.<sup>35</sup> He was more chary than the Webbs on the issue of professional autonomy and advocated a role for the consumer in the supervision and control of professional activities.<sup>36</sup> In doing so he put more stress on professional self-interest than did his fellow Fabian Socialists. Nevertheless, Tawney considered professionalism to be a factor which could transform industrial and commercial settings, if it was accompanied by the ethic of service.

Like the Webbs, Tawney's overall work was concerned with the problem of social change. He supported public ownership replacing private capitalism and supported the view that the professions would play an active role in any such transformation. This role was the same as that which Durkheim attributed to the professional association, namely, the introduction of morality and altruistic, or service,

motives into the economic order. None of these writers attempted to analyse the professions, or the social role of professional organisations, in terms of the relationship between such occupations and other occupations.

#### 2.2.4 Carr-Saunders And Wilson.

In 1933 Carr-Saunders and Wilson published a study of the professions in Britain as a companion to the Webbs' work on the trade unions.<sup>37</sup> This work was a detailed, historical account of the development and organisation of the professions and remains one of the most influential and informative works in this field. Even with the proliferation of material in recent times it is still an invaluable source of empirical material.

These authors avoided any precise definition of a profession. They claimed that drawing a boundary line between professions and other occupations was a necessarily arbitrary procedure. They maintained:

. . . the typical profession exhibits a complex of characteristics and . . . other vocations approach this condition more or less closely, owing to the possession of some of these characteristics, fully or partially developed.<sup>38</sup>

This avoidance of a definition was to preoccupy later sociologists who became almost obsessed with the task of writing lists of attributes which could be posited as both necessary and sufficient to demark a profession from other

occupations.

Carr-Saunders and Wilson, while avoiding a definition of a profession, did list four objects of professional association. These were:

1. raising and maintaining standards of competence,
2. establishing ethical practices,
3. increasing the status of the occupation,
4. protecting of interests of the members.<sup>39</sup>

The first two have been the focus of functionalist analyses of the professions, while the last two have been the main focus of the more radical analyses of the professions.

The state was considered by Carr-Saunders and Wilson to be an important factor in the development of a profession even if it was potentially ambiguous. Professional associations required the co-operation of the state in order to regulate admission to and expel members from the profession and thereby maintain standards of competence and ethical practices. However, the authors saw a danger of the professional association becoming an organ of the state in performing these functions. They maintained that if this happened, the freedom of the individual professional would have been lost.<sup>40</sup> This would have undermined the rights of professionals to associate freely and to organise themselves without hindrance, conditions which Carr-Saunders and Wilson

Wilson considered to be necessary in order for professions to exert a progressive and stabilising force on society.<sup>41</sup>

The authors also examined the strategies and tactics adopted by various vocations in their respective attempts at professionalisation. These strategies included: affiliation with universities, the introduction of examinations to test competence, and the use of the Royal Charter or licensing as a means of affiliation with the state. The link between the earlier professions, especially law and medicine, and the ruling classes was also noted.<sup>42</sup> It was the acceptance of these occupations as being fit and proper vocations for gentlemen that was seen as being the reason for the high prestige of these occupations.

In short, one can find the seeds of many of the themes currently found within both of the modern paradigms of the sociology of the professions in Carr-Saunders and Wilson's text. However the work was aimed at presenting a descriptive social history of the professions and not a theoretical analysis of their development. This, together with their claim that the professions were a social force which was necessarily progressive, places them firmly within the functionalist paradigm.

### 2.2.5 Marshall

The important role of the professions in maintaining and developing modern societies is a theme that was taken up by Marshall.<sup>43</sup> He incorporated a historical dimension into his analysis, claiming that in the nineteenth century the professions became more concerned with the idea of service than with the desire to pursue a gentlemanly way of life. The latter was said to characterise the more traditional professions up until that time. The professional associations were concerned with guaranteeing the technical efficiency of their members before allowing them to practise, with excluding the unqualified, and with introducing codes of ethics. These concerns were the means by which these occupations ensured respectability and consolidated their position in the society of Victorian England.

