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The position of professionals in public services is affected directly by public management reforms. This article systematically links different types of governance to professionalism, using Osborne’s (2010) distinction between Public Administration, New Public Management and New Public Governance. In the development of professionalism in the context of public management, one can observe an increasing fragmentation of sources of legitimacy, an accumulation of different professional requirements and a growing difficulty to distinguish professionals and non-professionals.
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INTRODUCTION

The position of professionals in public services is affected directly by public management reforms. In this article, we systematically link different types of governance to professionalism, using Osborne’s (2010) distinctions among Public Administration, New Public Management, and New Public Governance.

The state has traditionally played an important role in shaping the nature and role of the professions. A number of studies have furthered our understanding on professionalism in the context of public management (e.g., Pollitt, 2006; Clarke & Newman, 2007; Noordegraaf, 2007; Green, 2009). Whereas early professionalization processes paralleled the emergence of capitalism and the rise of the welfare state, more recent discussions have tended to focus on the effects of increased managerial control and performance measurement, examining the changing relationships between managers and professionals within an intra-organizational context (e.g., Exworthy & Halford, 1999; Muzio & Kirkpatrick, 2011). Less attention has so far been devoted to the effects of newer trends in governance, which place the professional in the context of inter-organizational networks. Exploring the implications of these latest developments towards more pluralism in governance would place the study of professionals again more explicitly at the heart of public management research.

Describing the evolution of the professional in public services is far from straightforward, since different conceptualizations and practices exist alongside one another, in various hybrid forms, rather than neatly succeeding one another. To disentangle and clarify this complex and muddled reality, it is necessary first to theoretically link typologies of governance to professionalism in a systematic fashion, identifying the effects of the former in terms of the constitutive elements of what it means to be a professional. The objective of this contribution is to propose the first outline of such a systematic framework.

To address the implications of shifts in governance for the position of professionals, we must revisit the basic conceptualization of professionalism. In the second section, we will discuss definitional elements emerging from the literature. Next, we will discuss the significance of the state and of modes of governance in shaping the professions. In the fourth section, we develop this link between governance and professionalism systematically, using Osborne’s classification of Classic Public Administration, New Public Management, and New Public Governance. We will end this contribution with suggestions for future research.

THE NATURE OF PROFESSIONALISM IN THE CONTEXT OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Following Wilensky’s (1964) famous assertion that everyone is becoming a professional, it is difficult to make a clear demarcation between professional professions and other occupations (Brante, 2011). The definitional issue has
since become less salient and scholars have come to accept that it is not possible to distinguish professionals and non-professionals strictly (Evetts, 2006). However, it is useful to revisit this discussion, since it helps to identify the key elements in a renewed assessment of professionalism (see also Saks, 2012).

Earlier work on professionalism shows that the concept of professionalism has always been interpreted in mutual and sometimes even contradictory ways (see Evetts, 2003; Crook, 2008; Brante, 2011; Saks, 2012). This is because different studies tend to emphasize different elements of professionalism: some stress the idealism of individual professionals, others the nature of their work in service delivery, yet others the conflict and interest group politics associated with professional occupations.

But although definitions of the professional vary (e.g., Burrage et al., 1990; Freidson, 2001; Sennett, 2008), they tend to incorporate the following components:

1. A professional has specific knowledge and expertise, based on the application of systematic theoretical principles.
2. The professional belongs to a closed community of people with similar knowledge and expertise. This community is characterized by shared norms and values, institutions for socialization, and regulation.
3. The closed nature of the community is considered legitimate by the wider society within which it operates.
4. Both at the individual level and at the level of their community, professionals are allowed a broad measure of discretionary autonomy to manage their own affairs.

We will now describe each of these characteristics in more detail.

Professionals rely on specific knowledge and expertise to fulfill their craft or practice. The knowledge and expertise professionals need to acquire consist of tacit and explicit (scientific) knowledge (e.g., Freidson, 2001; Sennett, 2008). Tacit knowledge is mostly gathered during an apprenticeship as it is based on acquiring specific skills to guarantee that professionals know better than someone else how to cut into flesh or conduct open heart surgery. Explicit systematic knowledge is acquired in lengthy and shared (university) training. Having both the skills and knowledge almost automatically generates trust in professionals and their judgments. As a consequence professionals are in a certain way set apart from other kinds of workers (Freidson, 1984) and laypersons.

