

Theories of Professionalism and Theories of Entrepreneurship – Alignments and Differences in Contemporary Capitalism

Distributed Paper

Anne KOVALAINEN, University of Turku, Finland

Seppo POUTANEN, University of Turku, Finland
Senior Research Fellow (SWiPE, see <http://www.smartworkresearch.fi/>)
Dr. Soc. Sc., Docent of sociology
Management and Information Systems Science (shared)
University of Turku, School of Economics
20014 University of Turku
Finland
email: seppou@utu.fi
tel.: +358 (0)40 723 8993

Changes and Challenges in Theories and Concepts for Professions and Professionalism
Friday, 20 July 2018: 17:30-19:20
RC52 Sociology of Professional Groups

XIX ISA World Conference of Sociology
Toronto, Canada
15th – 21st July 2018

Abstract

This paper takes up and brings together connections, linkages and differences between professionalism and entrepreneurialism. Through the discussion, the paper addresses the two separate fields that are aligned in some theoretical studies but less so in empirical research. There are several aspects through which professionalism and entrepreneurialism can be valorized and related to each other. In this Paper, research on professions and on entrepreneurship will be explored for the building-up of further theoretical and empirical research linkages and programmes.

Intersectionality, work arrangements and aspects of power, capitalism, new economy and markets are helpful in establishing differences and linkages between the two fields. The paper looks for assemblages and differences between the two conceptual fields in the modern post-Fordist world of work. The paper ends with notions of blurring boundaries, possible

interconnections and the future shaping of the research field common for professional and entrepreneurial studies.

Classics uniting the Professionalism and Entrepreneurialism Research

Research on professions and research of entrepreneurship have more issues in common that easily comes to mind, however, they are most often kept apart in theoretical discussions and both also having their own distinct empirical research trends. Both professions and professionalism on the one hand, and entrepreneurialism and entrepreneurship on the other hand contain the two classical key conceptual fields in sociology and social sciences that have some common theoretical roots than most empirical studies in either field would propose, as both fields of study have developed in differing directions over time. In the following we will explore both research fields, provide short review to current developments and offer ideas and directions for the future research.

Research on professions and research on entrepreneurship have some features such as sociological classics in common. Professions have been part of the sociological classics and canon, not only through Marx and Weber but also through Durkheim and Parsons' works (Parsons, 1939; Kuhlmann, 2006; Evetts, 2002; Hanlon, 1998). Weber's seminal work on professions and bureaucracy and on economy and society, Marx's writings on formation of social classes and stratification, Durkheim's analysis of moral communities and later Parson's recognition of relationship between professions and social order have been used as core, the corpus for theoretical foundation in the research of professions (e.g. Ritzer, 1975) in many ways. To lesser extent it is known or appreciated that these canonical classics have formed the core theoretical basis also for the research in entrepreneurship and self-employment and their roles in societal formation and economic development (Swedberg, 1991).

For Weber, professions were not the aim but the means by which the rationalization of the society was progressing, essentially the professions were part of the rationalization of society and bureaucratization process within society. These societal change processes were not attached to any specific occupational groups or professions alone, but more generally, change in the occupations and professions. Professions were seen as promoting societies where knowledge as an organizing mechanism was the key building block for societies no longer based on agricultural or manual labor alone. For Marx, professions were part of the class formation and vehicles for emerging societal inequalities (Kalleberg, 2011). For both Marx and Weber, entrepreneurship was an aspect of societal change, promoting capital accumulation, and through that inequality, and triggering dynamism in society. For classics entrepreneurship was first and foremost a societal force. Thus, entrepreneurship was not so much about individuality and individual aspirations as it was about societal change, in contrast to the current mainstream research of entrepreneurship which most often is the case about firm and business, and individuals in relation to these, not societies.

Even if the social sciences' classics, such as Marx and Weber, can be extended and shared by both research fields, entrepreneurship research and professions research, the ways the two concepts – professions and entrepreneurs - have been discussed and dealt with in the classical works are very different. Where both for Marx and for Weber alike, the professions have been part of the developing society, the formation of the normative social order, the entrepreneurship was discussed differently. For Weber entrepreneurship was a capitalist but more often, especially the small business owners were a preceding phase in the industrial development, superseded by larger and more complex organizational forms with more developed bureaucracy (and professional structure). For Marx the entrepreneurs were rent seeking capitalists or petite bourgeoisie and part of the class structure. This change of the class structure, through the diminishing petty bourgeoisie was also related to the renewal of the economies: through individual actions, irrespective of occupation or profession and through continuous development (Schumpeter, 1912/1961). In the works of Weber (1905/1960), the seventeenth Century protestant religious duties of individuals became the primary force for the economic activities. The Calvinist ethics and aspects of wealth accumulation, and following that, the rise of the capitalism through the general 'entrepreneurial spirit' (Weber, 1905/1960; Schumpeter, 1912/1961) created the origins in the entrepreneurship as research field. Schumpeter's ideas were formative for the Austrian school of economics (von Mises, 1963) where entrepreneurs are put at the center of all progress (and failure) in societies and in economies, and where the state governance in general and bureaucracy in particular are not beneficial for the entrepreneurial activities.

