Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Assessment of Judges' Professional Ideology

Ugljesa Zvekić

Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Belgrade

On the hierarchical ladder of occupations, one group of occupations has an extremely high position (Treiman, 1977). Average collective consciousness as well as members of this distinctive group of occupations themselves, attribute certain characteristics to the group; characteristics which are believed to be discriminative in relation to other occupations. That group of occupations granted exclusive attributes, and with empirically assessed special power and prestige is that of the professions.

In the past, the notion of profession has been linked with the traditionally independent, so called "free profession". Today, this concept applies to a much wider circle of occupational roles. Occupations which are today considered to be professions or which claim professional status, exercise their skills in quite different historical, structural and ideological conditions than their forrunners. Yet, they claim to possess certain specific attributes which make them similar to their models, and therefore, different from other occupations. Modern professions seek special institutional privileges, which once attained, draw them closer toward the traditional model of status group; as being set apart from others; as possessing some significant properties; as being prestigous, exclusive, and finally, powerful and privileged.

The persistance of the profession as a category points to the fact that occupational hierarchy has structural foundations. It also rests in the collective consciousness and at the same time represents the powerful ideologies of both society and the professions, especially those which try to maintain or promote their position in the general structure of occupational hierarchy.

Comments on the Literature

Professionalization, as well as the inverse process – deprofessionalization – is considered to be one of the principal marks of modernized society (Parsons, 1968; Moore, 1970; Mills, 1956; Illich et al., 1977). "Profession" is also a good example of how something which is not clearly defined may be loosely used in sociological literature. However, there are sporadic cautions that profession is a metaphor, that it is an ideological rather than sociological category, that it is of unprecise meaning, and that it is mostly of pragmatic value (Habenstein, 1963; Larson, 1977; Cogan, 1955).

Profession is most frequently defined as an ideal-type, that is, as an occupation possessing a set of specific attributes, which all together, individually or in some combination, compose a distinctive unity. For some writers, particular attributes have greater weight than others, or are considered to be sufficient indicators of professionalism (Parsons, 1954; Greenwood, 1957; Sussman, 1965). Thus, profession is also defined by the complex notion of professional culture, or autonomy, or technical competence, or type of solidarity, or organizational form, or ethics, or function in the system, or status, etc.[2]

Another stream of thought focuses on the fact that occupations participate in the struggle for power and try to form favorable public opinion about their attributes, social importance and exclusivity. Such evidence point to the ideological functions of the concept profession used in the process of mobilization for attainment, maintenance or promotion of occupational status (Larson, 1977).

A view which attaches ideological connotations to specific professionalism attributes finds that in favorable historical and structural conditions some occupations have attained a special high status, power and privileges, and then, worked on rein-

forcing their position precisely by claiming possession of these attributes and asking for social recognition of their alleged exclusivness. However, there is a methodological link between these doubtful views on the organic idiosyncracy of profession and views which define profession precisely by stressing the genuine distinctivness of the professionalism attributes. The link lies in the analysis of the structural and cognitive foundations of the professional ideology. Following this model of analysis, that is, commencing with the analysis of the cognitive bases and structure of alleged professionalism attributes, and then, analyzing their structural foundations, functions and roles, it is possible to assess, both theoretically and empirically, differences between the professions and other occupations. Such an analysis points out that the difference between professions and occupations is an important feature of contemporary forms of social differentiation and inequality. Therefore, it is structurally and ideologically founded. Professional ideology symbolizes the alleged cognitive exclusivness. It also maintains and hastens the process of occupational status inequality, acting as the mobilizing factor in the overall course of collective upward mobility. In some sense, the mere existence of the developed professional ideology may be a predictive differential between professions and other occupations (Zvekić and Savin, 1981).

The model of professionalism has been too tightly linked to the old, traditional professions. Thus, their professional ideology has been (and still is) used by many organizational professions as the device in the process of status mobilization. All professions are today organizational due to the important place organization has in modernized society and due to the complex technology professions use in the exercise of their roles. Organizational professions are in no way radically distinct from the older, traditional ones "...but should be seen as clear manifestation of tendencies also contained in them" (Larson, 1977). Some organizational professions are modern versions of the traditional ones. Others are generated by heteronomous bureaucracies, expansions of the large scale organizations. Finally, some organizational professions "proper" are formed and developed primarily by the extension of the bureaucratic state apparatus. What seems to be important is that professional ideology, although developed on premises of the ideal market-oriented free professional, not only survives within the bureaucratic setting, but seems to be further reinforced and supported by it.

This process is differently manifested depending on the empirical type of bureaucracy and on the historical, structural foundations, and functions a profession has. It also depends on the profession's cognitive complexity or the position that particular profession has in the context of organizational technology.