The erosion of the position of professionals is also related to higher levels of education, information technology, and the emancipation of the individual citizen (Haug, 1976, 1988). Expert knowledge is now no longer confined to a select handful of occupations. But even occupations that are still scarce (e.g., members of parliaments) have suffered from a loss of legitimacy (Dalton, 2004). In what is referred to as “proto-professionalization” (De Swaan, 1996; Dent, 2006), citizens make a psychological or medical diagnosis of their own, e.g., through Internet tests, before consulting an actual medical expert. The availability of information does not necessarily mean that they are equipped or competent to take part in professional judgment, but however that may be, this development does affect both the client-professional relationship as well as the position of the professional. Altogether, the work of the traditional professionals has come to seem less like magic (e.g., Wolinsky, 1988). As a result, their traditional authority is in decline, as they once replaced older traditional status positions such as that of the nobility. Professional methods have become more ambiguous and contested (Noordegraaf & Abma, 2003).

A closed community can be seen as a formal self-regulating group of people involved in a coherent craft or practice. These communities constitute the institutionalization of occupational practices with a high degree of self-control. Moreover, these communities create and symbolize professional behavior and practices by control and socialization. Within communities the means to do so are defining professional work, developing ethic codes of conduct, developing professional standards, establishing boundaries, and by threatening expulsion from its ranks and loss of the associated privileges if needed (e.g., Wolinsky, 1988).

Historically, community members have relatively little communication with others outside their own professional community and are fairly loyal to their professional community. Moreover, in Anglo-Saxon countries professional communities and in particular the communities of strongly professionalized occupations were able to mobilize power, and to establish professional control and occupational closure. Since being a member of a professional community and having the status of a professional became attractive occupational groups seeking recognition and public trust mobilized under the umbrella of an association, institute, or another formal body and tried to start up a professional community. The notion of a professional community spurred the professionalization of groups as diverse as engineers, nurses, planners, scientists, and teachers. It is illustrative that there has been a proliferation of occupations claiming to have professional status. Occupations that were previously regarded as insufficiently skilled or organized have started to “professionalize,” at least in name. In continental Europe the urge to seek recognition and form communities was less strong than in Anglo-Saxon countries. In continental Europe the states had a stronger influence on occupations, offering some occupations professionals control and making professions responding to external demands for political, economic, or cultural change.

The key characteristics of professionalism presented here are of course strongly linked to one another. Factors such as knowledge and expertise are essential for the legitimacy of
a closed community whereas the closed nature of a professional community in its turn is considered legitimate within the wider society in which it operates. The privileges of communities were acknowledged and accepted, allowing communities to regulate access and to remain closed.

At the individual level and level of the community professionals have a broad measure of discretionary autonomy in curing the ill, advancing science, and educating the young. The need for discretionary autonomy was strengthened by the notion that standardization of professional work is in most cases almost impossible. The nature of professional work requires individual treatments, confidential advice-giving, and trust and confidence between the practitioner and client. On the level of the community the discretionary autonomy is acknowledged and for a long time considered a natural facet of professional work (e.g., Green, 2009). The interests of individual clients to be treated as unique clients/individuals paralleled and strengthened the professional associations’ codes of conduct offering professionals discretionary autonomy to stay away from processes of standardization and stronger control.

Here, it is important to make a distinction between professions with and without strong professional associations. The stronger associations having the power to influence or even bypass policy initiatives are likely to have less difficulty in retaining the discretionary autonomy of their members (Tummers, 2012). Whereas school teachers and social workers, both having less strong professional associations, suffer from powerlessness and strategic means to influence or change policy. Despite the existing variety between professional associations the discretionary autonomy of most public professionals has decreased over the years. Public professionals have become socialized into organizations requiring them to focus on different coordination mechanisms (e.g., Noordegraaf, 2007; Reay & Hinings, 2009).