With the developing theories of societal progress and industrial societies it was no longer single individuals but complex societal structure and networks with social orders based on skills, competencies and hierarchies based on capital that were the common nominators for the classics dealing both with professions and with entrepreneurs. Since the classical works, the developments both within entrepreneurship research and within professions research have brought widely differing elements, theories and ways to describe and analyze the empirical subjects.

The views and the ways how the relationship between professions and state became an object of study varies. Inevitably the growth in the state's role in the planning, regulating and educating professional groups meant that professions were not to be seen solely as maintenance of stability and civility of societies (as in Durkheim), but increasingly as varied groups with differing and often with conflicting interests.

Differentiating the Theoretical Canon for Professionalism and Entrepreneurialism

The analyses of occupations, professions, professional work and professionalism were for quite a long time been differentiated from each other through normative categorizations, or

more pragmatically, through the focus of analysis and approach to the topic (Crompton, 1990; Adams, 2014). The further differentiation of research in the analyses concerning work, occupations and professions has led to a situation where some researchers have even announced ‘the death of the sociology of professions’ (e.g. Gorman and Sandefur, 2011), while other researchers see an ever-growing need to differentiate, for example, expert occupations (such as design) from ‘true’ professions (such as medicine or law) (Sciulli, 2005; Noordegraaf, 2007) and re-focus the analysis of professions. This bifurcation of research has since led to theoretical and methodological discussions of what are the most fruitful and most relevant ways to analyze empirically professions and professionalism in contemporary society, ranging from traditional institutional theories to Foucaultian ‘knowing subject’ and governance analyses and practice theories and theorists whereby profession becomes defined through the professional practices and through professional knowledge in practice (e.g. Young and Miller, 2014).

Traditionally, professions have been analyzed as entities regulated either by state or by professional bodies, which governed the entry and boundaries of professions (e.g. Abbott, 1993; 1988). Over time, the assumed and real sovereignty of professions changed and partly evaporated, and instead of state or professional bodies, the governance is understood to reside in the practices and praxis of the field. The governance may also lie in the praxis of organizations and organizational actors related to professions (e.g. Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006). The field in question may regulate or permit, and the ways in which the field practices challenge and change the boundaries, they become not clear-cut or rigid but flexible and varying (Bourdieu, 1990). The relationship between professions and state is changing and full of tensions, and this is not only due to the new public management that has entered the state but more because of the changes in the professions themselves.

In the sociology of professions this change outlined above has been discussed in different ways, linking it into the geographical area where research is conducted, for example, Anglo-American vs. European contexts, or Anglo-Saxon and Continental contexts and modes of professionalism (Collins, 1990). Professions are most often defined as occupational groups with specialized knowledge and education. Based on this, different classifications of both professions and research dealing with professions have been introduced, ranging from ‘pure’ professionalism to ‘hybrid’ professionalism (Noordegraaf, 2007).

Some researchers have added the shared ethical commitment to serve the citizens and the public interest(s) into the definitions. Even with this altruistic notion, the professions cannot be seen as mere objects of new modes of governing but they have become, as professional groups and as professionals, also directly involved in governance (Kuhlmann, 2013) and as such, part of the governance structure. Thus, professionalism defined as distinctive way of controlling and organizing work and workers, extends the idea of work into the governance and self-governance. The definition also differentiates professionalism from professions as embodiments of knowledge and competence. The analysis of professionalism thus involves occupational change and control of work in organizations and work places. The shift in the

embodiment of expertise from person with profession, to organization that defines the professionalism has also meant a change in the unit of analysis.

Professionalism and entrepreneurialism and research on these two topics are closely related to the emergence of new occupations, which for their part are developing into new professions. The development of new professions, with the historical changes in the higher education patterns for professions, that is, the expansion of the higher education system globally has also resulted wide research and discussion on the specific de-professionalization processes (Kuhlmann, 2013).