According to Marshall, it was the possession of ethical codes that differentiated professional groups from the trades. He justified locating the professions as a moral force outside the state and above the individual on this basis. The individual was posited as the true unit of service. It was therefore necessary that those who offered essential services were concerned with the well being of those being served. A code of ethics thus helped to protect the individual by orienting professionals to a concern with their client's interests over and above their own. At the same time he proposed that the professions had a duty both

to the individual and the community, with both duties, for the most part, being in harmony. If they did conflict it was usually because "the individual [did] not know what [was] good for him".<sup>44</sup> The proliferation of the professional mode of organisation was seen as rapidly spreading throughout occupations which could not be considered to be professions "in the full meaning of the term".<sup>45</sup> Thus Marshall, like Durkheim, viewed the professions as a means of introducing morality throughout the industrial and commercial spheres of modern society.

Professional organisation, for Marshall, was the consolidating force of the rising middle class, a class he viewed as dependent upon the capitalist system for both employment and status. Perhaps it is for this reason that he concludes the essay by stating:

In spite of all their faults, it rests with them [the professions], more than any one else, to find for the sick and suffering democracies a peaceful solution to their problems. <sup>46</sup>

#### 2.2.6 Parsons

More recently, Parsons has argued that the professions have become the most important single component in the structure of modern society. He saw them as being more important than the state as a mode of social organisation.<sup>47</sup>

. . . it is precisely one of the most important facts about Western society

that to a very great extent the primary institutionalised bearers of its main cultural traditions and leaders of its thought are highly professionalized groups without whose role the distinctive characteristics of cultural traditions would be very greatly altered. Hence, short of a very profound revolution, any important changes must articulate with them, especially with the universities, and conversely through both obvious and obscure channels they undoubtedly exert an enormous influence on the social system in this context.<sup>48</sup>

As with earlier writers, Parsons concentrated upon the distinction between professional and business groups. However, he departed from the earlier positions by claiming that any differences between these groups arose from institutional forces, rather than from the motives of the respective group members. He suggested that the professions were best studied, not in terms of their inherent qualities as occupations, but by an exposition of their relationship to the complex of diverse social forces, together with the specific functions performed within that complex.<sup>49</sup> However, as with most other writers in the functionalist paradigm, emphasis was placed upon the specific functions; the relations to the complex of diverse social forces were generally not subjected to rigorous inquiry.<sup>50</sup>

#### 2.2.7 The Attribute Approach To The Professions.

A satellite of the functionalist paradigm, yet still located within that paradigm, is what has come to be known as the attribute approach.<sup>51</sup> The principal aim of this

approach has been to draw up a list of attributes which can be used to distinguish professions from other occupations.

One of the earliest attempts to use this method was that by Greenwood.<sup>52</sup> Beginning with a statement emphasising the important position of the professions in American society, Greenwood proceeded to present a list of five attributes which would distinguish the professional from the non-professional occupation. These attributes were: a systematic theory to explain the practice of the profession, authority based upon a systematic knowledge base, community sanction, a code of ethics and a common culture. Using these attributes to construct an ideal-typical model of a profession, Greenwood claimed that social work had become a true profession.<sup>53</sup> During the 1950s and 1960s there was a proliferation of studies using this approach, especially in America. Many were studies of individual professions, such as Greenwood's, while others were more concerned with professions as a category.

One of the most notable characteristics of this approach has been the lack of consistency among the various authors using it. There has been little agreement as to either the number or nature of attributes necessary to define a true profession. Millerson, in a study which included both attribute and functionalist writers, found that 21 authors had generated no less than 23 different attributes.<sup>54</sup> Fourteen of these were found to be on more than one list, but no two lists were identical. Skill based

on theoretical knowledge, emphasis on education and training, the testing of competence, organisation, codes of ethics, and altruistic motivation were found to be most commonly used. Others were: loyalty to colleagues, impartiality of service, a specific type of professional-client relationship, indispensable public service, an emphasis on non-manual work, profits not dependent upon capital, and recognised status. Probably the only point of agreement was classifying medicine and law as "true" professions. In fact, these two professions, especially medicine, were often used to generate attributes for use in analysing other occupations. Millerson made no distinction between functionalist and attribute sociologists, as did Johnson. Johnson maintained that there was a difference. He claimed that this distinction was due to the attribute approach being both less abstract and having less explanatory intent than the functionalist approach.