Altogether, the four characteristics—or ideal types—of professionalism are interlocked and have led to a special way of controlling and organizing professional workers and their work. As we will show in the next section, the state has been a crucial force in defining the professions. Changes in how the state governs reflect directly on the latter, a point to which we will return at the end of this contribution.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GOVERNANCE IN RELATION TO THE PROFESSIONS

Evetts (2006) has asserted that the professions are generally focused on responding to external political, economic, cultural, and social demands for change, rather than on actively capturing or defending their status. The state has been a vital constitutive force in the development of professionalism by contributing to the institutionalization of occupational closure. Scott (2008) notes that the nature of professional power reflects the state’s relationships to the social groups that control the professions. We will here focus mainly on Continental Europe, the UK, and Canada and the U.S., bearing in mind that there are important differences in the regulation of professions among these countries and that there have been similar developments elsewhere. The state’s contribution to this process can be understood as vehicle to meet what was then perceived as in the public interest and, by extension, in the state’s interest. The result of this intertwined development has been that reforms of the state tend to affect the nature of professionalism directly.

The institutionalization process and process of professionalization parallels the emergence of capitalism and the rise of the welfare state. Adler et al. (2008) illustrate that occupations that are central to capitalist growth, such as engineering and accounting, claimed professional status in the 19th century; subsequently, with the rise of the welfare state in the 20th century, teaching, social work, and public health professions gradually institutionalized. In countries where the state developed into a welfare state, many of the formerly “free” professions were subsequently incorporated into organizations in the public sector and started to receive direct or indirect funding by governments. Professionals became “organizational professionals,” subject to both bureaucratic and professional control (Clarke & Newman, 1997). Wilensky (1964) captured this in the term “program professionals.” This has also meant that public management reforms have affected the nature of professionalism directly. As generally managerial control over public and private sector organizations has tightened, so have controls over professionals. The changed operational modes of organizations, such as a stronger focus on service outputs, the specification of products, the objectification of performance, and tighter budgetary control all forced the need to reshape professionals. To what extent and how the nature of professional work changed has largely depended on a complex mix of factors, including political interference, the status and power of professionals within the organization, the presence of state funding, and commercial fees (e.g., Evetts, 2011).

Nevertheless, the imposition of targets, benchmarks, and scorecards do have consequences for the prioritization of work activities, as do paperwork, box-ticking, and the standardization of work processes. Moreover, by considering professional work as a product that can be marketed, price tagged, and evaluated by consumers, it has become a marketable good. Consequently, the relations between professionals and clients change into a kind of customer relation through the establishment of a quasi-market. One implication for professionals has been that their orientation has to shift from the professional community its ethical codes, standards, and control mechanisms to the organization’s mores and customer’s wishes.

The causality of such developments is complicated, because governance cannot be regarded as the sole driver of changes in the position of professionals. Indeed, it can
also be interpreted as a reaction to those changes. The fact that managerial control over professionals could be strengthened has been facilitated by the loss of legitimacy described earlier, which occurred independently as general levels of education and knowledge in society rose. It also reflects general processes of rationalization and specific advances in the scope of measurement. Historically, it has proved difficult to define with precision what constitutes good medical treatment, good teaching, or good counseling. This is reflected, for instance, in the cumbersome process of developing public quality standards in search of greater accountability. For similar reasons, it has also proved hard to price and market these types of services. But our knowledge in these areas, while still incomplete and controversial, has significantly advanced (Anheier, 2005; Carman, 2009). This process has recently received a boost by the development of information technologies that aid the analysis and spread of information on an unprecedented scale.

While many professional tasks remain highly specialized and obscure to the layperson, information on them is much more readily available and more transparent. Most of us cannot perform open-heart surgery, at least not with a high chance of success; but we can read up on the whole procedure and its risks on the Internet. In various countries, there are websites comparing the performance of the hospital to others. This may make us appreciate the qualified surgeon’s skill, but it also reduces the mystery and makes us less likely to regard the surgeon as a creature with mystical qualities. In the public services as a whole, advances in auditing and monitoring methods and the rise of professional auditors have made performance measurable in more refined and accessible ways (Carman, 2009). Public management techniques introduced to exercise more control over professional practices are both an expression of this development as well as a driver of it.

Likewise, new trends in governance can be expected to change the position of professionals further. Discussions on the effect of public management reforms on this position tend to refer to a context of tightening managerial control, that is, to the type of reforms broadly referred to as “New Public Management.” Generally, that leads to an emphasis on intra-organizational dynamics and the effects of performance measurement. However, there is less work on more recent reformulations of governance practices that stress the pluralistic nature of modern-day government. A growing awareness of multi-problems and the existing interdependence between distinctive professional groups and organizations to tackle problems illustrate that the context of such practices is inter- rather than intra-organizational. This implies that organizations and their professionals have to engage in inter-organizational collaboration.