The questioning of the boundaries between professions has taken place already earlier, not only theoretically but also in empirical studies (Gieryn, 1983; Abel, 1988). With the growth, development and demise of the industrial, post-industrial and post-Fordist societies, following each other, research has provided new and renewed perspectives on the professions. Still, definition of profession has remained something of an enigma (Evetts, 2013; Sciulli, 2007; Kuhlmann and Saks, 2008, Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006), and it seldom meets research from other fields such as entrepreneurship research focusing on or analyzing the change in the professions, for example when the position changes from paid employment to self-employment and to entrepreneurial position (e.g. Kovalainen and Österberg-Högstedt, 2013).

Together with the notion of changing definitions of professionalism, the idea of “new epistemology of practice” (Schön, 1983, 49) has blurred the idea of professions by introducing practice based understanding of work professionals do. It is never ‘clean’ or ‘purified’, especially so with the growth of the ‘citizen science’, that is, networked or crowd science. This type of civic science which at extreme is about participating to scientific work by members of the general public, often in collaboration with or under the direction of professional scientists and scientific institutions (Oxford English Dictionary, 2014). Other forms of civic science and internet based knowledge sources relate to the public understanding and spread of knowledge, and as such they do test and even challenge the boundaries of traditional, strong professions. Expertise can no longer be restricted from other experts, clients or citizens, and tensions between professional groups (such as within medicine and nursing) are exemplifying the hybridized images of professionalism. Work identities matter and they have become part of the knowledge of the profession. As such, they also refers to origins of professionalism, to guilds, which were not only about skills and maintenance of level of skills but also of social ties and communities (Noordegraaf, 2007, 2011).

Even if not related to research on entrepreneurship, the research on professions and professionalism has had influence beyond its own field (Kuhlmann, 2006; Evetts, 2002). The debates and tensions about professions (Crompton, 1990) have been considered reflecting more general tensions in the field of sociology of work, occupations and employment rather than conceptual definition questions (see also Evetts, 2006; 2011). The concept of profession most often represents the generic category of occupational work, and even more, it seems to

be contextually bound: no clear demarcation line exists among the occupations defined as professions and those that are not. This naturally raises the question of how the professions emerge and change. (Francis, 2011). The process of ‘becoming’ a profession, ‘professionalization’, is a process whereby an occupation becomes defined as profession. The process of becoming classified as ‘profession’ refers to fluidity and change, and malleability of the professions (e.g. Kuhlmann, 2013; Allsop, 2002). The processual view underlines the new types of insecurities within professions that have not been present earlier in the analyses or theoretizations of professions. These insecurities as such bring in new elements to the ways in which professions are seen and analyzed in relation to the economy. They also bring in several aspects of entrepreneurship in alignment to professionalism in new ways. The questions of new public management, managerialism, independence and power become aligned in new ways and require new analyses.

Entrepreneurialism challenging Professionalism

How does entrepreneurship research recognize the distinction highlighted in the recent professionalism research between the two concepts, professions and entrepreneurs? It is noteworthy that the view into entrepreneurial activities within professionalism has developed through a different path than in professions research – as shortly described above - even if the classics are the same and shared. In the following some of the main threads are discussed and relations to professionalism studies are explored in order to valorize the relationship and possibilities for research agendas within the two fields.

The classical, Austrian economics’ tradition influenced (Kirtzner, 1973, von Mises, 1996, Hayek, 1945) view to entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship was strongly present in research even in the 1980s and 1990s literature on entrepreneurs: presence through individuals who were following the strong visionary path in the economic development. Even today, the emphasis on individuals and individuality is rooted in the ways the entrepreneurship is analyzed as societal and economic force and phenomenon (Shane and Venkataram, 2000; Alvarez and Barney, 2007; Eckhardt and Shane, 2013; Martin and Wilson, 2014). This ‘individual-laden’ mainstream orientation has much to do with the phenomenon of entrepreneurship being at the crossroads of economics, business studies and sociology (Kovalainen, 1995), but being rather functionalist in its philosophical origins and current research underpinnings. Recently, critical realism has been introduced as philosophical position that enables the analysis of opportunities, for example, but from philosophy of science point of view, this seems to be atomistic understanding of opportunities that have no structural or societal elements (Alvarez et al. 2014; Martin and Wilson, 2014).

It was not until the growth in the analysis of economies as social systems and also sources of global crises that the interest towards the entrepreneurship as part of the capitalism and its consequences throughout the economies. But this is not at the core of the entrepreneurship

theories. Rather, entrepreneurship as research field has been argued to be rather fragmented and attempts to create an “integrated” framework are plenty, in order to ‘define the domain’ and broaden the individual-orientation of the theories (e.g. Shane and Venkataram, 2000). Again, the question needs to be asked of whether one unified theory of entrepreneurship can exist, let alone work when no unified ontological or epistemological certainty reigns within the discipline. Given the vast variety in the appearance of entrepreneurship – as one organization form for economic activities – the research and theories of entrepreneurship have surprisingly left professionalism intact (Kovalainen, 1995; Kovalainen and Österberg-Högstedt, 2011).

