



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Alexandra A. Moskovskaya, Oleg A. Oberemko, Victoria L.  
Silaeva, Irina P. Popova, Inna B. Nazarova, Olga A.  
Peshkova, Marina V. Chernysheva*

# **DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN RUSSIA: A RESEARCH INTO INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK, SELF-REGULATION ACTIVITY, AND BARRIERS TO PROFESSIONALIZATION**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: SOCIOLOGY  
WP BRP 26/SOC/2013

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

*Alexandra A. Moskovskaya<sup>1</sup>, Oleg A. Oberemko<sup>2</sup>, Victoria L. Silaeva<sup>3</sup>, Irina P. Popova<sup>4</sup>, Inna B. Nazarova<sup>5</sup>, Olga A. Peshkova<sup>6</sup>, Marina V. Chernysheva<sup>7</sup>*

## **Development of Professional Associations in Russia: A Research into Institutional Framework, Self-Regulation Activity, and Barriers to Professionalization<sup>8</sup>**

Professional associations in Russia are to some extent novices in contemporary professional regulation. Only small part of them can play significant role in enforcement of professional control (representing professional community in front of other stakeholders, adopting professional standards, ensuring market closure, protecting of prevalence of professional ethics etc.). Partially that comes from the lack of experience of self-regulation that professions have in the Russian history and sharp invasion of the global market in the 1990-es, partially that follows tradition of state predominance in economy and society. During the last two decades a mass of organizations arose in Russia calling themselves professional associations, guilds, societies and unions. The task to understand who they are, whether they can and they ought to represent professional community and what are their ways of professional self-regulation became now a pressing practical problem and an interesting research task. The object of this research is mapping the field of variety of non-government organizations that claim institutional control as professional associations in order to clarify the following issues: - What are the main forms of professional associations by their qualitative characteristics - What are their actual means and feasible opportunities to achieve professional control in their field of expertise or at least influence it – What are the main limits of professional self-regulation they dispose and whether there are any alternative forms of professional regulation in certain professional areas.

**Key words:** professional association, professionalization, self-regulation, state, market-oriented professions

**JEL Classification:** Z13, D71.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Director of CSE, The head of research group, Ph.D. Economics, E-mail: amoskovskaya@hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Leading Research Fellow CSE, Ph.D. Sociology, E-mail: ooberemko@hse.ru

<sup>3</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Research Fellow CSE, Ph.D. Philosophy, E-mail: vsilaeva@hse.ru

<sup>4</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Sociology, Leading Research Fellow CSE; Institute of Sociology Russian Academy of Sciences, Senior Research Fellow, E-mail: irina\_popova@list.ru

<sup>5</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Doctor of Economics, Leading Research Fellow CSE, E-mail: nazarova@hse.ru

<sup>6</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Economics, Leading Research Fellow CSE, E-mail: opeshkova@hse.ru

<sup>7</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, Research Fellow CSE, E-mail: mchernysheva@hse.ru

<sup>8</sup> This working paper is an output of a research project “Development of professional associations in Russia” (head - A.A. Moskovskaya) conducted with support of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) Foundation for Development of Applied Search and the HSE “Career World” project (head – Ph. T. Prokopov). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

## **Introduction**

The present study is the preliminary result of initiative research into professional associations in Russia. The research was conducted in three stages. The first stage was dedicated to a preliminary exploration of Russian occupational landscape and existing professional associations. The latter's activity was analysed on the basis of publicly available information at the associations' websites, as well as interviews with particular professionals. At the second stage we studied methodology that reflected the activity of such associations globally with respect to individual professions' model, their characteristics, stimuli and obstacles to development. The third stage involved grounding the methodological approach to a two-dimensional map the Russian professional institutes that claim to perform regulatory functions. At this stage we also used various research instruments and conducted in-depth interviews with the heads of Russian professional associations according to a list of chosen 45 occupations. Although the qualitative analysis is yet to be concluded, a research group has already obtained enough data to draw the first conclusions and hypotheses. The study has used theoretical approaches, characteristic of global interdisciplinary research into professions and professional associations, particularly those of Sociology of Professions. Two of the authors (A.Moskovskaya, I.Popova) have experience in collaborating with global research associations that specialise in Profession Studies including International Sociological Association, Research Committee No52 "Sociology of professional groups" and European Sociological Association, Research Committee No19 "Sociology of professions". Intermediate results of this research project have been presented in August 2013 at the European Sociological Association Conference (A.Moskovskaya «Professional associations in Russia: between market and professional community», ESA Torino, August 27-31, 2013).

### **1. Professions: methodological background, research aims and objectives**

Conventionally, international academic community (predominantly Western) uses the term "professional associations" to describe not-for-profit organizations established by a group of professionals to independently regulate their activities. In this context the term "professional association" cannot be applied to any organization that chooses to operate under this name. It is an organization that serves to unite, either formally or informally, people of a certain occupation in order to define the conditions under which they may work in their chosen field. One of the principal goals of joining an association becomes the so-called "market closure" from non-professionals. This is achieved by creating institutions (usually with the help of the State) that legitimately close the market and set the conditions for entering thereof, which conditions are

defined by the professional association as a representative body of a professional community. It is also important that an association must be acknowledged as legitimate by the main stakeholders: the State, the majority of a professional community, and employers. In this case a professional association becomes a professional regulatory institution and, as such, constitutes the subject of the present research.

We had to take into account the Russian realities, namely that in this country the mechanisms of professional self-regulation are at the very early stages of development. Therefore we had to lower the criterion of professional regulation down to the participatory level, as not a single association of which we were aware that could exert professional control has yet become a leader in its field who would represent a professional community on the whole and would be responsible for drawing up the criteria for entering a market for specific services.

One has to stress that the term “professional” on this occasion does not stand for a vaguely high quality of work, in which meaning it is colloquially used in Russia. The institute of occupations creates the conditions, in which, to follow Freidson, people who regularly perform a certain professional function control their work to a higher extent than consumers, market, or the State. In this regard “professions” and “professionalism” do not emerge when people come together in a group, united by the aptitude for doing something (a pre-requisite condition). Rather, they emerge when this group of people has obtained the right to evaluate another person’s qualifications to perform certain tasks, to disallow others to participate in performing these tasks, and to define the criteria on which these evaluations are based (a sufficient condition). There hardly may be a professional association that fully controls its field, but those who stand the closest to being in control have been used for this study [Freidson, 2001, p. 12]. Such approach reflects a nearly two centuries’ tradition of developing professions and a century’s tradition of conducting studies of professions as a complex social institution. In this way an association is akin to a social cluster where a professional activity is separated from all others. Interestingly, while the English language distinguishes between “profession” and “occupation”, the Russian language does not have this difference, using the term “profession” in both senses (including any regular activity that warrants a salary) [Moskovskaya, 2010].

*The goal* of the present study has been a research into an industry structure, the involvement of participants, the functions and opportunities for control over professional activity that the existing Russian professional associations may be able to perform. We assumed that to a certain degree Russian professional associations perform one or a few of the following functions:

- - legitimation of a specific kind of professional activity (performed in full, this is akin to “market closure” for amateurs and charlatans; professional activity in such case embraces the sphere of intellectual services that require a long-term professional education: learned professions, knowledge based occupations)
- - protection of the services’ quality, as accepted by the professional community (this is often similar to protecting a society’s interest in obtaining the respective services)
- - protection of the interests of a professional community member
- - development and ensuring compliance with professional standards in the particular sphere
- - co-operation with professional education institutions, primarily with universities, in order to agree on mutual activities and to ensure a competent control over defining the criteria for giving marks to students and eventually granting diplomas of professional qualification
- - development of professional behaviour and ethical standards, whereby a professional community’s understanding of a professional duty is inextricably connected to a society’s interest in this kind of services.

Among the *objectives* of the first stage of our research were: 1) assembly and analysis of relevancy of lists of professional associations, acquired through various criteria and sources, 2) structuring of Russian professional associations according to their main qualitative features, 3) drawing hypotheses concerning a possibility for a professional association to exert a competent control in a chosen sphere, 4) drawing hypotheses concerning the principal barriers to regulation of professional activity by professional associations, and 5) identifying the forms and vectors of co-operation of professional associations with the State and high education institutions – insomuch as this information can be extracted from self-representation groups on the Internet and occasional interviews with practitioners.

## **2. Professional regulation: global experience. The place of professional associations in various professionalization models.**

At a glance this chapter may be more useful for a reader from the former USSR and Eastern Europe who is less familiar with the theory and practice of sociology of professionals due to a decisive historic un-embeddedness of the institute of professions in Russia. A number of works by Western authors [Balzer, 1996] studied the emergence and then halting of developing

professions in Russia at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> cc. Certain aspects of the Soviet quasi-professional project and the ideology behind it have been reflected in [Moskovskaya, 2010]. At the same time an overview of the principal approaches to professionalization in international methodology is important so we can better understand the contradictions of this process in Russia and the obstacles it faces. It can also help to see more precisely the different conceptual approaches to future estimates of a professionalization project in global – Western, per excellence – studies. Here Russia offers a unique example of attempts to put a professional project into practice in contemporary conditions, against all the challenges to professionalism that Western countries presently face, yet without socially rooted established professions, as is the case with the West.

Emergence of professional regulation institutions in a particular sphere means *professionalization* of this sphere. A classical approach to describing and studying this process belongs to the Anglo-Saxon school of professional research. In describing the principal stages of emergence of such institutions researchers [e.g. Neal and Morgan, 2000] usually refer to Caplow, Hughes and Wilensky. ([Caplow, 1954] [Hughes, 1958], [Wilensky, 1964]). It is well-known that the main actors of the Anglo-American model of professionalization are professional associations that collaborate with universities and negotiate with the State their share in licensing, accreditation and the actual process of professional services provision. In Europe the State plays a significantly bigger role in this process, compared to professional associations. Regardless of this difference the Western scholars generally accept that the principal controlling powers in professionalization of the society belong to the State, professional associations, and universities. (See, for example, [Evetts and Buchner-Jeziorska, 2001], [Burrage, Torstendahl, 1990] , [Torstendahl and Burrage, 1990]).

In 1964 Wilensky analysed the history of 18 occupations in the USA, thus revealing a typical process of establishing a profession. As many occupations in Russia are early in the attaining professional status it would not be out of place to follow Wilensky once again. (1) At first an occupation becomes an activity in which a person is engaged full-time. (2) Then an institution of professional education is created. Sometimes a professional university education emerges prior to national professional associations, as is the case with the old professions, whereas the process is often reversed for new professions in more recent times. Yet even when new professional education is not initiated by the universities, it nonetheless seeks to collaborate with the educational institutions for the purposes of creating a body of knowledge, developing a curriculum, educational programmes, and a system of academic degrees. Not only does this

stress an importance of universities in establishing professions (which function universities share with professional associations), but also this strengthens a strategically innovative role of a university and its first teachers in weaving together a newly cultivated knowledge with practice and so giving foundation to a new professional jurisdiction. If successful, a standardised professional education becomes an indispensable step needed to be taken in order to enter a professional field. On many occasions it was the universities that fostered the process of setting up national professional associations. [Wilensky, 1964, p. 144] The same sequence was recorded by Khurana in professionalization of management.[Khurana, 2007].

(3) The third stage in the process of establishing a profession is the emergence of professional associations per se. [Wilensky, 1964, p. 144-145]. 4) Only the fourth stage of professionalization according to Wilensky is a persistent political agitation to receive legal support of a new profession. Thus legal support is the next to the defining a competence as the latter at this moment has already achieved and somehow institutionalized by a professional group itself (with or without help of universities). (5) The final stage of professionalization is a formal introduction of an ethical code that protects the professional ideal and contains rules against the practitioners who did not pass a qualification stage [Wilensky, 1964, p. 145].