Adler, Kwon, and Heckscher (2008) show that the kind of collaboration that is these days demanded is not restricted to peer professionals but increasingly embraces peers from other professions. Moreover, they demonstrate that difficulties in moving toward a broader and denser collaboration between professionals should not be underestimated. Such attempts might lead to resistance, dispersed control, and constant ambiguity over which targets and standards are used. This is again likely to affect the ways in which professionals operate.

There is much valuable work discussing such relationships between public management reforms and the position of professionals, some of which we have already referred to (without any claim to be exhaustive). The discussion has been complicated by the fact that, as with modes of governance themselves, different conceptualizations and practices exist alongside one another, in various hybrid forms, rather than neatly succeeding one another. The challenge for future research is to disentangle these as precisely as possible. The first step towards this is to systematically link typologies of governance to professionalism, identifying the effects of the former in terms of the constitutive elements of what it means to be a professional. We will do so in the next section, using the typology developed some years ago by Osborne (2010).

PROFESSIONALISM IN THE CONTEXT OF SHIFTS IN GOVERNANCE

There are various categorizations of perspectives on governance, each of which categorizes approaches to government and, by extension, how the state relates to other actors. Generally they describe the shift from a centralized, top-down view to one with an emphasis on decentralization, output control, and competition, then to one in which the government operates in a pluralistic, more fragmented environment. The third and most recent is the most contentious, since there is still little consensus on its exact nature and effects. Here, we will follow the three-fold categorization recently proposed by Osborne (2010), which distinguishes between Classical Public Administration, New Public Management, and New Public Governance.

Classic Public Administration embraces elements such as dominance of the rule of law, a split between politics and administration within public organizations, and the hegemony of the professional in public service delivery (Lane, 1995). The second, known as New Public Management, focuses upon the control and measurement of output control, often in the context of competition and/or
financial discipline (Hood, 1991). The third and most recent is New Public Governance. New Public Governance can be seen as a paradigm of public service delivery that is rooted in institutional and network theory (Osborne, 2010). It posits both a plural state where multiple interdependent actors contribute to the delivery of public services, and a pluralist state where multiple processes inform the policy-making system. Of course, empirically these ideal, typical perspectives on governance are less easy to distinguish and various mixes can be found between countries and professional sectors. Nevertheless, it is clear that governance affects inter-organizational relationships within the public sector; by implication, they also affect organizations and the professionals working within them.

If this is the case, it means that professionalism in the context of public services is effectively redefined as the approach to governance changes. Therefore it is necessary to revisit the definition of professionalism suggested in the second section, in order to understand what professionalism means in a specific governance context. To restate, this definition consisted of four main elements:

1. knowledge and expertise;
2. community;
3. legitimacy; and
4. discretionary autonomy.

Each of these will be considered separately.

Two qualifications are necessary. Professionalism invariably involves a mix of elements derived from distinct governance traditions, so the difference must be read as gradual rather than absolute. For instance, even within a system of increased output control, the standards of the professional community remain important. A second qualification is that the suggestion of a single chain of cause and effect must be avoided. As we have argued above, social trends, governance, and professionalism are connected in complex ways. It is clear that the state continues to have a formative influence on the professions, since the modes of governance are influenced by trends such as privatization, quasi-markets, and the design of accountability. However, these trends are themselves triggered by developments in the professions. Likewise, as professionals become subject to stricter organizational controls, their autonomy takes on a partly different nature; but it is because of the weakening of professional communities that organizational controls can be imposed in the first place. The connection is one of Wahlverwandtschaft and not of singular causality.

Classic Public Administration

In Classic Public Administration, the professional community derives legitimacy from its substantive knowledge and expertise. The legitimacy of this knowledge allows the community to regulate access and to remain closed. Although professionals cannot be considered a unified block, by this time a large share of the professionals in the public services perform their activities within organizations and therefore become subject to stricter organizational controls. These are not the “free professions” of old. However, even though there may be an organizational context, such as a professional bureaucracy, the professional community remains dominant. This gives professionals a large measure of discretion. By virtue of the complexity of the tasks involved, process and output quality are barely measured. To outsiders, the professional is essentially a wizard. Professionalism remains a pre-rational, essentially mystical element in a rationalized organizational context. Control of professionals therefore mostly focuses on the input side, by limiting the access of clients to public services or capping budgets.