Much of the entrepreneurial research has been tackling with the positivistic approach, even if shown untenable in many aspects when trying to seek for the best entrepreneur, or most suitable business start-up. Within entrepreneurship research the questions of market invasion or New Public Management are rarely related to entrepreneurship in ways in which they are related to professions. It seems that neoliberalism, as defined and related to the general accounts of global transformations (e.g. Harvey, 2007), is seldom discussed in entrepreneurial theory constructions.

Professionalism, entrepreneurialism and new questions for research

Both professionalism and entrepreneurialism relate to the changing economic structures and especially to the emergence of immaterial knowledge economy and the new modes of production that re-designed new professions, re-organized the roles and places for old professions and old types of entrepreneurship anew. Even if these associations and fixtures relate both the professionalism and entrepreneurialism to the global changes and new forms of capitalism, it is rather surprising how few connections there exist between these two fields of research.

The professions historically emerged in the period of prospering welfare states in the twentieth century, as Kuhlmann (2013, e8) and several researchers of professions note. One of the new challenges for the analysis of professions and professionalism is that it should take into account the emergence of new types of professionalism which operate alongside the traditional model of professionalism (e.g. Francis, 2011). Thus the relevant questions no longer relate only to the codification of the professional knowledge, nor to the institutions producing professionals or entry requirements, but to more indirect forms of exclusions and inclusions.

Still, the questions of professional identity construction are persistent and relevant, and in fact, the body of literature on for example medical students and professional identities is expanding rapidly. This is partly due to the fact that gatekeeping within professions through education system is prevailing model and for most professions higher education system

maintains a standardized ideology of professional identity. Education to profession such as medical doctor entails not only the technical skills and knowledge required for standard medical practices but more importantly, the training to and ‘formation of an appropriate professional identity’, which has been expressed as one of the key curricular goals of the medical schools (Cooke et al., 2013). The tensions between the ‘formal’ requirements of professional identity often created within the education system, and the existence of differing professional discourses within profession and outside of professions have resulted growing ruptures, especially within medical professions where concerns of students’ unwillingness to primary care, ‘lifestyle priorities’, ‘lack of professionalism’ and ‘declining humanism’, to mention few, have been voiced out by faculties and medical educators alike (Frost and Regehr, 2013: 1570; Cruess et al, 2014). Even the recent literature on professional education within medicine gives normative definitions and instructions for the professional identity, yet in very positive and general manner, such as “medical practitioners of the future will possess and demonstrate the qualities of the “good physician”.” (Cruess et al., 2014: 1446)

Not fully unconnected to diversities and tensions in identity construction within professions such as medical profession, the larger societal changes blur the clear cut space for the professions to function. Even if professions did develop nationally in different ways, the global trends and transnationalism evens out the differences. One parade example of such development is the transformation of the welfare states into quasi-markets with neoliberal modes of governance. In this global trend, the professions – if they can be addressed as a unified occupational group - rarely remain unaffected and unchanged. The national differences become partly highlighted anew, partly evened out as global trends become ‘domesticated’ through national policies (Poutanen and Kovalainen, 2014).

Professions may enhance occupational change and regulate the development (e.g. through higher education), and professions also have the power to influence the policies of the state and governance, by being part of the governance system and through exerting power both within and outside of the governance. Professions are known to regulate their own field through “controlled content” as in classical professionalism (Noordegraaf, 2007) where occupations either establish a professional control or create an occupational closure (Friedson, 2001).

The state-professions –relationship has been under analysis for quite some time (e.g. Saks and Kuhlmann 2006; Room, 2007). In the recent years, the citizenship has been added into the configuration of state-profession –relation. These configurations between state and professions on the one hand, and professions and citizens on the other hand relate to the one of the biggest profession research field, that is medicine and health care professions research (e.g. Kovalainen and Sundin, 2012; Dahl, Keränen and Kovalainen, 2011). These configurations also relate to broader societal context of professions, including transformations of and within states, globalization, and trends in the cultural, societal and material organizations of services and productions.