The mentioned stages have become a model of establishing a profession, generally demonstrated by the Anglo-American historical experience where professional associations played the leading role during some of the active phases. For a long time this experience constituted the basis not only for the studies of professions but also by emerging professions in other countries as a blueprint “how to achieve professional status” [Neal and Morgan, 2000, p. 11].

Further comparative analyses illuminate the differences in essence and the main stages of formation processes, as Neal and Morgan demonstrated by the example of Germany and the UK. The principal difference consists in the role of the State. It became common knowledge there were two types of regulation of professional activity: Anglo-American (professionalization “from within” or “bottom up”, with a fairly small role of the State compared to self-regulation of the group members) and Continental European (professionalization “from above” where the State plays a very important role from the beginning of a professional project [Evetts, 2003 with reference to Burrage and Torstendahl]). Neal and Morgan drew a list of characteristics of the process of professionalization in Great Britain and Germany,[Neal and Morgan, 2000, p. 17-20] which we assembled in Table 1.

**Tab. 1. A comparison of stages of professionalization in Great Britain and Germany**

Great Britain, principal stages	Germany, principal stages
<p>1 – A full-time occupation</p> <p>2 – Establishing a system of internship with professionals, on the basis of the articles between an employer and an intern</p> <p>3 – Creating a professional association</p> <p>4 – Introducing professional qualification exams</p> <p>5 – Political agitation to acquire legal protection of specific fields of work and/or a royal patent (granted by the «Royal Charter»)</p>	<p>1 – A full-time occupation</p> <p>2 – Introducing local licensing</p> <p>3 – State introduces academic degrees in spheres it deems important</p> <p>4 – Creation of voluntary national professional associations (these were initially of a local origin and aimed at basic regulation of professions and acquisition of the legal support. Following the unification of Germany in 1871 national professional associations gradually began to appear, aiming to obtain legal protection and to provide the State with a regulatory role)</p> <p>5 – Gradual establishing of a “cameralist system” that becomes a midway solution, combining the State regulation with a degree of self-regulation</p>
Key system features	Key system features
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ - Professional associations bear responsibility for professional education</li> <li>➤ - Professions remain to a large extent autonomous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ - The State retains responsibility for professional education and giving suitable kinds of occupations the status of a profession</li> <li>➤ - Professions are to a large extent the subject of the State regulation</li> </ul>

Curiously, the German model of evolution of professions is nowhere to be found in Britain, whereas in Germany some professions had been established according to a British model, e.g. actuaries and topographers.

Neal and Morgan stress that the abovementioned peculiarities are characteristic for the period prior to the unification of Europe. The strengthening of international institutions of the European Union and establishing a unified system of mutual acceptance of professional qualifications (Directive 89/48 EEC 1998) has undermined the autonomy of national institutions of



professional regulation. The new conditions suggest an active intervention of supply and demand into professional regulation, making “market closure” and internal control pointless. [Neal and Morgan, 2000, p. 22]

The norms of the European Union and certain regional peculiarities are just some of examples of deviations from the established forms of professions and their self-regulation that have recently taken place. Many experts actively discuss the challenges professional institutions meet and have to overcome with globalisation of markets and commodification of services, migration of the majority of professionals to the sphere of hired work in companies, creating and developing the new kinds of services that also strive to forge and use the forms of would be professional regulation being at the same time more connected to market and business. The new models of professionalization and pseudo-professionalization are now very often created under the “external” pressure (from business corporations, clients, and market competition of professional organizations), and in some pessimistic opinion, the very professionalization becomes doubtful. This situation gives rise to such phrases as “professionalization for everyone”, a “crisis” in professions, “image professionalism”, “de-professionalization”, etc.

The term “deprofessionalization” has moved during the last years from the specialist lingo to the sphere of mass discussions between practitioners on the English-speaking Internet. Whereas in 2009 a Yahoo search query brought results in form of discussions taking place predominantly on websites of American professional associations and their journals, in 2013 the first positions are occupied by electronic dictionaries, libraries and general knowledge resources of wide geographical spread (or of unknown geographical origin). When we analyse search suggestions to the query “deprofessionalization (de-professionalization)” in Google – the world’s most popular search engine – we see that in English-language discussions on the Internet deprofessionalization is most often linked to healthcare, education (teaching included), law, pharmaceuticals, graphic design, and librarianship. It is easy to notice among the mentioned both professions that have long been established and obtained an “exemplary” system of professional regulation institutions (healthcare, law) and professions whose professional status has not been fully acquired, and the market closure has not been completed (pharmaceuticals, graphic design, librarianship). In the last two cases (graphic design and librarianship) the process of professionalization comes into doubt due to technological advances that change the essence of a profession.

Scholars and practitioners see market relations and the influence of businesses as the most regular and serious reason for changes in the sphere of professions and professional regulations.

When discussing professionalization of market-oriented occupations, scholars usually use such expressions as “business-related professions”, “managed profession business” or “professional service firms” (PSF). The latter are organizations where expert workers constitute an operational core of an organization and to a various extent control both resources and results of services provided [Kipping and Kirkpatrick, 2013, p. 778]. This definition also corresponds in Henry Mintzberg’s classification of organizational configurations to professional organizations and sometimes to innovative organizations [Mintzberg, 1989].

So, what is a market-oriented professional model? How different is it from a traditional model of professions, and what nuances (if any) does it add to the activity of professional associations as agents in the sphere of professional regulation?

Scholars tend to place the emergence of market-oriented professions in the context of globalisation. This is done, however, not as part of supra-national subject (e.g. the EU), but as part of unification and spread of markets, companies and services, either close to management or/and reflecting the interests of a business. First, this leads to a change in the role of a professional. He becomes a manager, combining professional and managerial functions, hires the personnel for companies that provide specialist professional services for businesses, and participates in professional partnerships and professional business companies [Kipping, 2011], [Dent and Whitehead, 2002]. Second, this causes a change in the quality of professional competence. It is no longer an academic knowledge (although the new market-oriented professions still require a higher education degree) but a wide experience in solving business tasks brought about by market competitions and linked to the evolving conditions of markets, in response to which companies’ strategies also evolve. Third, in order to support a professional status of professional groups of a new type and to “close the market”, an institution is needed that would be responsible for definition and protection of professional norms. However, such institution will find it hard to establish itself without a due support from large corporations and influential global organizations. As a result, national professional associations that strive to perform the role of such institution may turn out to be very weak and lack the required influence.

D. Muzio et al. used management consultancy, project management and executive search to illuminate a formation of a new model of professionalization that he called “corporate professionalization” in reference to Kipping. Admittedly, although Kipping finds a professionalization project based on management consultancy “hollow”, “image professionalization” and calls it a “linguistic category” [Kipping, 2011, p. 531], Muzio seems to defend the new types of market occupations as a new professional model. It is not just an

institution that carries professional qualities, i.e. an attempt to enter a market, an appeal to specialist competence and skills of a professional group, and coming together in a professional association. The role that people play within an organization also becomes “professionalised”. Here we talk about the groups of “management professionals” who participate in completing “projects of collective mobilisation” and focus on taking key positions and participating as decision-makers in managing large companies [Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 393]. At the same time not only do they occupy the space within an organization and create the “spheres” of professional practice, but they also take part in “designing” an organization [Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 393]. An institutional theory also points out to the influence that professional institutions and organizations exert on each other. According to DiMaggio and Powell, professional networks and associations, along with universities and professional education institutions, represent an influential mechanism that “defines and spreads the norms of organizational and professional behaviour” [DiMaggio and Powell, 1991].

What features can we recognise as being characteristic of a market-oriented model of professional services?

- Services provide an increased added value for a customer [Muzio et al., 2011, p.458].
- The leading roles belong to large corporations: they create space for a new profession and link and augment professional norms with organizational strategies, tactics, and methods. As a result, this may be seen as “professionalization from the outside” where the leader is not the State (as in a traditional European model) but corporations as key market players.
- Large and influential corporations may substitute professional associations as creators of norms and professional regulators, or the so-called institutional entrepreneurs. Furthermore, they may provide professional education for their members and partners. This education may differ significantly, in standards and curriculum, from the one recommended by a professional organization, whereby the latter is not acknowledged. Malhotra cites a fitting example in legal sphere in Great Britain, while Lounsbury shows how a newly established American professional association in the sphere of financial services was swamped by the interests of dominant companies. As a result, a professional association could not fulfil its natural task of creating a system of professional credit, becoming an “example of market logic” instead.[Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011, pp. 394, 396].

- Due to an important role that globalisation plays in spread of businesses and transferability of services, professional associations also change their status in this market-oriented model: they become supranational and similar to large corporations. [Muzio et al., 2011].

- Strong professional associations of a traditional type in the spheres of healthcare or education may become, in a situation of growing importance of market competition and management, initiators of changes in educational programs in order to enhance them with market-oriented disciplines and skills, e.g. business efficiency assessment, business planning, and leadership (Noordegraaf). [Noordegraaf, 2011, p. 465] This does not solve the problem, however. The question remains: does this serve to change a professional model in principle (when a traditional professional association becomes market-oriented), or are we merely talking about teaching students the general principles, rather than specific skills that enable them to work according to market conditions (when a traditional professional association appears to adapt to the demands of the market by using the market ideology).

How are these changes seen in the context of Profession Studies? Since the subject of this paper is an exploration of tendencies in development of professional project in contemporary Russia, we shall only make a few passing comments before delving deeper into Russian realities in the next chapter.

First of all, not all those who specialise in Profession Studies recognise market-oriented professions and/or professions similar to management as professions per se. A number of experts claim such recognition would mean we distort or even refute a professional project (D.Sciulli, R.Khurana, M.Kipping), while others see here new opportunities and a new model of professionalism in the making (J.Evetts, D.Muzio, M.Noordegraaf и др.)

Secondly, in many market-oriented professions there exists a gap between a body of knowledge in a specific field, which may be codified and shared (taught) in a professional education institution, and a successful experience of business practitioners, which constitutes practical knowledge that is uncodifiable in principle. This dichotomy has been noted by Western scholars as early as in 1960s. Wilensky observed that one of the principal driving forces behind the institutionalisation of a profession in a particular sphere was the emergence of a specific body of knowledge that may be practically used as a basis for professional services. According to the scholar, this was the primary reason for acquiring legitimacy and establishing a profession (rather than a fight between various social and professional groups for spheres of influence and the State's support, as many think). This body of knowledge originally forms in the sphere of

applied professional work – a process that usually takes place in a professional organization in the industrial society. The knowledge further develops and solidifies at the universities. It is here that market-oriented professions (at least those that are linked to management) experience serious problems. Even though to be a successful manager one needs to acquire and amass experience, its practical application is subject to a situation and conditions and depends on the manager himself and the actual working conditions of a client organization. As a result, it is difficult to control quality of such work and to distinguish between various factors that contributed to a positive result. Among the factors – a professional’s specialisation in a particular field of knowledge, understanding the specifics of a concrete organization, and advanced communication skills and experience that are now directly connected to professional skills. Wilensky claims that, in order to form the basis of a professional project, knowledge and skills must be neither too narrowly focused, nor too generic, nor too dependent on the specifics of a particular organization. Instead such knowledge and skills must be repeatable and transferable in any conditions.[Wilensky, 1964, pp. 138-139]. Michael Eraut, referencing Oakeshot, 1962 and Aristotle, also pointed to a contradiction between technical (codified) and practical (uncodifiable) knowledge and skills, although he also saw possibilities for connecting the two [Eraut, 1994, pp. 42-43].

Rakesh Khurana dedicated his fundamental study to the history, essence, and obstacles on the way of professionalization of management [Khurana, 2007]. He demonstrated that the start and realisation of a professional project in management sphere in the USA were based on a rising national interest in Social Sciences and a growing confidence that effective management can and must rely on an academic discipline. This was the driving force behind university rectors and professors’ efforts to open faculties of Management and business schools within universities at the early stages of professionalization of management in the U.S. The fact that developing the discipline of management has soon began to contradict a successful management practice demonstrated the fact that a professional project was unfinished, especially in linking of a specific “body of knowledge” with the managerial practice of organizations.