Of course, even within this approach the autonomy of professionals is not without controversy, but the legitimacy based on substantive knowledge is essentially respected as a different logic within the organization. The divide between professionals and non-professionals is clear. The autonomy of the professionals is structured largely at the level of the professional community and controlled at the individual level. This precedes a phase in which output and organizational processes come under increasing scrutiny. We will discuss this in terms of a switch from one governance perspective to another, but it should be kept in mind that historically it was less a sudden imposition of organizational controls than an incremental process, by which the line between professional and organizational communities has gradually faded.

New Public Management

In New Public Management, rationalization has penetrated to the professional layer of the organization. The mix of organizational and professional control has tilted towards the former. The contention of much work in this field is that it has led to severely diminished professional autonomy (Green, 2009). How these public management reforms have in fact affected professionals may be more ambiguous. On the one hand, they have underlined the need for decentralized decision-making and autonomy, which can be seen as favoring professionals. On the other hand, and this is the interpretation stressed in much of the literature on professionalism, NPM also emphasizes output control and performance measurement, which potentially diminish professional autonomy and professional judgment when output is defined and measured in detail. This includes performance measurement and stricter control over the type of activities that professionals should concentrate on. As a consequence, professionals are no longer the sole arbiters of questions and means. It is no longer the individual capacity, knowledge, or professional judgment that is at stake but the overall quality of the service, the organization, school, or hospital.
Legitimacy based on the exclusivity of knowledge is by this time becoming less pronounced, with knowledge becoming less opaque and more open to outside scrutiny, which means that there is scope for standardization and control. Accountability-enhancing change programs involve some degree of standardization, formalization, and outsider or managerial control and evaluation (Detert & Polluck, 2008) As a consequence the autonomy of professionals is structured to a far greater degree by the measurement categories defined within organizations. The difference between professionals and non-professional employees has further eroded.

This is the classical kind of internal conflict described by the sociologists who studied the dynamics of bureaucracy in Weber's wake and later captured in such concepts as Hage's mechanic-organic type (1980) and Mintzberg's "professional bureaucracy" (1983). In organizational terms, it usually takes shape as a tension between the program proponents and the professionals within the organization—often professional bureaucracies—that have to implement management strategy. Contrary to what is sometimes argued, professionals are not necessarily on the losing side. Organizations with a strong body of professionals have often proved quite adept at insulating themselves from new managerial techniques, even with the state investing a lot of effort in imposing these techniques (Ackroyd et al., 2007).

In addition, conflict is not a given: the extent to which tension translates into conflict has been shown to vary. Earlier studies have shown that formalizations could be perceived positively as well as negatively by workers, depending on their enabling or obstructive nature (Adler & Borys, 1996). These findings indicate that the extent to which formalization is considered intrinsically meaningful is relevant for its acceptance and might prevent an actual power struggle. Where this does occur, it is because professionals perceive that most attention is given to performance rankings, and efficiency while other valued ends seem to be marginalized.

As compared to Classic Public Administration, this type of governance is less a dialogue between fundamentally different social entities and value systems than a discussion over the relative weight of different objectives. Professionals do recognize the need to control the effort expended in relation to demand—indeed, the principle is inherent to professional communities that close access and regulate internally. The question is to what extent organizations can reach a balance between values that is considered fair by all those concerned. To what extent inherent tensions over values translate into conflict can be described as a measure of the civic quality of an organization as a social entity (Brandsen, 2009).

New Public Governance

In New Public Governance, the organizational context becomes an inter-organizational context, usually geographically or functionally defined, in which professionalism is defined by the interaction with networks of organizations. Inter-professional collaboration implies that professionals need to find ways of engaging with contending audiences in energizing projects that new social relationships, new networks, and that new communities may be formed. The knowledge to solve problems is dispersed and as such the process of defining the relevant knowledge is itself part of the interaction. As different communities interact, the objectives and standards of individual professionals become contested within complex and dynamic arenas. As a consequence, communication and trust are as important in establishing legitimacy as knowledge itself. It is not only the position of the professional that is being contested, but also the nature of the substantive task (Noordegraaf, 2007). This was of course also the case under New Public Management, but the controversy has become more fundamental. It is not only a question of weighing different objectives of professional activities, but of challenging the very nature of these objectives. This is the governance perspective that has so far received the least attention in the public management literature on professionalism.