In the formulation of the "functionalist" models there is no attempt to present an exhaustive list of "traits", rather the components of the model are limited to those which are said to have a functional relevance to the society as a whole or to the professional-client relationship.<sup>55</sup>

While Johnson's distinction is a valid one, it is not sufficient to claim that the attribute approach is a distinct paradigm. The lack of a theoretical stance or a disagreement over specific issues does not constitute a

distinct paradigm. The attribute approach is, in fact, is a satellite of the functionalist approach to the professions; it merely avoids an explicit theoretical commitment. It is, however, implicitly functionalist and therefore must be located within the functionalist paradigm. Both approaches assume the importance of the professions in modern industrial societies, emphasise a sociology of regulation rather than a sociology of change and share a positivist epistemology seeking to develop inflexible categories for social analysis.

All the theorists who have been discussed so far have been working within the one paradigm -- functionalism. Within the literature there is a gradual shift of emphasis from the professional association to the professional occupation as the focus for sociological analysis. This paradigm assumes that the professions are a positive and beneficial force in society. Durkheim's argument that the professional organisation can provide a sound basis of morality for industrial societies still underpins much of the later work in the functionalist paradigm. Thus it is assumed that a "true profession" will place the interests of society (public interests) before the interests of the practitioners.

However, by assuming that the professions always play a beneficial role in any social change, analysis of the change itself is often avoided. Later, it will be demonstrated that the involvement of at least one occupation, medicine,

in the changes of chiropractic has not necessarily been beneficial in spite of the medical stance stance being justified by the ideal of service to the public. An adequate explanation of the changes in the occupation of chiropractic cannot be undertaken by relying upon the assumption that professions play a necessarily beneficial role in any social change. This is simply because the two occupations have taken diametrically opposed positions on the merits of chiropractic in the Australian health care system. The underpinning assumption of the functionalist paradigm in fact prevents a proper assessment of the changes in the occupation.

Some functionalist authors, e.g. Parsons, have suggested that the professions need to be studied in the broad context of the social institutions in which they are located. This suggestion has not been taken up in any rigorous fashion within the functionalist paradigm. The result has been a failure, in most instances, to give a proper account of the development of the occupation under scrutiny or its relations with the broader social structure in which it is located. Instead of working toward such an approach, the work of the functionalists has come to concentrate upon the problem of defining a profession in terms of qualities internal to the occupation. The assumed positive function of the professions has contributed to this malaise, since it has diverted sociologists' attention away from the struggle by professionals to convince the state,

the public and other occupations that their function is positive. The attribute approach in sociology is the most extreme manifestation of this position.

### 2.3 THE USE OF HISTORY.

The unreliability of the attribute approach, its emphasis on specific problems, together with its atheoretical, ahistorical epistemology have made it a ready target for the barbs of more critical writers. Roth, for example, in the leading article to the first issue of the journal The Sociology of Work and Occupations maintained that the emphasis of attribute sociologists on the issue of distinguishing professions from other occupations had decoyed sociologists into becoming mere apologists for the professions.<sup>56</sup> He claime claimed that these sociologists have failed to recognise the ideological dimension of professional rhetoric and consequentially have neglected important theoretical and social problems raised by the position of the professions in modern society.

Roth suggested a historical approach to the professions as a solution to the "attribute rut" and cited the work of Reader, Jamous and Peloille, Friedman and Gilb as useful starting points.<sup>57</sup> While the emphasis on history is certainly useful, there are three crucial issues which he fails to recognise. The first is that the attribute approach can be used as a basis for historical analysis as Inkster's work on the professionalisation of medicine in

nineteenth century Sheffield, using Greenwood's criteria, demonstrates.<sup>58</sup> Secondly, Roth implied that any sociologist who has used a list of attributes is an attribute sociologist. By doing this he failed to recognise that the attribute approach is a type of functionalist approach. (Johnson also makes this confusion.)<sup>59</sup> He thereby implicitly rejected the entire functionalist approach on the grounds that one of its subsidiaries is inadequate. Finally, by claiming that analysis of professional rhetoric is the solution to the dilemmas generated by the attribute approach there is the implication that any use of attributes whatsoever is invalid. These problems can be clarified by a brief examination of the current debate in the history, philosophy and sociology of science.