Within professions studies, the majority of the research focuses on health care professions, especially on medicine and nursing, and to some extent legal professions, teaching, accounting, engineering, journalism and architecture as Adams (2014) points out. When 501 articles on sociology of professions field (US, UK based) were analyzed, the most usual questions in relation to professions were intersectionalities (such as gender, race, ethnicity, migration), regulations and public policies, work satisfaction and work organizations are among (Adams, 2014: 4). Most usual approach among the 501 articles Adams analyzed was case study although there were empirical divergences across regions and nations. Single case studies have, according to Adams (2014), dominated the sociology of professions for at least a decade. In general, case studies on single professions do not hinder or stop theoretization on professions, as Adams (2014: 8) claims, but they may narrow the empirical base for arguing of the changes, for example. In contrast, we would argue that the addressing the societal – including markets – changes and theoretical varieties in the ways of explaining these changes may have been different and thus differently addressed in US in comparison to European studies on professions.

In similar vein to the general societal transformations mentioned above, the knowledge society discussion more specifically brought the question of the authority of professions into the forefront. This type of questioning the authority of entrepreneurs has not taken place in the literature. Where the entrepreneurship research saw the market niches for new entrepreneurs and businesses emerging (Bygrave and Hofer, 1991; Bruton et al., 2010), the professionalism research called into the question the ‘possession of knowledge’ as a firm basis for profession (e.g. Dall’Alba, 2009), and more generally, ‘possession of knowledge’ as epistemological basis for professional knowledge (Grosz, 1994; Mol, 2002).

Occupational mobility has in social sciences classically meant most often the analysis of opportunities for advancement to better jobs – and this specifically has only meant analysis of salaried jobs, that is, paid employment. Occupational mobility has been and still to large extent is assumed to be the primary indicator for social advancement in general. As concept, occupational mobility has, however, assumed the kind of dynamic society and state development built on certainties which most of the Western societies have not been able to reside for quite a while during the first part of the 21st century.

Analysis of organizations as sites for professional control and domination has shifted emphasis on the inter-occupational competition (Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011). The competition becomes prevalent: how the incorporation of management training as a way of increasing the occupational/professional status and standing has changed the ways in which professions enter the markets. The competition has required the solid basis usual for professions, such as standardization and formalization of entry to profession, the work tasks, qualifications and content of the work which have all become more transparent. Transparency is in relation to management of the professions, and at the same time, built in into the very profession itself (e.g. Kuhlmann and Saks, 2008).

With the growth of the global labour markets for some professionals and global organizations 'domesticating' not only professionals but work patterns and practices, there is a large amount of research with neo-Weberian theories of the professions and professions in a globalizing world (Faulconbridge and Muzio, 2008; 2011; Saks, 2010; 2011) and also research on managerialism (Dent, 2005), New Public Management and professions (e.g. Evetts, 2002; Muzio and Ackroyd, 2005; Boyce, 2008; Thomas and Hewitt, 2011), again, keeping in mind the occupations which are most common in profession research (Vallas, 2011).

There is, however, much less literature on the ways in which entrepreneurialism and entrepreneurship relates to professionalism, and how it becomes built into the everyday work practices of professionals. The entrepreneurial activities among health professionals have most often been analyzed as an "outer" layer of any profession. Increasingly, entrepreneurialism has been related to the capturing of opportunities (e.g. Boyce, 2008; McDaniel, 2006) rather than closely aligned with the ways the profession can be organized and understood in society. Our analysis of health care professionals who moved from paid employment positions to entrepreneurial positions contradicts the argument of "outer" layer of entrepreneurship that relates to the profession and leaves the core of the profession intact. For most respondents in survey and interviewed professionals the differences between what counts as 'profession' work and what counts as 'entrepreneurial' work were not clear-cut nor self-evident, and over time in the work practices these different professionalisms and work tasks merged with each other, bringing the new dimension into the professional knowledge of care and new assemblages to professionalism, yet leaving the basic ideas of care work intact. Whether those features such as ethics of care can be considered to be the core of the profession or not, is debatable (Kovalainen and Österberg-Högstedt, 2013; Kovalainen and Simonen, 1998).

With the increase in the analyses of processes of professions, change and conflicts within professionalism, malleability of professional boundaries, work and organizations, both historical and Foucaultian analyses have grown in importance (e.g. Ball, 2012a). Foucault's influence has been vast in the studies of economic phenomena, but in somewhat diluted form even if as result, the historians of professions, especially in medical profession, started to study and write about professionalization and emphasizing the process view into the profession building and construction. This led to critique of "attribute studies of professionalization" and led also to critique of cross-cultural empirical data studies with functionalist aims. Instead, a growth in research using narratives also historically, took place. For example in medical history at the 1980s, the historians produced "compelling narratives of change" that utilized a "multidimensional model of professionalization [that] . . . included the ideas of both market and monopoly along with older attributes of professionalization" (Burnham, 1998, 143-44).