Third, it is accepted in sociology of professions to distinguish between the logic of organizational hierarchy, the market logic, and the professional logic that are all regulated differently due to their different nature. This thesis was most amply formulated in a monograph by Eliot Freidson, one of the most cited authors [Freidson, 2001]. This new market-oriented professional project is a mix of all three ways to organise a social activity. Prior to Freidson, this division was described by Wilensky in a previously cited work. He analysed the separate roles (a

professional, a bureaucrat, and a client) that professionals play in organizations and demonstrated that a hierarchical business organization does not merely limit a professional autonomy, but also circumscribes an ideal of a service, while orientation on a client undermines a collective professional control [Wilensky, 1964, p. 155]. In traditional professional models (both Anglo-Saxon and European) professional associations are responsible for the ideals and collective control. However, in a market-oriented model, as we were able to see, professional associations are often restricted in their rights and opportunities to exert an influence.

Next, professional associations created within a market-oriented model have entirely different aspirations depending on whether they are formed from the bottom up by a group of professionals who offer services (self-regulation) or from the top down upon the initiative of key business players. Both models are vulnerable considering the connection between services and business. In the first case professional associations may appear weaker than large corporations and risk falling under their influence. In the second case the goal of an association is not so much a “market closure” from non-professionals or workers who specialise in an adjacent professional sphere. Rather it is the imitation of a professional association to mobilise professional forces (“professionalism as a resource”), which is why some authors use a term “corporate professionalism” to describe this type of association [Kipping, 2011, p.533]. They stress that this type of association allows companies to build authority, to acquire status, to win the trust of their customers, while establishing control over personnel of a relevant professional level. Under favourable conditions this imitation conceals good perspectives for professional development. An appeal to clients and to practitioners who provide services, although coming from outside, may stimulate the growth of professional control within a company, based on self-discipline and control over work and its results by those who perform the work [Evetts, 2006, p. 523].

Those who see the new model of professionalization in market-oriented spheres in a positive light (e.g. Muzio and co-authors) state that a traditional approach to professionalization based on a general body of knowledge (that the new market-oriented professions usually do not have) ignore two other capabilities of professional associations. First, it is an ability to formalise, systematise, and perfect the body of knowledge to collectively mobilise a professional group; and, second, an ability to find alternative ways for a market closure that allow to put the standards of services and previous practical experience that helps to solve a client’s problems here and now above the formal knowledge and skills. As a result they may create a system of qualifications, quality standards for products or services (that correspond to a customer’s

demands and trust), as well as ascertaining credentials for a specific kind of service. [Muzio et al., 2006, p.446]

Further questions that have to do with a professionalization of long-established occupations and new market-oriented activities are better studied, using examples of Russian organizations that may claim the status of a professional association and that were the subject of our research.

### **3. Making lists and structuring the landscape of professional associations**

*An evaluation of a possibility to map the landscape of professional associations with the help of the Internet and national organizational registers.*

The first and principal barrier we had to overcome in the course of our research was the problem of making a preliminary list of professional associations and professions, from which we could then choose pilot cases on which to perform a formal analysis of websites and quality in-depth interviews with activists. Having a grounded preliminary database helps to objectify a selection. According to the initial research plan, we were going to form this list, using the data from the mass search engines (Google, Yandex), but limiting the number of search results subject to analysis by taking into account the amount of hours we wanted to spend on this stage. These search results were then to be combined with the lists of professional associations provided by the Committee for Professional Standards of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs. How are these changes seen in the context of Profession Studies? That since 2006 has been working with professional associations and employers to develop professional standards and solve ensuing problems<sup>9</sup>

The first search results from Yandex instantly revealed some serious problems in using this method to make a preliminary list of organizations. For a start, today the Internet is seen as the easiest way to expand a database of partners and clients and to create a positive image for an

---

<sup>9</sup> As of 2012 the work in developing standards has been scrutinised by the Government and a number of ministries. The Regulation of the Government of Russian Federation №23 per 22.01.2013 confirmed the Rules setting the order of development, confirmation, and implementation of professional standards. Additionally, the Regulation of the Government of Russian Federation №2204-p per 29.11.2012 confirmed the development plan for professional standards. According to this plan, the interested departments of executive power and all-Russia unions of employers and trade unions had to define no less than 400 professional standards in 2013 and then in 2014 (no less than 800 standards in total). The principal responsibility in this area belongs to the Ministry of Labour of Russian Federation. Furthermore, the standards corresponding to the state-approved register may be developed at the expense of the State.

organization. Therefore, the term “professional” is often used in a context, other than institutional (which is the subject of our research). Search suggestions demonstrate that users identify many objects as “professional” (e.g. ethics, cosmetics, education, a burnout), except “association” or similar. As far as organizations were concerned, the first positions in search for our query “professional organization” were occupied by those that satisfied the mass queries either through their real status, or a simulation thereof for the purpose of increasing sales. The name of a professional association as studied here could not objectively be applied to either type.

Secondly, only a fraction of professional associations or organizations of professional regulation had either of the terms in their title (“professional” or “association”). So alongside “association” we had to use similar terms: “guild”, “union”, and “society”. Besides, we had to substitute the term “professional” with a relevant profession’s title: association of doctors, child surgeons, architects, appraisers, etc. Limiting the search by “field” of professional activity meant that we would obtain a limited list of professional associations because at that stage we did not have a complete list of “professions”.

Due to these problems we tested an additional search strategy using the United State Register of Legal Entities (USRLE, or «ЕГРЮЛ») as a database. We acknowledged a wide variety of types of incorporation of professional associations by including not only self-regulated organizations (SRO), but all registered professional organizations and unions whose tasks are to form and strengthen a professional status of a particular professional group on the whole, and to control how these functions are carried out.

The next step was to select from this generic list a number of organizations that could be defined as professional associations by formal attributes (title, legal status, sphere of activity) and by keywords, primarily “association”, “union”, “guild”, “society”; here a legal status and a form of organization were not decisive in making a selection). Making a generic list of professional organizations was complicated by imprecise meaning of these terms for the purposes of our research. Using only similar keywords provides dangerously vague results (associations - 28243, guilds - 2177, unions 52368). Adding the adjective “professional” narrows down the results: we thus found 128 professional associations, 70 professional guilds, 254 professional unions, and 7926 professional societies.

This approach helped to diminish the number of errors but it did not exclude them altogether. We faced the biggest problems with professional unions, the majority of which work as “trade unions” rather than “professional” organizations, i.e. their efforts are primarily directed to



negotiating the workers' conditions of labour and employment with their employer and rarely focus on qualitative characteristics of work and promoting professional community interests in the society at large. In Russia it is also difficult to distinguish between "professional association" and "trade union" because terminology is really tangled. The word "professional" is used to define both a regular work activity of any kind ("occupation" in English) and a professional activity that involves performing a complex knowledge-based work ("profession" in English). Trade unions ("профсоюзы") and professions ("профессии") sound similarly in Russian language and in fact are cognates, whereas in Western sociology they are hardly ever used together.

We planned to further narrow our research with the help of the State Register, first, by professional field, and then by functions that certain organizations perform according to their websites. A quick review of websites revealed that organizations could be tested by their belonging to professional associations according to the following functions (if present): 1) regulations of professional activity (developing legislation, professional standards, etc); 2) negotiation with the state of legal and organizational aspects of professional activity; 3) provision of professional training and education (the rules for marking and attestation, creating the curricula, professional education per se, and other forms of co-operation with institutes of professional education); 4) participation in controlling the quality of work and licensing of organizations and specialists; 5) participation in activity of global professional associations, especially where this activity concerns the important regulations and professional standards, etc. These functions are very helpful in that they allow to clearly distinguish between professional associations as meant in the present research from trade unions (even when they share function #2), on the one hand, and from organizations of employers, on the other hand (these may sporadically exercise certain aspects of the first three functions<sup>10</sup>). The biggest difficulty we faced when using these functions as a marker for professional associations at this preliminary stage consisted in their dual purpose. They had to expose an institutional role of the candidate organization (i.e. one of the results of our research), while also being a filter for selection (a basic selection criterion that could not be formally fixed). For this reason we decided to unify the lists of professional organizations formed on step 1 and step 2.

---

<sup>10</sup> Despite the noted differences between the employers' organizations and professional associations (as meant in this research), and also despite the fact that a title was enough to identify a type of organization, the actual difference between the two requires a special attention. As the analysis of global experience shows, there may be many problems with the so-called "market-oriented" professions. Preliminary results that we obtained for Russia will be analysed below.

## **Two-dimensional classification of a professional field for selective research**

An analysis of public resources and pilot interviews convinced us that, in order to map a landscape of professions and to identify relevant professional associations, we had to use a simple two-dimensional model. One axis was identified as a licensing regime (or: a degree of the State regulation of professional activity, including self-regulation), while another axis was a subject matter of professional activity according to the 2008 International Classifier of Professions and Specialisations.

The initial logic behind the State's licensing the occupations is most clearly seen in the articles of 2001 Act "On Licensing of Specific Occupations" («О лицензировании отдельных видов деятельности» 2001 г. 129-ФЗ per 08.08.2001, repealed in 2011 after the new law came into force). The State relied on the global practice, when defining the occupations that were subject to licensing, explaining it through their influence on the following:

- level of citizens' safety;
- national security;
- national defence;
- people's health;
- maintenance of law;
- observation of Constitutional rights and freedoms;
- preserving historical, cultural, and ethical heritage.

In the new 2011 law there are no references to selection criteria, while on the list of occupations there are 50 positions, including: education; healthcare and pharmaceuticals; chemicals utilisation, engineering, production, and storage of weapons; broadcasting, etc. Meanwhile this law no longer regulates certain occupations that are subject to licensing, but that can now obtain the license under a different act, among these: usage of atomic energy; production and turnover of ethyl, alcohol, and alcohol products; all occupations that entail a protection of state secret; credit organizations etc. Certain areas have been fully withdrawn from the sphere of the State licensing (as of 16.11.2011), even though they were previously subject to a licence: exploration and mining of natural resources; mining of precious metals and stones and producing jewellery;

car and bus manufacturing; organization and owning of casinos and playing facilities; cartographic works; melioration, etc.

This wide diversification of the kinds of activity that are subject to licensing, along with a variety of applicable laws, does not help to clarify the general principles that the State uses to regulate professions. At the same time certain aspects of this new law follow the logic of its predecessor. Obviously, it is the State, and not professional organizations and their representatives, that currently define, which of the Russian professions must be state-regulated. This is also true of the self-regulating institutions. In general, we may identify two models of State regulation, with each one having different consequences:

- Socially important types of professional activity that provide higher risks for a society, which therefore need to be precluded by institutional measures, in particular, by State licensing
- Within a type of professional activity there appear positive conditions for autonomy in both economic activity and social responsibility, thus creating economic and social conditions for an organization to become an SRO.

Thereby, in order to map the landscape of professions according to the level of State regulations we identified four groups:

- 1) licensed types of activity<sup>11</sup>; among these - (a) 45 occupations as per art. 12.1, under the Licensing Law; licensing of (b) 11 occupations as per art. 1.2 and (c) 3 occupations as per art. 1.4 are regulated by the industry laws;
- 2) occupations in transition, for which there has been made a principal decision to refuse the State licensing and to operate under a different regulation regime, once a federal law, presently at the developing stage, comes into force;
- 3) occupations that are already self-regulated and accredited by the regulating State institutions;
- 4) occupations that have always been exempt from licensing — such as the ones never mentioned in any version of the Licensing Law.

The second criterion for building our two-dimensional model was the European classification of professions, as we said above. Bearing in mind our limited research resources, we restricted our selection by following parameters:

---

<sup>11</sup> “That may not be regulated in any way other than by licensing” (Art. 2.3 Law for Licensing of Specific Occupations №99-Φ3 per 04.05.2011).