Our main theoretical thesis is that a proper professional ideology, consisting of universal professionalism attributes, may be present with the true organizational professions. Furthermore, it may not only coexist with bureaucratic ideology, but may be even supported or created by it. This is especially true for an organizational profession working within a professional bureaucracy. In a definite sense, professional bureaucracy requires the true professional ideology. A clear example seems to be the profession of judge in Yugoslavia (Zvekić, 1982).

Theoretical Dimensions

In order to refine the content of judges' professionalism, we have, following classical literature and Hall's professionalism model (1968), constructed a scale for measuring judges' professionalism. As will be seen later, the content of the items shows that the scale is in fact measuring professional ideology. In other words, although we are critical of the possibility of differentiation between structural and attitudinal attributes, an attempt to measure attitudinal attributes is compatible with the theoretical standing that professionalism is in essence measurable only in terms of professional ideology. Other criteria, like the length of education, may well differentiate occupations but are not sufficient for a more sophisticated differentiation in terms of professionalism. Thus, we tried to determine the major dimensions of the professional ideology of judges, and secondly, to what extent those dimensions are different from the ones theoretically linked with the ideal model professional.

Selection of the theoretical dimensions has been guided by the classical literature, organizational specificity of the profession, and the proposed theoretical model which enables analysis of the structural foundations and ideological ramifications of the professionalism attributes.

These dimensions are:

Professional Colleagues as the Major Referent Point (PCMRP). This dimension encompasses central elements of the acceptance of appropriate norms and standards as well as identification with professional peers and the profession as a whole.[3] The central concept here is that peers are the controlling referent group, and that such a state is highly valued. Several subdimensions are included: peer judgement; friendship ties; accessability of information on professional performance; peer ranking as opposed to the official bureaucratic position.

Importance of the Professions' Function (IPF). It is expected that a profession is eager to show its social importance. It has a shared consciousness about efforts needed in order to acquire and later to promote social privileges, power, prestige and status. Consciousness of the importance of profession's function represents a belief in the indispensibility of the profession, its exclusive nature and bespeaks a view of the profession as being set apart from other occupations.

Commitment to a Calling (CC). This is the most sacral and, thus, the most ideologized dimension of professionalism. In classical terms it expresses specific occupational ties, the inner satisfaction of the role player, life-time devotion to the service, high ideals, and a reluctance to change one's occupation for better financial rewards. In a sense, commitment to a calling conserves a sense of professional belongingness, and represents aspects of the professional reward system and trust in the idiosyncratic properties of the calling.

Autonomy (A). For many authors, this is the core value of professionalism. In operational terms it refers to the possibility of independent decision-making in the functionally specific domain. For judges, it is also part of the legally institutionalized normative model. Being a highly valued property it calls for readiness to defend it from possible intrusions.

Service Orientation (SO). This feature of the universal professionalism corpus refers to the service for the public good in general, with a special emphasize on client's interest. Here it is defined as a belief in public service, since some organizational professions lack proper clientele. However, judges are structurally tied to communal clientele. Having no direct or immediate clients makes some difference in role relations, but does not exclude the existence of a service orientation "…even if the goal pursued is abstract and impersonal" (Moore, 1970). The degree

to which professionals believe in their social utility, indispensibility and work for public good becomes an important attitude component for measuring professionalism (Snizek, 1972)

Taking into account these theoretical dimensions, we have constructed a scale of professionalism.

Research Design

Our universe is made up of professional judges at the level of the Communal and District Courts in Serbia (the largest federal republic in Yugoslavia).[4] The sample consists of 866 judges or 66 % of the total population. The composition of the sample is representative for the court system, age, sex and career distribution of the population under study. Data were gathered by mailing self-administered questionnaires of the multiple choice type. Over 250 variables were used to measure several research areas: social characteristics; process of socialization and recruitment; attitudes on various legal matters, and role-set (public prosecutors and attorneys in private practice); organizational identification, and a variety of professionalism aspects, including the scale.

The scale of professionalism consists of 49 items measuring five theoretical dimensions. A Likert-type scaling procedure has been applied with half of the items being positive and the other half negative.[5] Theoretical dimensions are expressed by unequal numbers of items. Thus, PCMRP has 15 items; IPF has 5; CC has 13; A has 7, and SO has 9.