A very different view into the professionalism and entrepreneurialism is built through the Foucaultian analysis which transcends the view into the ways the ideologies work through professions. Entrepreneurship and professionalism become analyzed not as foci of research

but as vehicles through which governance works in sectors and occupational groups such as education or health care (Kuhlmann, 2006; Thomas and Hewitt, 2011). As one example of this is ‘management as moral technology’ among professions such as teachers. Through schemes of self-appraisal, school improvement and development of the professional skills in programmatic ways teachers are urged to believe that their commitment to such processes will make the school and themselves more professionals (Ball, 2012b). The discourse analyses of professions and processes are suggested to better describe the socio-cultural aspects and ambiguities of professionalism at the present times (e.g. Thomas and Hewitt, 2011; Lindblad and Goodson, 2011; Ball, 2012b; Gale et al., 2013).

Future alignments

The late-capitalism of the early twenty-first century is marked with new types of insecurities and tensions, opportunities and changes intensified by globalization. The current financialized capitalism has capacity to embrace and swallow its critics (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2006) even in flexible and narcissist manner. New Public Management has transformed both private and public sector organizations and their modes of operation. They have adopted business logic and become more entrepreneurial by their modes of organizing activities. These managerial and market-oriented, entrepreneurial changes have become current *modus operandi*, habit of working.

The intersections between new types of transnational work, migrating workers, gender and new types of global dependencies and interdependencies have been analysed and discussed widely in relation to changing care work and global care chains (e.g. Dahl, Keränen and Kovalainen, 2011; Poutanen and Kovalainen, 2014; McDowell, 2014), but to lesser extent in relation to professions and their change, or indeed, the new economy. In relation to work, the ‘new economy’ often refers to changes in the ways the work is conducted, due to advances in information technology, globalization, and the commodification of knowledge (e.g. von Hippel, 2006; Mirowski, 2009). Studies of the new economy have shown how new technologies and production logic have rearranged work tasks and professions (Vallas, 2011) and for example care work globally, irrespective of profession in question (Yates, 2012; Sweet and Meiksins, 2012).

The complexity of the care as work and as profession contradicts the logic of new economy (Poutanen and Kovalainen, 2014) as it requires the embodied presence of the carer and the cared-for. Care as work and as profession carries in itself power as well as dependency and vulnerability. As work, care has become global labour through the global care chains, being partly market-based and commodified and partly fragmented work through contracts, but these facts are challenged by professions and as such they are not enough to change the nature of the required *embodied presence* in the care work and the *embodied location* of the care. Care work still takes place in personal contact between carer and cared-for, but this embodied

relationship carries in itself also larger set of social relations within which the caring is done, perceived and assessed by others (Poutanen and Kovalainen, 2014). The global professions amidst the new economy, entrepreneurship and markets require new type of analysis in professions research.

Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurialism have mainly entered the professionalism vocabulary through the globalization of health care, new or emergent markets for services provided and new public management pervading the public sector. But the theoretical frames through which entrepreneurialism is scrutinized within professionalism research are based on very different approaches and rather stable ontological positions in which professions have 'core' identities – as outlined above – and markets and capitalism are distanced from this core. Thus, markets are thought to lie outside of professions and professionalism, and professions are often thought to be strangers to capitalism. While professions have become empowered and to some extent able to resist the changes, this is not necessary the case: in the case of most contemporary service occupations, professionalism is being imposed upon "from above", such as through and by employers and managers. In such cases the question of autonomy within professions and professionalism vis a vis entrepreneurialism become explicated and questioned anew.

References

- Abbott, A. (1993) The sociology of work and occupations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 187-209.
- Abbott, A. (1988) *The System of the Professions: an Essay of the Division of Expert Labour*. University of Chicago Press: London.
- Abel, R.L. (1988) *The legal profession in England and Wales*. New York: Blackwell.
- Adams, T. L. (2014), Sociology of professions: international divergences and research directions. *Work, Employment and Society*, 1-12, 2014.
- Allsop, J. (2002) Regulation and the medical profession. In Allsop, J. and Saks, M. (2002) (eds.) *Regulating the health professions*. SAGE: London.
- Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., McBride, R. and Wuebker, R. (2014) Realism in the Study of Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 2: 227-233.
- Alvarez, S.A. and Barney, J. B. (2007) Discovery and Creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1, 1-2: 11-26.
- Ball, S. J. (2012a) Introducing Monsieur Foucault. In Ball, S.J. (ed.) *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. Routledge: London.
- Ball, S. J. (2012b) Management as moral technology. In Ball, S.J. (ed.) *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. Routledge: London.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2006) *The Third Spirit of Capitalism*. Verso: London.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press: Stanford.
- Boyce, R.A. (2008) Professionalism meets Entrepreneurialism and Managerialism. In Kuhlmann, E. and Saks, M. (2008) *Rethinking Professional Governance: International Directions in Healthcare*. Policy Press. London.
- Bruton, G.D., Ahlstrom, D. and Han, L. (2010) Institutional Theory and Entrepreneurship: Where Are We Now and Where Do We Need to Move in the Future? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34, 3: 421–440.
- Burnham, J. C. (1998) How the Idea of Profession Changed the Writing of Medical History. *Medical History*, suppl. no. 18. London: Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.
- Bygrave, W. D. and Hofer, C.W. (1991) Theorizing about Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Winter 1991, 13-22.