- 1) we chose only professions that required high education — here we had a better chance of finding a professional association, whose functions differ from those of trade unions and business organizations that strive to protect a business in general, rather than a specific profession;
- 2) we excluded occupations directly linked to secret services: intelligence and counterintelligence, weapons, harmful and dangerous production. We are interested to study the development of a professional association as an integral part of the civil society, therefore we need to start from the professions that occupy the centre of the society, rather than its periphery;
- 3) we focused on mass professions and excluded some “exotic” and less popular professions and fields. Among these (as defined by the Federal Law for Licensing) - (44) works to actively influence meteorological and geophysical processes and events; (45) meteorological works; (34) turnover of ferrous and non-ferrous metals; 35) provision of services in employing the citizens of Russian Federation outside of Russian Federation and some others.

According to these limitations, we used the classification of professionals (“major group 2”<sup>12</sup>). A combination of these two criteria (types of professions and level of regulation) resulted in a table with two main parameters and 24 boxes (Table 2):

**Tab. 2. Preliminary two-dimensional classification of professions**

Professionals	A. Licensed professions	B. Professions in transition from licensing stage to self-regulation	C. Self-regulating professions	D. Professions exempt from licensing (all other professions)
21. Science and Engineering		X		
22. Health		—	—	
23. Teaching	X	—	—	X
24. Business and administration		X		
25. ICT		—	—	

<sup>12</sup> International Standard Classification of Occupations: Structure, Group Definitions and Correspondents Tables. Geneva: ILO, 2008. Vol. 1. P. 109.

26. Legal, Social and Cultural sectors	X	—	—	
--	---	---	---	--

Some cells remained clear because, due to the regulation regime, there are no professions that would satisfy the criteria. For instance, the cells in B and C columns in “Doctors” row cannot be ticked because the self-regulation regime in healthcare is legally prohibited. The reason is usually the same for all other empty cells, which leads to an automatic exclusion of 8 cells from the selection. The final structural model of a selection can be seen in Table 3.

**Tab. 3. A selection model**

	A. Licensed	C. Self-regulated	D. Other
21. Engineering	Aviation, Space, Atomic Energy, Fire Safety	Designers; welders	Engineers (non-licensed)
22. Health	Doctors	—	Non-licensed healthcare services
24. Business and administration	Insurance	Financial auditors	HRs
25. ICT	Broadcasting, communications	—	Webmasters and programmers
26. Legal, Social and Cultural sectors	—	—	Journalists

For every type of professional activity listed in the table we used the Internet search to draw a list of professional organizations – viable candidates for the role of professional associations. Within each type of activity we randomly selected organizations for further research with the help of a random number generator.

## 4. Professional associations in Russia: some results

### The Logic of the State

Already at the preliminary stage of our research (an analysis of websites and documents released by the State and a series of interviews with the heads of well-known professional associations in the fields of Healthcare, Architecture, and Engineering) we have seen a confirmation of a key role the State plays in defining the agenda for associations and the main spheres where self-regulation may develop in Russia. We saw this in the documents cited above that reflect the government's initiatives in fostering the process of formation of professional standards (see ref. 34 of the present paper) and a series of laws, starting with the first Law "On Licensing Specific Occupations" from the year 2001 (129-ФЗ per 08.08.2001) that was changed in 2011 by the law with the same title (№99-ФЗ per 04.05.2011) and finishing the laws on self-regulated organizations. Among the latter there are a general framework Law on Self-Regulated Organizations (№315-ФЗ per 04.12.2007) and several "industry" laws that describe the specifics of self-regulation in particular professions and contain a suggestion to the State to introduce self-regulation in these spheres. Some examples include: the Law "On Auditing Activity" (№ 119-ФЗ per 07.08.2001), the Law "On Evaluation Activities in Russia" (№135-ФЗ 25.07.1998). Later, following the adoption of the law on self-regulation, certain changes have been made to other laws that reflected the existence of such law and describing a particular sphere is self-regulated. Other examples of "industry" laws are the Law "On Advertising" (№ 38-ФЗ per 13.03.2006), "On Heat Supply" (№190-ФЗ per 27.07.2010): these laws mention self-regulation in their spheres in the very first chapters (Ch. 4 and Ch. 6, respectively). To introduce self-regulation in construction and architecture, apart from the actual 2007 Law on Self-Regulated Organizations, certain changes were made to a Town Planning Code of Russian Federation, and some Regulations of the Government of Russian Federation and some orders of ministries and departments were approved. Such was the case with the Order of the Ministry for Regional Development of Russian Federation №274 per 09.12.2008 "On approving a list of works concerning engineering research, building and reconstruction, major rebuilding works on the objects of capital construction, which influence the safety of the objects of capital construction".

The 2007 Law on Self-Regulation defines self-regulation as "an independent, initiating activity, carried out by the subjects of entrepreneurial or professional activity, that consists in developing and setting forth the standards and rules of the mentioned activity, as well as in controlling the compliance with the mentioned standards and rules" (Ch. 1). In this case self-regulation "is carried out on condition of uniting the subjects of entrepreneurial or professional activity in self-

regulated organizations” (Ch. 2), abbreviated as SRO (Russian: CPO). Self-regulated organizations are such non-commercial organizations that “based on membership and either unite the subjects of entrepreneurial activity by specific industry or by the market of manufactured goods (works, services), or unite the subjects of professional activity of a particular kind” (Ch. 3). It is assumed that such organization should create special bodies of control over compliance of the members of self-regulated organization with standards and rules of entrepreneurial or professional activity and consider the cases when disciplinary action had to be taken against a non-compliant member (Ch.4). The SRO must satisfy the following demands:

- 1) unite as members of a self-regulated organization no less than twenty-five subjects of entrepreneurial activity or no less than a hundred subjects of professional activity of a particular kind, unless the federal laws on self-regulated organizations of entrepreneurial or professional activity state otherwise;
- 2) have standards and rules for entrepreneurial or professional activity, mandatory for all members of a self-regulated organization;
- 3) ensuring an additional material responsibility of each of its members to the consumers of goods (works, services) or other (Ch.3).

A mere description of this new dimension of the State policy towards professional self-regulation may look too vague. To avoid this, we would like to show how professional self-regulation may develop from the “top”, using auditors as an example.

The Law “On auditing activity” № 119 per 07.08.2001 stimulated a creation of the “unions” in the sphere of auditing, similar to professional associations, that would be able to share to some extent the burden of professional regulation of their activity – all this 6 years before the actual Law for Self-Regulated Organizations was adopted. Admittedly, the auditing law meant that a self-regulated organization would be controlled by a federal ministry. For instance, the law:

- Defined (Ch. 18) the order of “State regulation of auditing activity” by “an authorised federal institution” (in this case the Ministry of Finances of Russian Federation),
- Provided for the creation within the Ministry of the Board of Audit “with the aim to take into account the opinion of professional participants of the auditing market” (Ch. 19); “The Regulation for the Board of Audit” was approved by the Order of the Ministry of Finances almost a year later;
- Introduced the definition of non-profit professional auditing societies accredited by the Ministry of Finances that, “in order to create conditions for auditing activity of their members and protection of their interests”, were encouraged to set “required rules (standards) for their

members for conducting professional activity and of professional ethics” and “to systematically control the compliance with these rules and standards”;

- Clarified that subject to accreditation by the Ministry of Finances are the societies that have “no less than 1000 certified auditors and/or no less than 100 auditing organizations” (Ch. 20).

This law obliged the auditor: a) to be a member of a self-regulated auditing organization; b) to have a certified qualification of an auditor; c) to annually improve their qualification by attending special educational programmes confirmed by the auditing organization, of which he is a member. Only those professional institutes that have been accredited (certified) by the Ministry of Finances as self-regulated auditing organizations may enter the market to provide their services and subsequently raise their qualification.

In the next version of the Federal Law “On Auditing Activity” the article 20 defined an accredited professional auditing society as a “self-regulated society”.

In October 2003, following the results of monitoring the functions of the organs of state power the Government of Russian Federation decided to transfer certain functions of the Ministry of Finance in the sphere of regulating accounting and audit activities to professional societies. This was confirmed in the document “The Concept of mid-term developing accounting and reporting in Russian Federation”. Along with dividing the responsibilities and creating partner relations between the Government and professional community, the document reflected an idea of a professional association, previously unknown in Russia (Table 4).

**Tab.4. A division of responsibilities between public authorities and organizations of professional community in the field of audit.**

<b>In the fields of accountancy, reporting and auditing activity the following is controlled by:<sup>13</sup></b>	
<b>Public authority</b>	<b>Professional community</b>
a) devising the state policy;	a) representing and defending the interests of a professional community;
b) improving the legal framework for	b) drawing up suggestions for improving the legal

<sup>13</sup> “The Concept of mid-term developing accounting and reporting in Russian Federation” (approved by the order of the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation № 180 per July 1, 2004 г.). Ch. 2.3. (URL: [http://www.minfin.ru/common/img/uploaded/library/2006/08/konc\_sr.pdf])



professional activity;	framework for professional activity; c) participating in or initiating the devising of Russian professional standards and other regulations, as well as explanation thereof ;
c) setting for a procedure for approving the IFRS and implementing it throughout Russia;	d) providing professional public examination of IFRS that are being endorsed in Russia;
d) facilitating development and approval of Russian standards and other regulations	e) devising and distributing guidelines and information materials; f) compiling and distributing a set of best practices;
e) ensuring government control of law compliance;	g) devising the norms of professional ethics and controlling the compliance with them among the members of professional community; h) controlling the compliance with professional standards; i) providing advanced training to the members of professional community;
e) j) monitoring of the factors of risk for stability of the system of professional activity;	
f) k) interaction with inter-state and inter-governmental organizations	

In the course of this ideology, according to art. 5.1 and 5.2 Ch. 18 of the Federal Law “On Licensing” (version per 31.12.2005<sup>14</sup>), in Russia as of July 1, 2006 there ceased a licensed auditing activity. This was a decisive shift from state regulation in the sphere of professional audit to self-regulation. Admittedly, the cut-off date for licensing subsequently changed a few times: it moved to January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 (in the next version of the same law per 27.07.2006), then to July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007<sup>15</sup>; on July 25<sup>th</sup> licensing was re-introduced<sup>16</sup> and was finally repealed on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> On licensing particular occupations: Federal Law № 128 per 08.08.2001, version Federal Law of Russian Federation № 200 per 31.12.2005.

(<http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=57487;fld=134;dst=100540;rnd=0.6557210287554464>)

<sup>15</sup> Version of the Federal Law “On Licensing...” per 29.12.2006 N 252-Φ3.

<sup>16</sup> Version of the Federal Law “On Licensing...” per 19.07.2007 N 135-Φ3.

<sup>17</sup> Version of the Federal Law “On Licensing...” per 14.07.2008 N 128-Φ3.

In general, further plans of the State regarding self-regulation are no longer limited by existing laws and regulations. In April 2013 the Ministry of Economic Development of Russian Federation, being a sort of strategic headquarters of the Russian Government for deciding all kinds of questions, made an official announcement of its interest in preparing “suggestions to improve the legislation of Russian Federation in the sphere of self-regulation of entrepreneurial and professional activity”. It should be noted that the Ministry has not announced a tender for devising such suggestions this year. At the same time the government still plans “to address the shortcomings of the Russian practical functioning of self-regulated industry institutions and to bring together different approaches to the establishment of a system of self-regulation, based on international practice”<sup>18</sup>.

What are the characteristics of the role and intent of the State in the sphere of professional regulation?

First, the State would like to transfer some of its functions in many spheres of professional activity to professional associations, whereby it stimulates their emergence.

Second, the State does not a difference in principle between self-regulation of entrepreneurial and professional activity.