As with many historical studies of the professions, historical studies of the sciences were, until recently, dominated by accounts which emphasised the internal development of a particular field. The main focus of these studies has been upon "great men" and "grand theories". This has often entailed examining how "grand theories" were developed by "great men" and how such theories subsequently influenced the development of the field. This approach has been called the internalist approach, because of its focus upon developments within a discipline.<sup>60</sup> More recently, an approach which has emphasised the importance of the relations between a science, and broader social, political and economic forces has challenged the dominance of the

internalist approach in this field. This has been called the externalist approach. While social, political and economic relations were not ignored by those who used the internalist approach, their importance was underplayed. Extending this argument to the sociology of occupations, what becomes clear is that it is not merely the adoption of a historically orientated analysis which can get sociology out of the "attribute rut". Rather, it is a specific type of historical analysis which must be used. This analysis should focus upon the relations of a profession to the social structure in which it is located, rather than the attributes generated by the internal dynamics of a particular occupation. Of course, this does not mean that internal dynamics are to be excluded from the analysis but rather that they will no longer become the main focus of any theoretical analysis.

Historical analysis of the professions does not necessarily solve the problems presented by the broader functionalist paradigm, even if the analysis is externalist. Nor does it necessarily overcome the problem of uncritical acceptance of professional rhetoric. An externalist history merely shifts the level of analysis from the normative to the institutional level. As Dahrendorf has pointed out in a discussion of Parsons' work, a functionalist analysis does not necessarily preclude analysis at the institutional level even if it has tended to direct the attention of sociologists to problems of the normative aspects of social

structures and away from institutional analyses.<sup>61</sup> Roth has failed to recognise the need for an institutional analysis and also failed to tackle the problems which the functionalist paradigm raises for an adequate analysis of the process of professionalization.

The problem raised by the acceptance and legitimation of professional rhetoric derives, not from the attribute approach, but from the functionalist paradigm within which it is located. The dependence of the professions on "a complex balance of diverse social forces" was noted by Talcott Parsons.<sup>62</sup> However, as Larson has noted, Parsons and others who have adopted similar "ideal-typical or institutional" approaches to the professions have tended:

. . . to emphasise the functional relations of the professions with central needs and values, at the expense of the "complex balance of social forces" which supports such relations.<sup>63</sup>

The use of a historical analysis, then, does not necessarily link the problem of professional rhetoric to the fundamental assumptions of the functionalist paradigm. It does, however, lead the way to a broader, more comprehensive analysis of the professions. This, when combined with a critical evaluation of the underlying assumptions of functionalism, can lay the groundwork for an adequate sociological account of an occupation and occupational change.

## 2.4 THE RADICAL STRUCTURALIST PARADIGM

The main thrust of the functionalist paradigm has been toward analyses of the professions as being central to the order and regulation of society. The result has been the use, as basic premises for sociological analysis, of the authority of the professions and the legitimacy of their position as agents of social control. This is a view with which most professionals themselves would wholeheartedly agree. To be sure, many authors of this genre have indicated some misgivings about the motives of some practitioners but, on the whole, there has been no thorough analysis in the functionalist framework which has been consistently critical of the rhetoric or interests of professional groups. The basic assumptions of the paradigm do not allow for this. Rather, the critical work constitutes a distinct and separate paradigm which has focused attention on processes external to the occupation.