- Collins, R. (1990) Changing conceptions in the sociology of professions. In Torstendahl, R. and Burrage, M. (eds.) *The Formation of Professions: Knowledge, State and Strategy*. SAGE: London.
- Cooke, M., Irby, D.M. and O'Brien, B. C. (2013) *Educating Physicians: A Call for Reform of Medical School and Residency*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Crompton, R. (1990), Professions in the Current Context, *Work, Employment and Society*. Special issue, 4: 147-166.
- Cruess, R.L., Cruess, S.R., Boudreau, D., Snell, L. and Steinert, Y. (2014) Reframing Medical Education to Support Professional Identity Formation. *Academic Medicine*, 89, 11: 1446-1451.
- Dahl, H. M., Keränen, M. and Kovalainen, A. (2011). Introduction. In H. M. Dahl, M. Keränen and A. Kovalainen (eds.), *Europeanization, Care and Gender: Global Challenges* (pp. 1-19). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Dall'Alba, G. (2009) *Learning to be Professionals*. Springer: London.
- Dent, M. (2005) Post-new public management in public sector hospitals? The UK, Germany and Italy. *Policy Polity*, 33(4):623-36.
- Durkheim, E. (1992) *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*. London: Routledge.
- Eckhardt, J. T. and Shane, S. A. (2013) Response to the commentaries: The individual-opportunity (IO) nexus integrates objective and subjective aspects of entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 160–163.
- Evetts, J. (2013), Professionalism: Value and Ideology. *Current Sociology*, 61(5-6): 778-796.
- Evetts, J. (2011) A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology*, 59, 4: 406-22.
- Evetts, J. (2006), Trust and professionalism in knowledge societies,. *Current Sociology*, 54(4): Monograph 2.
- Evetts, J. (2002), New directions in state and international professional occupations. *Work, Employment and Society*, 16(2): 339-351.
- Faulconbridge, J. R. and Muzio, D. (2011) Professions in a globalizing world: Towards a transnational sociology of professions. *International Sociology* 27(1): 136-152.
- Faulconbridge, J. R. and Muzio, D. (2008) Organizational professionalism in global law firms. *Work, Employment and Society* 22, 1: 7-25.
- Francis, A. (2011) *At the Edge of Law: Emergent and Divergent Models of Legal Professionalism*. Ashgate: Avebury.

- Friedson, E. (2001) *Professionalism: the third logic*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Frost, H.D. and Regehr, G. (2013) "I AM a Doctor": Negotiating the Discourses of Standardization and Diversity in Professional Identity Construction. *Academic Medicine*, 88, 10: 1570-1577.
- Gale, K., Turner, B. and McKenzie, L. (2013) *Action research, becoming and the assemblage: a Deleuzian reconceptualisation of professional practice*. Educational Action Research 4. London: Sense Publications.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1983) Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 48(6): 781-95.
- Gorman, E. and Sandefur, R. (2011) 'Golden Age', quiescence, and revival: how the sociology of professions became the study of knowledge-based work. *Work and Occupations*, 38, 3: 275-302.
- Greenwood, R. and Suddaby, R. (2006) Institutional Entrepreneurships in Mature Fields: The Big Five Accounting Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1): 27-48.
- Grosz, E. A. (1994) *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Indiana University Press, Indiana.
- Hanlon, G. (1998) Professionalism as enterprise: Service class politics and the redefinition of professionalism. *Sociology*, 32, 1: 43-64.
- Harvey, D. (2007) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayek, F. (1945) The use of knowledge in society. *American Economic Review*. 35: 519-530.
- von Hippel, E. (2006). *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Kalleberg, A. (2011) *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs. The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Kirtzner, I. (1973) *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kovalainen, A. (1995) *At the Margins of the Economy. Women's Self-Employment in Finland 1960-1990*. Avebury: Ashgate.
- Kovalainen, A. and Simonen, L. (1998) Neo-Entrepreneurship in Finland in Welfare Services. *Transfer*, 4:3, 462-490.
- Kovalainen, A. and Österberg-Högstedt, J. (2013) Entrepreneurship within social and health care – a question of identity, gender and professionalism. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5, 1: 17–35.