Third, in many fields, where the State believes self-regulation is necessary (in our research one of such fields was auditing), it retains the right to confirm professional standards, to devise policies for development of this or that field, and to keep hold of the principal means of control over professional education. The latter is significant because the majority of higher education institutions providing professional education are State-owned, and their programmes are confirmed by the Ministry of Education of Russian Federation. When the State initiates the spread of self-regulated organizations, these are allowed to work with lower-level organizations and to bear financial responsibility. In other words, self-regulation means a partial autonomy, and not discretion to develop institutions of professional control.

Four, a comparison of activity of professional associations in non-regulated spheres<sup>19</sup> with those in State-regulated (where their activity is subject to the Law of Self-Regulation (e.g. audit, architectural engineering) or to State-licensing (healthcare) shows that an active participation of

---

<sup>18</sup> From a report on the interest in organising an open tender of Ministry of Economic Development of Russian Federation for devising the relevant suggestions. M., 22.04.2013.

<sup>19</sup> Here: non-regulated sphere means the absence of special state measures to license or the absence of self-regulation of professional activity

the State as regulator stimulates (or at least is accompanied with) an initiative to self-regulate from below. On these occasions in some organizations that we surveyed we observed a realisation of more mature functions of professional associations, as well as an active competition for leadership between the main national professional societies.

For instance, in healthcare two organizations compete for national dominance: the National Medical Chamber (created in 2010, headed by the well-known child surgeon Leonid Roshal) and the Doctors' Society of Russia (created in 2013, headed by the academician and cardiologist Yevgeniy Chasov). The National Medical Chamber has been preparing some truly revolutionary measures to change the Russian legislation that include a mandatory membership in a united professional medical association and a strengthening of control of professional community over the level of qualification, ensuring it increases through regular training and certification of doctors. This means that doctors strive to self-regulation and prepare to "close the market" from non-members or unqualified practitioners. The leader of the Chamber has for a long time most sharply criticised the policy of the Healthcare Minister from the previous Government. Following the change of government in 2012 the Ministry of Healthcare and the National Medical Chamber have been trying to collaborate more. In particular, the meeting of the Chamber in April 2013 basically saw an approval of a candidature of an important state official: the head of Roszdravnadzor (Federal Service for the Oversight of Public Health and Social Development), one of the key agencies controlled by the Ministry of Healthcare of Russian Federation. Both competing organizations accept as members various specialist medical organizations. Respondents among doctors and open sources confirm that the charters of both organizations have no critical differences. Moreover, some respondents suspect that the second organization has been created as a counterpart to the first to weaken it and to drain-away some of its members, and that both, to bigger or lesser extent, are supported by the State.

"At the inception of the Chamber there was an idea to unite what there had been at that moment. [There were] 2 gradations: 1) Professional societies by specialisation, and 2) Regional societies. [Now ] there have been some attempts to take over certain functions of the State. But the State, which is so used to always govern everything, to this day cannot give up any of its functions, even the smallest." (H-5)

"...We have not got a political will to make a decision..., to create a professional organization that could be a self-regulated organ." "The National Medical Chamber is created by the State's decision.. The opinion of doctors cannot be generalised.. There are some lobbying interests that foster all decisions." (H-4/) "The Ministry of Healthcare does not delegate its functions to a

social organization, until it is headed by someone so-and-so, with whom the Ministry decides to work together. I.e. the situation depends neither on there being an organization, or professionals, but on concrete personalities.” “Traditionally, Ministry of Healthcare has been responsible for everything.” (H-1)

Speaking of audit, here the market has now been nearly “closed” by 5 (previously – 6) self-regulated organizations accredited by the Ministry of Finance where an auditor is legally obliged to be a member in order to perform relevant professional functions<sup>20</sup>. However, according to respondents, this “market closure” is only nominal for now because the State is not ready to ensure the law enforcement; hence there are many auditors on the market who offer services, while not being a member of any of the accredited organizations. One may assume that the main battles between professional societies of auditors as the subjects of self-regulation have already been fought. Today the biggest threat to professionalism is not the rivalling professional associations or state officials but the market itself, precisely the unexacting attitude to these services. The majority of clients look for accounting consultants who can help them with tax mitigation and are therefore not interested in a quality audit as such. Furthermore, a mandatory audit, legally defined, may become a formality. However, the biggest disadvantage, in respondents’ opinion, is the inability of the State to ensure that audit is at all performed. “There is still no responsibility [of a company] for not performing an audit in general. The companies think they’d rather not have an audit because the fine is ridiculously small compared to auditing expenses.” “Our difficulties, I believe, have more to do with the fact that a professional community itself does not feel its power and has not yet acknowledged a self-regulated organization as instrument of influence on the market.” At the same time the proof of a professional organization getting established may be seen in the fact that all self-regulated organization united their efforts, when preparing amendments to a draft law on auditing. Previously “there has never been the case when everyone agreed with a single text. Suddenly all united and wrote not just any paper, but a large draft law that contains the minute changes, highly technical, very political, and very profound. Now, this is what I consider a big achievement.” (Aud-1)

---

<sup>20</sup> The sixth SRO of auditors, accredited by the Ministry of Finance – a non-commercial partnership “The guild of auditors of Regional Institutes of Professional Accountants” – was excluded by the Ministry from the list of SRO on 27.06.2012. This exclusion of a once strong “regional” organization with headquarters in St. Petersburg attest for a hot competition inside and between professional organizations in the market of training and re-training of auditors and accountants. It is possible that the tendency towards a “globalisation” among the SRO will continue, as noted in the media. – See: Репникова Н. «Большая аудиторская семерка» станет «большой тройкой» // URL: [http://www.rbsys.ru/print.php?page=1437&option=news\_audit]. Доступ: 07.03.2013. (Repnikova N., “The Big Auditing Seven” may become “the Big Three”, available on the website since 07.03.2013.)

In the field of architecture there was a heated discussion about the conditions for self-regulation and professional control in the sphere of design and town planning. In this field there work three professional associations of national status: the Architects' Union of Russia (established in the USSR in 1932), the National Society of Designers (NSD, established in 2009 as a "national union of self-regulated organizations consisting of members who prepare design documents"), and the most recently founded National Chamber of Architects (NCA). According to the NCA's charter, the organization aims to regulate architectural activity within the framework of "a single professional platform uniting all self-regulated organizations of architects, which members are individual practising architects". While the differences in charters of all three organizations is relatively small, the National Chamber stresses the individual membership and responsibility and thus explains its objectives: "to develop a basic model of continuous advanced training for architects based, first and foremost, on professional practice" and to establish throughout Russia the common rules for certification of "architects" and "expert architects".<sup>21</sup> Meanwhile a simultaneous existence of the second and third organizations is a conflict in itself. Yet some believe that emergence of NCA indicates a split in the Architects' Union, too<sup>22</sup>, even though the both NSD and NCA are represented within the Union, just as some of the self-regulated organizations that are part of the NSD support the creation of NCA. As for the Architects' Union, its activity is based around the creative part of the profession (exhibition, conferences, contests etc), rather than its industrial and organizational characteristics. The Architects' Union has even introduced a system of certification that has not been recognised by the NSD.

As far as the differences between the NSD and NCA are concerned, according to the head of the NCA S. Melnichenko, "NSD organises the work of self-regulated organizations who, in turn, organise the work of their members, the project and design companies". But there is a profession, and there are rules of the profession. These will be the subject matter for the NCA". [Melnichenko, 2013] Technically, here we see alternative means of professional regulation, either on the basis of uniting organizations and employers (NSD) or on the basis of uniting practitioners (NCA). Formally, according to today's legislation, their co-existence is possible; however the complete market closure may only be achieved, if the process is headed by the NCA. The problem is not only that the NSD does not expect its members to be individually

---

<sup>21</sup> From the text of the Charter of the NCA, version per 27.08.2012 (<http://www.gap-sro.ru/old/Documents/08-2012/06.pdf>)

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, V. Lukin. «How to ask for charity, or A few words about setting the Chamber of Architects») <http://sroportal.ru/publications/valerij-lukin-kak-po-miru-poiti-s-sumoj-ili-neskolko-slov-ob-idee-sozdaniya-arxitekturnoj-palaty/>, Available in Russian.

responsible and does not provide certification. A self-regulated organization that constitute the NSD represent only 30% of practising architects, according to the most critical respondents. The remaining 70% are either the organizations of “builders, or of architectural minions” (A-1). A simultaneous existence of two organizations with such different approaches to membership (individuals or organizations, although membership is mandatory in either case) and to qualification requirements and responsibilities is only temporary. Most likely, the State allowed this in the wake of entering the WTO and the necessity to switch to international standards in architecture and building. In the opinion of some architects, the idea of the NCA to create a self-regulated organization consisting of individual members badly fits and even becomes “unsolvable” within the framework of the present Law for Self-Regulation. They believe that the Chamber of Architects is an entirely new body that has never been known in Russia, and to develop this structure there must be changes in legislation. [Balabashina, 2012]

## **Professional Logic**

Contrary to the fields of occupations where the State actively participate as a pioneer of professional regulations in the form of licensing or via self-regulation, in “non-regulated” occupations the ability of a professional community to organise itself is strikingly lower, as follows from our interviews. In our selection the “classical” examples of such “professions” were engineers and journalists that are non-licensed and excluded from the Law on Self-Regulation. We interviewed some leading figures in professional societies that claim professional regulation and noted the four most widespread themes:

- (1) pessimism towards the present state of a professional group or quality of professional services, and the lack of opportunities to change anything through the effort of one’s organization,
- (2) anxiety regarding the erosion of a professional group and substituting professional regulation with market stimuli that are seen as a threat to the profession,
- (3) accounts of numerous “small acts”: a monument to a notable professional figure was unveiled, an event commemorating a memorable date took place, a competition to find the best professional finished, winners received their awards. To compare this to the abovementioned active representatives of professional medical and architectural associations, they see a professional crisis and the problem of market invading the sphere of professional regulation as a starting point for their own initiatives to self-regulate the sphere, to communicate with the State, and to devise a programme, a draft law, or an organization to radically change the negative situation in their sphere. In their interviews they also occasionally noted small acts but these

usually were the instances of defending a professional in court, spreading the information about the organization in order to grow the number of supporters (i.e. the ideological agitation). In other words, they are all focused on measures that can bring about qualitative changes,

(4) focusing a conversation on the problems of business and market, rather than professional practice and provision of professional services. Here the word “professional” is used just as often, if not more often, than in other spheres. However, the phrases “professional business” and “professional community” are seen as the same, in particular, a professional community tends to mean a union of business organizations, and not practitioners.

Here are some examples (we tried to give literal translations of responses):

(1) “... Soon we began to feel this lack of some kind of professional standard. Roughly speaking, how can you say, who is a journalist and who isn’t? Being a member of journalism, of the Union of Journalists doesn’t work. Nobody is now a member, and nobody worries about this. There are no licenses. Having a degree in Journalism doesn’t matter”. “...A professional community is in a terrible state: it is shattered, humiliated, and simply crushed”. “...We rather talk about some internal rules, which... that people obey...”. “This necessity is certainly rising in the souls of a certain number of people, but it has to rise in the entire professional group”.

## **In Search of Professional Logic**

At the start of research we assumed that a relatively higher activity in the field of professional self-regulation will be seen in the spheres with minimal attention from the State and therefore experiencing a smaller “regulating” pressure from the top (i.e. no licensing and no specific laws concerning the activity of an SRO, although the general framework law on Self-Regulating Organizations allows to create them in any sphere). However, the actual interviews revealed a different picture.