Given the broader loss of professional legitimacy in society described earlier, this is not only a discussion among different organizations and professionals within formal collaborative networks, but also a discussion that takes place in direct interaction with clients. Patients and pupils voice private opinions based on case-to-case experience. A non-representative, but illustrative anecdote from a family member of one of the authors: a doctor visits a patient in hospital; the patient asks how long the effect of the painkiller will last; the doctor gives a time; the patient answers: “That’s just your opinion.”

Table 1 summarizes the changes in the function and position of professionals by presenting the definitional elements of professionalism (left column) together with the three types of governance.

CONCLUSION

This article has addressed the conceptualization of the role of professionals in public services. The state has had an important formative role with respect to the professions. Historically, power delegated to professionals in law and medicine was in the state’s interest to foster stability and civility of the social system. After the professionalization of these groups, power was also delegated to new occupations and new professional groups that were central to capitalistic growth. At the time, this served the interests of the state. More recently, the state’s interests have best been served by constraining and commodifying professional activity, e.g., by codifying standards and encouraging transparency. It is clear that the fate of the state and the professions is closely intertwined, which means the nature of the latter is determined to a significant extent by shifts in
governance. The interesting question for public management research is how different types of governance specifically affect professionalism.

In this article, we have systematically addressed how types of governance (using Osborne’s categorization of Public Administration, New Public Management, and New Public Governance) affect the position of professionals in the public services. If these are read as successive stages in the development of governance (though this is a simplification of empirical reality) what we see is an increasing fragmentation of sources of legitimacy, an accumulation of different professional requirements, and a growing difficulty to distinguish professionals and non-professionals.

There has already been some valuable work on the effects on public management reforms on the position of professionals, although this has so far particularly focused on the effects of New Public Management. What such work is beginning to show is that professionals in the context of public management must be considered as a specific subset of professionals meriting independent study. Many important issues remain for future public management research, four of which we here identify.

The first is how the most recently formulated perspective in governance, here described as New Public Governance, will ultimately affect the position of the professionals and how the change should be assessed. Whitty (2008) considers a new active and engaged professionalism preferable to returning to the traditional type. Others, by contrast, have claimed that inter-professional collaboration will result in de-professionalization (e.g., Furlong, 2005). Empirically, we still know relatively little about the dynamics of interprofessionals contacts in this context, their effects upon professional autonomy and legitimacy, and how this in turn affects the relative status and power differences between new and old professions.

A second and related question is how professionals function when different logics coincide and possibly conflict. Although New Public Management is decidedly passé in the vanguard of public management research, it is still very much alive in the practice of government departments and public agencies. The succession between different types of governance is not clear-cut and different types of governance co-exist. Theoretically it is possibly to identify the effects of distinctive types of governance, but how do professionals respond to a context in which different elements mix?

Furthermore, there is the question how the substantive content of professional work is influenced by changes in governance. Perspectives on governance are not neutral instrumental philosophies, but value-laden visions on the motivation and drives of actors and the proper role of governments. Each perspective therefore also carries normative assumptions about what professionals are and what they should be doing. This connection between the governance of professions and professional content needs further work, especially on a cross-sectorial basis.

Finally, that also means that the professional in the context of public services can be regarded as distinct from professionals in other domains of society. Drawing inspiration from business literature and the sociology of professions is useful, and interaction between the different traditions should certainly be encouraged. However, it is essential that public management research takes the responsibility of developing its own, distinctive theoretical perspective on professionalism and how it relates to more general issues.

TABLE 1
Professionals and Three Subsequent Types of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>NPM</th>
<th>NPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Mystical knowledge</td>
<td>Rationalized knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Dominant professional community</td>
<td>Dominant organizational community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of legitimacy</td>
<td>Professional standards</td>
<td>Organizational output and professional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Structured by professional community</td>
<td>Contested within professional bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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