The radical structural paradigm has only begun to exert a significant influence on sociological work on the professions over the last twenty years. Before then, it was to be found mainly in the work of economists who saw the professional association as a mechanism which weighted market forces in favour of suppliers.<sup>64</sup> While the problem of pecuniary motives was often mentioned in the functionalist literature, it was generally considered to be less important, or at least modified by, the motivation of professionals by service ideals, together with the important

role of the services played in the functioning of the overall society. It is the radical structuralist paradigm to which we must turn in order to find the theoretical constructs to build an adequate framework to properly analyse the professions as social phenomena. One of the first sociologists to take up this theme was Rueschemeyer.

#### 2.4.1 Rueschemeyer

Rueschemeyer argued that one of the main problems with using a functionalist model to analyse the professions was the strong influence which the medical profession has had on the development and application of that model.<sup>65</sup> Applying the model to the legal profession he found it wanting because it did not account for either the non-scientific character of legal knowledge, crucial to an understanding of the legal profession, or the social dissensus about the values to which that profession is committed.

In order to overcome these shortcomings he suggested a number of revisions to the functionalist model.<sup>66</sup> First, he suggested that more emphasis should be placed on different types of knowledge, since different occupations will have different types of knowledge on which they are based. Secondly, by "focusing explicit attention on divergent and possibly conflicting value orientations and interests" the analysis would be able to deal adequately with conflict of interest between professionals and the groups which they serve. (To this I would add being able to deal with

conflict of interests with other occupational groups.) Finally, Rueschemeyer suggested that by integrating some analysis of social stratification with an analysis of professions "the collectivity-orientated self-definiton" of the professions accepted by the functionalist model could be avoided.

The first of these points could be incorporated within the functionalist paradigm. It is the last two points which place Rueschemeyer outside that paradigm. He suggested that it was not "core values" which were crucial for an analysis of the professions, but rather the class location and social origins of the practitioners, together with the class position of their clients and "other role partners". It is the access to and mobilisation of the "means of power, prestige and ideology" which were crucial, for Rueschemeyer, to the development of an adequate explanatory model of the professions.<sup>67</sup> This theme was developed in more detail by Gilb.<sup>68</sup> However, before considering Gilb's work, it is useful to examine the work of Johnson.

#### 2.4.2 Johnson

Johnson presents an argument which is similar to that of Rueschemeyer's criticism of functionalism. He also incorporates a more explicit criticism of the ahistorical assumptions built in to the functionalist approach. He

argues that these assumptions leave the functionalist account of the professions open for the same attack levelled at the functionalist theory of stratification. He sees the functionalist analysis as:

. . . .a distortion of reality because it neglects a historical explanation which indicates that any given reward structure is the result of arrogation by groups with the power to secure their claims and create their own system of legitimation.<sup>69</sup>

The thrust of Johnson's argument is to claim that neither the trait nor the functionalist approach to the professions can account for "the real variations in the organisation of occupations in culturally and historically distinct societies".<sup>70</sup> He maintains that, in order to overcome the shortcomings of the functionalist approach, the object of the study ought to be the institutional control of an occupational activity, not the activity per se. This control can be analysed in terms of the extent to which an occupational group imposes its own definition on the producer-consumer relationship.

Three types of control are proposed: collegiate (in which the definition is made by the producer), patronage (in which the consumer defines), and mediation (in which a third party, such as the state defines the relationship). Johnson maintains that mediation by the state is a threat to professionalism (collegiate control). For example, if the state can control the standards of education and practice,

the professional association becomes reduced to the status of a pressure group performing the "trade union" functions of fighting for income and conditions. The members of the occupation would, in such a case, lose the power to define both the scope and content of practice since the identity of the occupation would no longer be under the control of the practitioners themselves. While Johnson does recognise the importance of power in any analysis of the professions, Johnson does not locate the source of this power in any concrete or meaningful way. This position is quite similar to that of Carr-Saunders and Wilson. The state is perceived as a threat to professional autonomy and professional power, both of which are rooted in collegiate control. The manner in which the state can enhance collegiate control and occupational autonomy tends to be underplayed.