In “non-regulated” occupations the ability of a professional community to organise itself is strikingly lower, as follows from our interviews. They usually work as “clubs” and have an informal status. In our selection the “classical” examples of such “professions” were engineers and journalists that are non-licensed and excluded from the Law on Self-Regulation, as well as naturopaths as representatives of a non-licensed type of healthcare. We interviewed some leading figures in professional societies that claim professional regulation and noted four most widespread themes:

(1) pessimism towards the present state of a professional sphere or quality of professional services, the lack of opportunities to change anything through the effort of one's organization, and anxiety regarding the negative influence of the market, the erosion of a professional group and substituting professional regulation with market stimuli that are seen as a threat to the profession,

(2) accounts of numerous "small acts": a monument to a notable professional figure was unveiled, an event commemorating a memorable date took place, a competition to find the best professional finished, winners received their awards. To compare this to the abovementioned active representatives of professional medical and architectural associations, they see a professional crisis and the problem of market invading the sphere of professional regulation as a starting point for their own initiatives to self-regulate the sphere, to communicate with the State, and to devise a programme, a draft law, or an organization to radically change the negative situation in their sphere. In their interviews they also occasionally noted small acts but these usually were the instances of defending a professional in court, spreading the information about the organization in order to grow the number of supporters (i.e. the ideological agitation). In other words, they are all focused on measures that can bring about qualitative changes,

(3) focusing a conversation on the problems of business and market, rather than professional practice and provision of professional services. Here the word "professional" is used just as often, if not more often, than in other spheres. However, the phrases "professional business" and "professional community" are seen as the same, in particular, a professional community tends to mean a union of business organizations, and not practitioners.

(4) All interviews without exception (there was no difference in principle between regulated and non-regulated professional activity) are linked together by the State as the main subject of the dialogue. On some occasions this is a talk about lobbying the interests of a professional community and/or the market, and on other occasions this is a critique of a faulty, in the majority of respondents' opinion, State policy towards their industry. Sometimes there are grievances for the insufficient care for the organization and lack of support, including financial support. A part of respondents called their relationship with the State a "partnership", another called the State a "curator", and only once an interview mentioned "competition" (in the field of accreditation of educational programmes and certification of engineers). Below are some examples.



## Concerns for the profession's fate

*“... Soon we began to feel this lack of some kind of professional standard. Roughly speaking, how can you say, who is a journalist and who isn't? Being a member of journalism, of the Union of Journalists doesn't work. Nobody is now a member, and nobody worries about this. There are no licenses. Having a degree in Journalism doesn't matter”. “...A professional community is in a terrible state: it is shattered, humiliated, and simply crushed”. “...We rather talk about some internal rules, which... that people obey...”. “This necessity is certainly rising in the souls of a certain number of people, but it has to rise in the entire professional group” (J-7)<sup>23</sup>*

*“At the moment there goes a complete nonsense. The union of scientific and engineering societies from time to time holds contests for engineers and gives them certificates on the basis of winning a contest. Well, you may count this as a kind of certification of an engineering qualification. Although this is not at all a system... [because] there it is all in such an embryo state, or in a state when you cannot use this certificate. Say, you've got a certificate XYZ. Now what, does this mean that you'll be accepted as an engineer anywhere? Who recognises this certificate?” (E-2)*

*“In present situation there is either no opinion of a professional (public) organizations, or it is fictional. There exists a kind of organization that has this or that label of a professional community, and it puts its signature under certain documents as a mere formality. Professional issues are solved by unprofessional or by little qualified professionals [civil servants]. The public bodies must solve the problems of co-ordinating the State interests with the interests of professional communities. And the latter should have the decisive say”. (H-5)*

*“[Now] the market of companies of interest for them [auditors] has shrunk... Turns out that all companies are so-called socially important, among them are those where the State holds over 25%, there are many of those. And in all these companies they [auditors] can only perform the same functions that any student, a person without a certificate, in general... So they don't need to*

---

<sup>23</sup> All interviews are anonymous. The numbers in brackets indicate respondents, where the letter(s) stands for an industry, and the number for the position of the respondent in our research list. So, J- journalists, E - engineers, Aud – auditors, Ins - insurers, IT – Information Technology specialists, H – doctors (healthcare), H nonlic. – non-licensed healthcare practitioners..

*perform any procedure as auditors. And this, most likely, will lead to a strong differentiation between auditors...*” (Aud-1)

*“The market crushed and smeared, I would say, a professional morality”. “The boundary between journalism and advertising is vanishing”. (J-7)*

## **Philosophy of “small acts”**

*“At least 80% of registered scientific and technical organizations are organizations that are part of our union of engineering organizations... We position ourselves as organisers, public organisers of work with engineers, yes. And advanced training, and relevant contests, “Engineer of the Year” and so on. [ Q. On participation of an organization in advanced training] “We deal with conferences, and with courses we practically... we look that they... this is impossible because in every company there should be their courses, and at the university – theirs”. [ Q. What about re-training programmes?] “No, we don’t... well, we control programming, so here it is then...” (E-1)*

*“The main task now, as before, is to use all our means and methods to assist in advanced training... we opened very significant courses for journalists who go to hot spots... apart from that, we have various clubs. Well, for instance, just before you, I had a visit from the president of a club of journalists who specialise in energy sector... And now we are preparing to celebrate the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Victory [in the Great Patriotic War of 1945] in 2015, and we announced a contest for journalists who write on this subject, will be gathering them”.(J-2)*

*“If we talk about self-regulation, then a self-regulated organization must correspond with a particular corporation management... And instead we have club organizations”.( H-4)*

## **About “professional” market and “professional” business**

*[Q. On organization’s mission]”Well, really, perhaps, to create a positive environment to develop business... To raise the level... of service... [in telecommunications] to the level corresponding to all capitals of the world’s leading countries”. ( J-2)*

*“The mission is to assist at developing IT industry in Russia”. “All that is left is to find support from the State in order to sustain the entrance of small firms to the global market – the support of export. To sustain the system of qualification and preparing of professionals, so there are more developers on the IT market. And the next objective is to deal in service business”. (IT-1)*

*[Q. On mission ] “I would not use the mission category... , I would use the term “key directions of activity”. The first is to represent the interests of the IT business in the State... The second is to regulate relations within the sector, i.e. in the business sphere between the companies, etc. And third, but maybe auxiliary direction is to create conditions to foster the market growth”. (IT-2)*

*“[An organization ] has been created with the goal to grow the economic efficiency of the work of member-firms. Such support was especially important in the conditions of a crisis. We expected to unite organizations that produce high quality products and provide services to people. We expected that such organization and the society on the whole would guarantee the safety of production [first and foremost, BAAs]”. (Hnon-lic.1)*

*“[An organization] was necessary in order not to lose partner connections for all techies, something like it. This was on the one hand. And on the other hand, there arose the problems... of certification, it is a question of entering the global markets. We do not move towards some questions that we might even perhaps have posed, like protecting the interests of individual members of an association or something else... It was clear from the beginning that it was not the case. We do not stress that, but [we stress] precisely the questions of technical progress”. (E-3)*

*“Well, at first there was a society... a committee was created... or better, not a committee but a kind of union of Director Generals of four plants. And then on their basis there was created, as a matter of fact, our society... because in the conditions when industry had not been developing [in 1990s], it was necessary to protect it. And the main function of any, precisely, professional organization is to lobby the interests of this organization, of its members”. (E-4)*

Previously in this subsection we cited answers that focused on business, however in every interview the same respondents also spoke about professional services. The link between these two aspects of market-oriented occupations is well illustrated by the following statement:

*“We protect the interests of a professional community. This is why I rather feel myself not a public figure but a member of some professional team. A community. Yes, yes, a professional community. Strictly speaking, I, being an insurer, protect other insurers... There is but another question, with a full understanding that, unless the interests of those who insure – agricultural and horticultural producers – are observed, then the insurance will not evolve.” (Ins-3)*

## **A contradictory dialogue with the State**

Within the professional community, be that long-established professions or new and market-oriented occupations, there is no common opinion on the necessity to distance itself from the State or to co-operate with the State in making professional decisions. On the one hand, we hear grieving comments that the State does not like sharing power and will probably never give it up, but on the other hand people say that the State support is necessary to develop professions, a professional market, and a system for provision of services.

*[Q. What is the goal of your organization today?] “Our goal. It is developing agricultural insurance in Russia. But, first and foremost, it is the support from the State”. (Ins-3)*

*“...Unfortunately, it is possible to create a professional organization only with consent, support, and directive of the Minzdrav [Ministry of Healthcare]” (H-4)*

*“An association, yes, it is to collect and listen to all points of view and to make some kind of consolidated decision that would suit the State, on the one hand, and the business as a producer of material values, on the other hand”. (E-3)*

*[Q. Who defines the agenda – it is the market, the State, or a professional community itself?] “First and foremost, it is certainly the State. Then, the community. And finally, the market”. (Ins-1)*

*“I’m developing an organization, but I have not got the means to pay salaries. Speaking of co-operation with the State, there is probably no such... For example, we hold annual congresses but we do not receive support from the State... Now everything that we do is not required by the Minzdrav. Our programs are excluded from licensing according to the new regulation”. (Hnon-lic.-1)*

*[Q. On State regulation]. “Instead of developing standards, instead of doing concrete work on the question, what was Gosstandard doing, in general?.. In every sphere there had been respective committees and commissions that supported this and dealt with it. From Gosstandard, which is now Rosstandard, there came not one, but a few people to a conference. We advised each other, we had a committee for standartization [in our organization].. [and now at Rosstandard they say:] “We only control the quality”. (E-1)*

*“I came to invite to a congress of the Association... [the president of one well-known society of entrepreneurs]... He says: “Where do you hold your congress?” I say: “At the hall of the Ministry of Education”. He responds: “I won’t go there, you are not a public organization. If you hold your congress at the hall of the Ministry of Education, you are just a kind of their mouthpiece, and you won’t be inquiring into the flaws of its work”. (E-2)*

*“When we deal with accreditation of educational programmes, then the State accreditation of educational programmes is in the zone of conflict of interests. Because the State must organise the education, and it also organises accreditation of educational programmes... We would like them to recognise us. But at the same time we would not like them to dictate us, to meddle in our work”. (E-2)*

*“This association got formed indeed, as you say, sometime in 1991... it was an initiative of the ministry [of automobile industry of the USSR], on the one hand, and on the other hand, it was a community of technical specialists of automobile industry... At this time the USSR had started breaking up... it [automobile industry] was really on the brink...” (E-3)*

*“There are no fully described standards; a doctor must have the freedom to apply rules depending on a concrete situation... The doctor is driven into forms. We have no other choice. Only to unite into an association”. (H-5)*

*“How can they [doctors] exist in this system separately from the State? We may talk about the autonomy of a doctor’s professional activity, but not about the autonomy of the system of doctors’ self-management”. (H-4)*

*“We develop suggestions based on the Government’s programs, develop suggestions based on the Government’s regulations, develop based on draft laws, existing laws. It was with our suggestion that the Department of Automobile Industry within the Ministry of Industry and Trade has been created”. (E-4)*

We tried to use these interview extracts to highlight some characteristic directions in the discourse of professions and professional services among the representatives of what we called professional associations. Before we analyse their content we would like to clarify once more what organizations they are, and why among them there were, for instance, some business associations in the sphere of insurance, information technologies (IT), and even automobile companies.

The first reason has to do with methodology of search and objectifying the results. The two-dimensional model of structuring the landscape of professional associations, as described in section 3, could not guarantee that the preliminary lists would ONLY contain organizations that satisfy the criteria of a professional organization in the sense it is used in our research because, in the end, we relied on the title of an organization and on a classification of types of activity. In further selection of companies for a quantitative analysis of websites, which remained outside the scope of the present work, we selected organizations randomly. And it was only after the website analysis, when we used such indicators as the availability of the charter (what could be read online), proofs of co-operation with the State and educational institutions, membership in international professional societies etc., that we were able to select for further in-depth interviews those organizations that at least formally satisfied the criteria of a professional association: i.e. they had claims to regulate a respective sphere of activity in the industries we mentioned earlier in this work. Precisely for this reason, when we quote, among others, the leaders of organizations that do not seem to have any regulatory functions, or that seem to care for business more than for professional activity, we may say that such organization represent those among professional associations that are very focused on achieving commercial results or, as one respondent put it, are oriented on “club activity” (i.e. an activity that seeks to integrate a community without a specific goal), rather than some random organizations that have never had any intention to participate in professional self-regulation. They have had such intention, but this is how they have to realise it.