Kovalainen, A. and Sundin, E. (2012) Entrepreneurship in Public Organizations. In Hjorth, D. (ed.) Handbook in Organizational Entrepreneurship. Edward Elgar Ltd. London. Paper 15.

Kovalainen, A. and Österberg-Högstedt, J. (2011) Finland's changing public sector: Business, trust and gender in municipalities. *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier* 13, 2: 57-73.

Kuhlmann, E. (2006), *Modernizing Health Care: Reinventing Professions, the State and the Public*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Kuhlmann, E. (2013) "Riders in the Storm": the professions and healthcare governance. *SAÚDE & TECNOLOGIA, SUPLEMENTO*, P. e6-e10. ISSN: 1646-9704.

Kuhlmann, E. and Saks, M. (2008) Introduction. In *Rethinking Professional Governance: International Directions in Healthcare*. Eds. Kuhlmann, E. and Saks, M. Policy Press. London.

Lindblad, S. and Goodson, I. F. (2011) Researching the Teaching Profession under Restructuring: Professional Knowledge and Educational Restructuring in Europe. *Studies in Professional Life and Work*, 4: 1-10.

Martin, L. and Wilson, N. (2014) Opportunity, discovery and creativity: A critical realist perspective. *International Small Business Journal*, 1-15.

McDaniel, S. A. (2006) Self-Employment: How Individual Choices Interact with Market Economies. *International Sociology*, 21: 796-805.

McDowell, L. (2014) Gender, work, employment and society: feminist reflections on continuity and change. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28, 5: 825-837.

von Mises, L. (1963) *Human Action, A Treatise on Economics*. Yale University.

Mol, A. (2002) *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

Muzio, D. and Ackroyd, S. (2005) On the consequences of defensive professionalism: Recent changes in the legal labour process. *Journal of Law and Society*, 32, 661-687.

Muzio, D. and Kirkpatrick, I. (2011) Professions and organizations – a conceptual framework. *Current Sociology*, 59, 4: 389-405.785.

Noordegraaf, M. (2011) Remaking professionals? How associations and professional education connect professionalism and organizations. *Current Sociology*, 59, 4: 465-488.

Noordegraaf, M. (2007) From "Pure" to "Hybrid" Professionalism: Present-Day Professionalism in Ambiguous Public Domains. *Administration & Society*, 39,6: 761-785.

Oxford English Dictionary (2014). Oxford University Press.

Parsons, T. (1939) The professions and social structure. *Social forces* 17: 457-467.

Poutanen, S. and Kovalainen, A. (2014) What is New in the 'New Economy'? Care as Critical Nexus Challenging Rigid Conceptualizations. In Grulich, J. and Riegraf, B. (2014) (eds.) *Geschlecht und transnationale Räume*. Münster: Verlag Westphälisches Dampfboot.

Ritzer, G. (1975) Professionalization, Bureaucratization and Rationalization: The Views of Max Weber. *Social Forces*, 53, 4: 627-634.

Room, G. (2007) Challenges Facing the EU: Scope for a Coherent Response. *European Societies*, 9 (2).

Saks, M. (2010), Analyzing the professions: the case for the Neo-Weberian approach. *Comparative Sociology* 9: 887-915.

Saks, M. (2011) *Professions and the public interest: medical power, altruism and alternative medicine*. London: Routledge.

Schumpeter, J. (1912/1961) *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schön, D. (1983) *Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Sciulli, D. (2005) Continental Sociology of Professions Today: conceptual contributions. *Current Sociology*, 53, 6: 915-42.

Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000) The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 217–226.

Swedberg, R. (1991) *Schumpeter – A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sweet, S. and Meiksins, P. (2012) *Changing Contours of Work. Jobs and Opportunities in the New Economy*. 2. ed. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publications.

Thomas, P. and Hewitt, J. (2011) Managerial Organization and Professional Autonomy: A Discourse-Based Conceptualization. *Organization Studies*, 32, 10: 1373-1993.

Vallas, S. (2011) *Work: A critique*. Boston: Polity Books.

Weber, M. (1905/1960) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's Sons.

Yates, N. (2012) Global care chains: a state-of-the-art review and future directions in care transnationalization research. *Global Networks*, 12(2),135–54.

Young, M. and Müller, J. (2014) From sociology of professions to sociology of professional knowledge. In Young, M. and Müller, J. (eds.) *Knowledge, Expertise and the Professions*. Routledge, Oxon, UK.