Producer autonomy, for Johnson, is crucial to a proper understanding of professionalism. The potential for autonomy is created by the specialised skills of the professional which enables the development of a structure of uncertainty in the relationship between producer and consumer. It is the indeterminacy generated by this structure of uncertainty which allows for collegiate control when members of an occupation have access to "resources of power". In this schema, indeterminacy is equated with mystification rather than with the sophistication or rationality of the knowledge base. Jamous and Peloille, from whom Johnson draws the concept of indeterminacy, argue

that rational knowledge which has the potential to be routinised undermines its potential for indeterminacy, and thereby its potential as a source of power, since it then becomes readily accessible to the uninitiated.<sup>71</sup>

The key concept of Johnson's analysis is "resources of power" and access thereto. However, he does not specify what these resources are. Further, access to resources of power is seen in the light of the broad notion of membership of a ruling class or caste.<sup>72</sup> In a later work he points out that the weakness of his earlier analysis lay in his failure to develop an adequate account of class relations. Here he argued that:

. . . professionalism, involving colleague control of work activities, can arise only where the ideological and political processes sustaining indetermination coincide with the requirements of capital.<sup>73</sup>

By this argument then, the process of professionalisation tends to be undertaken only if an occupation is able to serve the interests of capital.

Johnson suggests a conceptual framework for dealing with the problem of the class location of the professions. He does not, however, undertake a comprehensive class analysis of the professions. Nor is it within the scope of this thesis to pursue such a task. Merely by focusing attention on a single occupation such an undertaking is ruled out since a broader range of occupations would be

required to do this adequately.

#### 2.4.3 Gilb

Gilb's work on the professions was not written as a sociological essay, but as an essay on government. However, her analysis fits quite well into the radical structuralist paradigm in that it emphasised power, prestige and professional, as opposed to public, interests in the discussion of the development of the professions. Gilb's primary concern was with the relations between private organisations and the state via the processes of public lawmaking.<sup>74</sup> While the main emphasis was upon the professions and professional organisation, her aim was to shed light on the American system as a whole and the relations between the various parts of that system, using the professions as a focus.<sup>75</sup> While she spent some time on the comparison between the modern profession and its traditional predecessor, the guild, the main focus of her historical account is upon the development of the professions in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

Gilb saw the main reasons for the organisation of professionals into their respective associations during this period as being due to changing social relations in the economic sphere of modern society, together with "the organisational revolution in business, labour and other fields". The rise of the corporation threatened the livelihood of those professionals who were not corporate

employees. The professional association was seen to be the professionals' response to the dominance of society by the corporate organisation. The former gave professionals a mode of organisation which could protect their position in the developing social structure.

According to Gilb, the early professional associations in the U.S.A. were formed by elitist groups, often by professionals who also held responsible government positions, and were orientated to the advancement of "better" members.<sup>76</sup> These organisations were not generally representative of the main body of the occupation. Gilb did not assume that the professions were inherently distinct from other occupations. Rather, she concentrated upon examining the way in which the organisation of the professionals was influenced by the developing social and political institutions of modern American society.

The trend was for the associations to shift from being locally organised to become national organisations. This shift was facilitated by improvements in communication systems in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, together with the perceived need for these associations to lobby at a national level in a co-ordinated manner. Especially important was the desire to gain control over their work situation and the means of effectively sanctioning members and competitors.<sup>77</sup> Some members of the professions were not conforming to the good example set by the "better" members. Consequentially, to gain public

respect and maintain an identity compatible with their elite positions, the professions turned to the state for the power to impose effective sanctions, both on practising members and prospective practitioners.<sup>78</sup> The aim of the professional associations was to exclude the unorthodox and the unqualified at the same time as enhancing the status of their members.

In her treatment of the state, Gilb made a significant break from the earlier functionalist writers who maintained that involvement with the state could be detrimental to the autonomy of the professions, at least in the long term. For Gilb, the state was crucial to the maintenance of professional autonomy. Her analysis used detailed empirical material to make broader generalisations about the systematic structure of American society. While she did not develop the notion of the state or the role of the professions in forming or maintaining class structures to the extent that later writers such as Larson and Johnson have<sup>79</sup>, she has presented detailed empirical material in such a way as to make clear the necessity of using both a historical analysis and a theoretical paradigm which does not confuse professional rhetoric with the interests of professionals in the manner which most functionalist analyses have done.