The second reason has to do with the obvious absence in language and in practice of clear and fixed models of professions, as described in the Western studies on professions. There were certain periods in pre-Soviet and Soviet history when we could find relevant examples in specific knowledge-based occupations, but they have not become widely accepted and clear to the majority of those who participate in the process, and, of course, very little was written about them in academic literature. This is why even the internationally recognised Russian doctors who came forward with a legislative initiative to introduce professional self-regulation on the basis of mandatory membership in the national organization and who are aware of the Anglo-Saxon tradition of self-regulation in Healthcare and medicine are not averse to thoughts on market and management:

*“At one point I realised that without creating a new clinic I would be unable to grow professionally, nor to prepare a new generation of doctors, so I was forced to start managing”.*

(H-5)

*“Unless you [do it] as friends, then the professional community that has the right to license and accredit, must have the right to be responsible for this man [patient]. To be responsible with its reputation, its finances. And there are almost no finances...” (H-3)*

*“In the entire world professional organizations have to take into account globalisation tendencies... And we have no competition instead”. (H-4)*

Many respondents vividly showed in the interviews that, for them, the questions of keeping both profession and business are currently entwined. They do not even guess that “the logic of market” and “the logic of profession” contradict one another in academic discourse:

*“[Mission] – is, primarily, the development of a profession, precisely the Russian auditing profession. You see? So this is an organization that guards the rights of Russian auditing profession”. “The participants of the auditing market, it seems to me, do not yet understand that an SRO is... not merely some sort of additional procedures that came out of the blue to create a new burden that does not bring any benefits. In reality this is an instrument of market influence”. (AUD-1)*

## **Professional organization’s landscape**

What qualitatively different types of organizations are represented within the occupational landscape that we studied? We decided to illustrate this with the help of a table structuring the findings (Table 5). The vertical rows have the previously accepted division of spheres of activity into non-regulated, licensed and regulated by the SRO legislation according to the policy chosen by the State. The horizontal rows demonstrate variations of market and professional logic, shared by organizations according to the concept of "three logics" of social order, identified by E. Friedson: professional, administrative, and market logic. We accepted that the professional logic of a weaker kind may have the appearance of a club (either due to the general weakness of an organization, or to a higher pressure from the State of market on this sphere) (column 1 of Table5). In a stronger version, professional logic tends to strive to close the market according to an active realization of professional regulatory functions, mentioned at the beginning of our paper in the notion of professional association. These organizations form column 4 of Table 5. Regarding the market logic we also accepted that there were two types of market orientations: predominantly hierarchical organizations with diverse personnel where the experts armed with knowledge do not constitute an operational core (column 3); or professional service firms which

employees are mainly professionals who possess the knowledge. Such firms usually have a "flat" management structure and are distinguished by their commitment to a profession. We defined the former type as professional unions of employers and the latter as professional service firms. It is this second type of organizations that may be defined as a market-oriented model of profession, as we mentioned in part 1.

As a result, based on predominance of "professional", "market", or "administrative" (State-chosen) "logic", we distributed the sampled organizations into four groups: professional "club" organizations, business associations (here dominating business objectives are underpinned by the rhetoric of professionalism), business related professional service associations (with objectives of business and professional development being intertwined), and professional associations per se (or, in our project, associations claiming regulation and self-regulation of professional activity). We were unable to use a more fractional classification of professional organizations (or professional service firms, PSFs), provided by von Nordenflycht (Nordenflycht, 2010), to better distinguish between the mixed type organizations due to a small number of cases and an insufficient development of organizations claiming to own a predominantly "professional logic".

Organizations where administrative logic dominated were not present in the research. Furthermore, even in theory we can only vaguely imagine what kind of professional organization we could have in practice. Conditionally, in this category we could enlist the non-government and non-commercial organizations created upon the State's initiative either to fill in the gaps in otherwise lacking professional regulation in the society, or to imitate it.<sup>24</sup> However, since professional regulation has not so far become a priority of the State policy in Russia, such organizations are unlikely to exist outside our selection. This is different for professional unions in our selection that today only continue to exist thanks to the State support. As a rule, these are organizations that have existed since the Soviet times; they are rather strongly focused on promotion and maintenance of a professional status that has somewhat diminished during the market reforms. Therefore even if their representatives whom we interviewed admitted the State curatorship or direct financing we still ascribed such organizations to a professional, not administrative, type.

---

<sup>24</sup> In other words, these would organizations similar to the ones called "gongo" in Western studies on the problems of NGOs (from «GONGO» – Government-organized non-government organizations). In literature this term has a rather negative connotation as a "quasi-civic", imitative organizations fulfilling a specific political order of the State establishment.



It is difficult to understand the actual number of organizations falling into any of the cells in Table 5, based on our research that was predominantly qualitative. To further quantify our findings, we will need to conduct research in each of the four groups, or at least in groups 3 and 4, as the ones most obviously claiming the capability for professional regulation both in institutional sense of the term “profession”, and in terms of models of profession. Different to them are the first group that claims professional status but not the institutional control (regulation), and the second group that claim control but do not distinguish the professional nature of activity as specific, non-market and non-administrative mechanisms of operation and social order. As such, this lack of distinction is not bad per se, but this means neither type of organizations specialise in professional problems and therefore cannot be considered professional associations in the sense we have been using throughout our research. Professional ideology often is used by them as a rhetorical method and an external attribute of market or administrative mechanisms of power. Groups 3 and 4 are related, respectively, to a market-oriented and a classical model of professions, as described in literature, with one difference: in Russia the degree of development of both models and their functionality is far smaller than in the West. At least, such was our preliminary conclusion.

Let us describe in detail the four mentioned groups.

Table 5

**A structural grid to describe the professional landscape (according to the degree of presence within a segment of predominantly professional or predominantly market-oriented types of unions)**

Relation of sphere of activity to the State regulation	Professional “clubs”	Business associations	Business related professional service associations	Professional associations
Non-regulated	+	+	+	-
Licensed	+	-	+	+
SRO-regulated	-	+	+	++

Legend: + present, ++ unobviously present, - non-present.

**The first group** are "club" organizations, i.e. those, in which the main activity is to integrate a community or a part thereof, yet without a specific regulating goal. The larger part of goals in such organizations are of "humanitarian" nature, as it were: an exchange of opinions, discussions of technical professional problems, an organization of conferences and academic discussions, an announcement of contests, and a co-operation with international partners. The latter activity, although aimed at increasing the influence, particularly by raising a professional status by demonstrating the acceptance in the international community, does not yet seek to use this

quality in the domestic market of professional services in order to close it or to “catch” more members or clients. These organizations are unlikely to be counted as professional associations because even at the plant they do not strive to professionally control a relevant sphere of activity. Nonetheless they are professional agents of influence with a focus on developing a professional community. Such organizations are equally present in non-regulated segment (e.g. various engineering specialisations), and in the licensed segment (healthcare). ). Among them some are rather active and modern for their professional sphere, while others are inert, having been created in Soviet times or even earlier. Furthermore, here one may also find organizations that were born in the moment or a project and later lost the momentum and could not develop any further. In particular, this explains why out of 273 professional organizations whose activity we analysed with the help of the Internet up to one third of them have not got a website, or the website has not been updated for a long time.

**The second group** brings together business societies according a specific kind of activity. Their leaders genuinely believe their organizations are “professional” (e.g. “professionals of the insurance market”, “professionals of the telecomm market”, “cable TV professionals”, “a professional union of car manufacturers” etc). This group is also not homogenous. There may be found both employers’ unions from large industrial complexes and unions of smaller organizations of a narrower type in one or another service sphere.

For instance, a union of small and medium insurance companies in the niche sectors (e.g. agricultural insurance) may be very close to their clients and so withstand the large vertical and integrated companies – the insurance monopolies that have become such due to their attitude to clients. In this case not only in rhetoric, but in objectives we can see the indication of a professional unity, a commitment to quality services, an understanding of common interests of the company and its clients (that sets them apart as professional business organizations), and an ambition to protect the "niche" from outsiders (the first stage of “market closure”). In other words, these organizations are somewhat similar to the third, "mixed" group where professional and business interests are tightly entwined.

Also present in the second group are the unions of major business players that clearly are the unions of employers - i.e. a union of car manufacturers. Although we decided this was a predominantly market, not professional, type of association, one could not help noticing that professional problems were consciously considered in this organization. However, different to the union of professional engineers, car manufacturers, in their own words, are focused on improving the engineering "trade" that is seen both as a business (in commercial sense) and as a

means to develop an intricate technological complex. This explains the statement of one of the respondents regarding the industry's technical progress and modernisation of Russian car manufacturing as one of the goals of this organization.

Car manufacturers in our study stood for the engineering profession. While studying engineering organizations as such in an attempt to make a selection of relevant professional associations, we faced the following problem. An engineering profession is presently very specialized and widely present, often in very different industries, from construction and architecture to manufacturing (factories and plants). Despite a big number of organizations, however, we could hardly find professional unions of engineers in the proper sense of the word. It is well-known that today engineers do not practise privately, their work being deeply rooted in complex industrial or construction systems. Therefore we usually came across the unions of employers that curated concrete kinds of production or construction, or the unions linked to teaching engineers. The latter had more chances to claim the role of professional associations, than the employers' unions, but their main focus is education. Yet we could not include them in our selection: it is classified as a different type of activity, and also represents a different category of State regulation because education must be licensed. Within our research framework we had to limit ourselves to the above explanation. At the same time, and hypothetically speaking, in certain concrete fields of activity (and perhaps in their larger part) the universities and unions of professional education are far stronger players in what concerns a consolidation of professional community and an attempt to create the agenda for professional self-regulation. In other words, they do play the role of professional associations – even though they generally share the opinion, that educational standards must be based on professional standards, the latter being formed in the practical sphere of production of goods and services, i.e. in companies.

Bearing in mind this contrast between the unions of major manufactures (basically, employers' unions) and the unions of smaller insurance firms that focus their efforts on a concrete group, or "niche", of clients, there rises a question: should we not include such unions of insurers into the third, and not the second, group? If truth be told, should we accept Nordenflycht's classification, these organizations would be described as a market-oriented model of profession, yet with the weakest professional qualities (lack of "professionalized workforce"). We did not go along this route because we had a different problem to solve. While Nordenflycht had studied the landscape of organizations in professional business sphere, our goal was to examine the potential for professional self-regulation. Getting back to the example of unification of smaller insurance companies, it should be noted that some of them have many signs of a PSF: a) they also claim to

own a specific market of services, albeit fragmented with the entrance of new players on the conditions of "open" market, and b) they are tied to the interests of clients in this market and even develop a particular area of knowledge that corresponds to the clients' specific needs, even though this knowledge cannot be codified, for it is not easily transferable, being formed through accumulating the practical experience at solving the clients' tasks. This problem exists in management consulting, too, which the majority of Western authors ascribe to the market-oriented professions. At the same time management consulting demands a higher specialised education, as it is obvious that a significant knowledge base is required to provide services of a particular quality. Different to management consulting, the niche insurance and the knowledge accumulated therein are not mature enough to claim a separate specialisation in the higher education framework. There is no secret that there is no clear specialised professional education programme at the universities in the sphere of insurance in general, let alone the agricultural insurance. To be precise, there is a dimension in the universities' courses called "insurance" but it actually uses the term to unite otherwise separate and not directly linked to insurance established specializations: estimation of financial risks, financial management, mathematical modeling, the theory of probabilities. This sum of knowledge does not provide a new quality thereof in the sphere of insurance, while further specialisation of small insurance companies that deal with clients with complex and special needs (e.g. agriculturists) is yet insufficient to create such new quality for an entire profession. At the same time the principal place in the insurance market is occupied by the major players - providers of mass services. Their operational core is insurance agents with secondary special education that takes one year to receive, provided the candidate has completed the general education. An insurance agent in such company is an easily replaced and separated from management functions hired worker with a rather weak knowledge base neither codifiable or non-codifiable. Therefore we considered "professional" unions of such companies to be more of an employers' union type, which in classification falls into group 2.

**The third group** has recently been described by international scholars. The main examples in this group in our selection have been the societies of IT organizations. In this sphere the State has not introduced self-regulation; however, it is present in the work of auditors and appraisers that have also been included in this group. This group demonstrates that the regulating activity of the State may not influence directly the activity of a professional self-organization, provided we understand professional service firms as a variation of a profession's model, in the spirit of scholar literature on PSFs. Like others, this group needs to be analysed deeper in order to understand how it can remain active in a segment that is not regulated by the State. A specific attribute that helped to distinguish this group from the market-oriented companies of the second

group was the fact that here all principal operations are undertaken by practitioners (programmers, designers, business consultants, auditors, and appraisers) within a linear administrative structure where the boundary between an operational core and managing functions is fairly transparent, and management itself is quite relaxed. In Henry Mintzberg's classification (Mintzberg,1989) such organizations occupy a transitional stage between "professional" and "innovative" organizations. Speaking of special features of the PSFs, Nordenflycht singles out two figurative characteristics that have more to do with the place of professionals within an organization and the adaptation of organizational mechanisms to the specifics of the staff consisting of experts, and less to do with the role in managements. The first characteristic is called "cat herding": it suggests high demands on the part of professionals who constitute an operational core of a professional company to the conditions of employment and a high degree of their professional autonomy, which they will refuse to work without. The second characteristic is an opaque quality of services that usually remains such even when the service has been rendered (Nordenflycht, 2010, p.160).<sup>25</sup> To avoid such services becoming a profanation, and to ensure development of professional knowledge and technology, there is required a special institutional form, whereby some studies argue that, as far as PSFs are concerned, there is a special model of professionalization. To render such services it is necessary to establish a special regime of professional regulation that is exercised by the firm and by professional unions of such firms, in order to form professional standards, to lobby the interests of a specific segment of services to the State. Most importantly, these unions ensure the normal conditions of functioning and co-operation with other market participants, including the facilitation of entering the international market.

**The fourth group** of organizations in our research was made up of professional unions whose activity was the closest to the Western analogues in functions and objectives yet not in maturity. Here we placed organizations that claim professional regulation, up to the notorious "market closure". The most advanced organizations in this sphere happened to be a Medical and an Architects' Chambers and a number of other organizations, including the principal competitors of the above mentioned - The Union of Russian Doctors and the National Society of Designers

---

<sup>25</sup> The article by Nordenflycht that we cited is not about programmers but the characteristic used is typical for this type of professionals and their organizations. See J.H.Rainwater, Herding Cats: A Primer for Programmers Who Lead Other Programmers. Цитируемая статья Норденфлихта не посвящена программистам, но характеристика – типична для описания именно программистов и их организаций. См например, недавно переведенную на русский книгу Дж.Х.Рейнвотера, которая так и называется: «Как пасти коты? Наставление для программистов, управляющих другими программистами» - в русском переводе: М., ИД Питер, 2006 (ПЕРЕВ:см.англ.название <http://www.ozon.ru/context/detail/id/1861855/>)

that we described at the beginning of chapter 4. The fact that both organizations are called “chambers” is likely a coincidence. At the same time this is a symptomatic fact that a Russian professional association uses a somewhat unusual for Russian public organizations word “chamber”, which is not at all unusual for democratic countries where it is used as a name of a parliament’s house. This speaks for the orientation on a classical model of professions based on self-organised democratic movement from within.

The above said does not mean that all public professional organizations in Healthcare or Architecture (or at least the largest and most nationally focused) may all be lumped into the fourth group. For instance, among professional medical unions there is a multitude of "club" organizations both independent and auxiliary, or acting in support of the main activity of one or another major medical centre. On some of these occasions even the websites of such public professional unions exist as subdomains of the "main" medical institutions’ websites. At the same time respective medical centres may combine the functions of providing specific services with research activities and further professional education, raising the doctors’ qualifications. In such cases they fulfill the functions of professional regulation and professional associations, similar to the above mentioned PSFs. For instance, in pediatrics this kind of professional medical centre and at the same time – an institution of professional regulation, the analogue of a professional association is represented by the Pediatrics Institute, nowadays known as the SCCH «The Scientific Centre for Children Health» of the Russian Academy of Medical Sciences. In neurosurgery such medical centre is represented by the N.N.Burdenko Neurosurgery Institute, and there is little wonder that the website of the Russian Association of Neurosurgeons is located on a subdomain of the Institute.

Ascribing medical centres and clinics to PSFs is entirely natural in scholar literature on professions and PSFs. They differ from the third group of professional type of business organizations in our selection in that they receive significant State funding and are organizationally connected with the State, despite providing paid services. We did not see this as our goal to conduct special interviews with the heads of major medical centres but some of them were nonetheless interviewed as the leaders of professional unions. For this reason clinics did not formally fall into group 3, although logically they can be ascribed to this group, in spite of all the differences between them and programmers’ and auditors’ unions. In Nordenflycht’s classification they would also be described as a PSF, falling into different sub-groups within this category.

The specific trait of Russia and a general trait of all groups, as we mentioned, is a rather tight cooperation with relevant regulating State authorities. This is true both for organizations that are financially or structurally dependant on the State and for independent organizations, whose financial stability and influence are rooted in a successful business (e.g., unions of car manufacturers, IT specialists). Conditionally we may even indicate a similarity in Russian and German experience in professionalization from above, although the difference in time makes such correspondence only relative

Another specifically Russian trait is the attempts of many professional unions of all four types to use the influence of well-known, relevant international organizations (through formal membership, accreditation etc.) to raise their own professional status domestically and even to use it to fight competitors. The literature ascribes this trait to PSFs (the third group in our classification), where membership in international organizations is expected to compensate the lack of influence or the absence of professional associations in market-oriented professions. Our observations in Russia, however, demonstrate that the backing from international professional associations is sought not so much because of the "market characteristics" of services but due to absence of national professional unions and the general lack of consolidation of all the different professional communities, regardless of how close their goals are to the control of their sphere of professional activity, or if these goals are focused merely on "club" activity. Further research will require a closer juxtaposition of working conditions and institutes for regulation of similar professions in Russia and in the West. It will also require a deeper examination of the general traits and variations within the groups of professional unions, identified in our research.

## References

- Balabashina D. (2012) Time does not wait: in Russia is created the chamber of architects. // SNIP № 7-8. (In Russian)
- Balzer H. D. (1996) Russia's Missing Middle Class: The Professions in Russian History. // M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
- Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R., eds (1990) Professions in Theory and History: Rethinking the Study of the Professions. // London: Sage.
- Caplow T. (1954) The sociology of work. // University of Minnesota press.
- Dent M., Whitehead S. (2002) Managing professional identities: knowledge, performativity and the "new" professional. // Routledge, L., N.Y.
- DiMaggio P., Powel W.W. (1991) The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. // Economic Sociology – Vol. 11, No.1.
- Eraut M. (1994) Developing professional knowledge and competence. // Routledge, L., N.Y.
- Evetts J (2003) The sociological analysis of professionalism: Occupational change in the modern world. // International Sociology 18(2).
- Evetts J, Buchner-Jeziorska A (2001) The Professionalization of Knowledge in European Markets: Engineering in the UK and Poland. // Current Sociology - Vol.49, No 4.
- Evetts J. (2006) Trust and professionalism: challenges and occupational changes. Introduction. // Current sociology - Vol. 54. No 4.
- Freidson E.(2001) Professionalism. The Third Logic. // Cambridge: Polity.
- Freidson. E. (2001) Professionalism: The Third Logic. // Cambridge. Polity Press in ass.with Blackwell Publishers.
- Hughes E. (1958) Men and their work. // Free press, New York.
- Khurana, R. (2007) From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession. // Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kipping M. (2011) Hollow from the start? Image professionalism in management consulting. // Current sociology - No. 59.
- Kipping P., Kirkpatrick I. (2013) Alternative pathways of change in professional service firms: the case of management consulting. // Journal of Management Studies 50.
- Melnichenko S. (2013) The State has de-facto agreed to our chosen strategy for the development of a profession. // SNIP №6. (In Russian)



Mintzberg H. (1989) *Mintzberg on management: inside our strange world of organizations*. New York : Free Press ; London : Collier Macmillan.

Moskovskaya A. (2010) The problems of formation of a profession's model. The Russian experience in the light of the Western methodology. // *The World of Russia: Sociology, Ethnology* - Vol. 19, No. 3. (Available in Russian).

Muzio D., Hodgson D., Faulconbridge J., Beaverstock J., Hall S. (2011) Towards corporate professionalization: The case of project management, management consultancy and executive search. // *Current sociology* - Vol. 59., No.4.

Muzio D., Hodgson D., Faulconbridge J., Beaverstock J., Hall S. (2011) Towards corporate professionalization: The case of project management, management consultancy and executive search. // *Current sociology* – Vol.59, No.4.

Muzio D., Kirkpatrick I. (2011) Introduction: Professions and organizations: a conceptual framework. // *Current sociology, Current Sociology* - Vol. 59., No.4.

Muzio D., Kirkpatrick I.(2011) Introduction: Professions and organizations: a conceptual framework. // *Current sociology* - Vol. 59, No. 4.

Neal M., Morgan J. (2000) *The Professionalization of Everyone? A Comparative Study of the Development of the Professions in the United Kingdom and Germany*. // *European Sociological Review* – Vol.16, No. 1.

Noordegraf M. (2011) Remaking professionals? How associations and professional education connect professionalism and organizations. // *Current Sociology* - Vol. 59., No.4.

Nordenflycht A. Von (2010) What is a Professional Service Firm? Toward a Theory and Taxonomy of Knowledge-Intensive Firms // *Academy of Management Review* 2010, Vol. 35 No1, pp. 155-174

Torstendahl, R. and Burrage, M., eds (1990) *The Formation of Professions: Knowledge, State and Strategy*. // London:Sage.

Wilensky H L. (1964) The professionalization of everyone? // *American Journal for Sociology* – No. 70.

Alexandra A. Moskovskaya (The head of the Research Group), National Research University Higher School of Economics, Director of the Center for Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation Studies , Head of the Division of Applied research of Work and Professions.

E-mail: [amoskovskaya@hse.ru](mailto:amoskovskaya@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (495) 7729590 (tone 11879)

Oleg A. Oberemko, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Sociology. Leading Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [ooberemko@hse.ru](mailto:ooberemko@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (499) 1520910

Victoria L. Silaeva, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Philosophy, Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [vsilaeva@hse.ru](mailto:vsilaeva@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (916) 5768534

Irina P. Popova, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Sociology, Leading Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [irina\\_popova@list.ru](mailto:irina_popova@list.ru)

Tel.: +7 (495) 7729590 (tone 11878)

Inna B. Nazarova, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Doctor of Economics, Leading Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [nazarova@hse.ru](mailto:nazarova@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (495) 6216630 (tone 11562)

Olga A. Peshkova, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Ph.D. Economics, Leading Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [opeshkova@hse.ru](mailto:opeshkova@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (495) 7729590 (tone 11878)

Marina V. Chernysheva, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Research Fellow CSE.

E-mail: [mchernysheva@hse.ru](mailto:mchernysheva@hse.ru)

Tel.: +7 (495) 7729590 ( tone 11878)

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Moskovskaya, Oberemko, Silaeva, Popova, Nazarova, Peshkova, Chernysheva, 2013