The aim of the scale is to define the major empirical dimensions of judges' professionalism or, rather, their professional ideology. In view of this aim several points are worth mentioning. Thus, the beliefs and attitudes of judges concerning their own professional image is difficult to understand without knowledge about judges' group affiliations. Such loyalties and affiliations emerge out of the institutional setting in which they are socialized, use their professional skills and experience power and hardships. Significant others for professional judges are their peers in the same legal institutional structure. Their professionalism is a manifestation of both normative role requirements and organizational requirements, of the whole

step-wise process of professional socialization and experience. Professionalism, or here, professional ideology assumes the existence of developed, patterned relations to the role, that is, a set of consistent and lasting attitudes and beliefs. These attitudes and beliefs are reinforced in the process of matching them with values required by the role model and by significant others. Thus, professional ideology is an evaluative concept, which means also that there is a clear tendency to protect its significance and to minimize efforts aimed at disturbing or destroying it (Hogarth, 1971). In constructing the scale we assumed that the core of the collective image can be detected by examining the position an individual has in relation to group-professional standards. The goal of this attempt is to focus on the structure of group conformity or ideological standards of the reference group. Here, it is the professional peer group.

Finally, our scale is tested on only one profession, and thus, may express idiosyncracy of that population. Of course, professional ideology of judges, what is in fact measured by the scale, is to some degree naturally idiosyncratic. However, the basic structure of the scale with somewhat modified item content may be applied to numbers of other occupational groups.

Findings and Analysis

Using a set of data consisting of subjects' scores on 49 items, we employed factor analysis, that is, the method of principal components. Criterion for extraction has been set up as LAMBDA > 1. Using the appropriate standard procedure 15 factors have been extracted which were then rotated in the OBLIMIN position. Analysis of the projection of items on factors (orthogonal and parallel) showed the existence of 7 logical dimensions, others being too specific or unidentifiable. We then applied the appropriate procedure for the 7 factors. Analysis of the projection of items on factors showed the existence of 6 logical dimensions, the seventh being too specific. Reliability of the scale of 7 factors is expressed by the Spearman-Brown co-efficient of 0.87.

Both procedures led to similar factor configurations. Due to this notable similarity, and to lack of space, in the following tables and analysis we will present parallel projections of the 6

Table 1. *Parallel Projections of Variables on Oblimin Factors*

FACTORS

ITEMS No

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	.076	.363	.020	.149	.106	.071
2	.154	.276	.044	.016	.214	.051
3	.088	- .061	.007	- .506	- .218	.055
4	.037	.400	- .003	- .243	.138	.301
5	.216	.089	.033	- .552	- .065	-.030
6	.107	.120	.119	- .403	.092	- .191
7	- .025	.206	.042	.267	.201	.419
8	.434	- .016	- 050	- .267	.013	.228
9	.363	- .012	- .084	- .346	- .140	.484
10	.058	.563	.155	.113	.043	- .162
11	.216	- .055	.030	- .605	.029	.107
12	.086	- .011	.577	- .248	- .161	.171
13	.465	.008	- .138	.080	- .089	- .039
14	- .103	.137	.144	.036	.467	- .267
15	- .050	.287	.263	.196	.368	- .084
16	.108	.238	.181	.106	.074	.448
17	.078	.319	.029	.267	.163	.140
18	.399	- .035	-.001	- .217	.113	- .023
19	.229	.616	.115	- .107	.166	.184
20	.125	.246	.014	.124	.337	.349
21	.008	.009	- .001	.022	-.068	- .035

identified logical dimensions. Then, we will compare the theoretical and empirical dimensions of the professionalism scale. Thus, the degree of the empirical fit of items used to measure each of the five theoretical dimensions can be determined.

Tables 1. and 2. present the results of that analysis.

A first glance analysis of the structure of the obtained empirical factors suggests that we are dealing with dimensions similar to the theoretical ones, and therefore, to the classical ideal-typical professionalism attributes.

The first factor consists of items which were theoretically conceptualized to measure autonomy, service orientation, and peers as the reference group. Thus, it is empirically defined by the nexus of three highly interlocked subdimensions. On closer examination it seems that the first factor reveals three notable and core professionalism elements: autonomy in decision-making, belief in the work for public good, and promotion of professional purity (for the notion of purity, see Abbott, 1981). In a sense, these dimensions theoretically refer to the possible

22	.060	- .129	- .144	- .254	- .018	.032
23	.093	.135	.542	- .018	.046	.135
24	.604	- .032	- .030	- .201	.017	.157
25	.473	- .120	.091	.067	.035	.203
26	.313	- .043	.020	- .108	- .166	.469
27	.134	.457	.091	- .004	.044	.228
28	.534	.053	.051	- .171	- .042	.149
29	.545	-.040	.005	- .167	- .128	.083
30	.029	.600	.178	- .043	.241	- .012
31	.039	.303	.176	.057	.490	.011
32	.635	.335	.034	- .053	- .096	.089
33	.057	.189	.024	.132	.325	.004
34	.643	.271	.058	- .012	- .101	.014
35	.653	.159	.108	.023	- .061	.133
36	.039	.639	.184	.009	.317	.066
37	- .068	.386	.299	- .032	.371	.003
38	.678	.157	- .034	- 112	.136	.081
39	.652	.127	- .004	-.096	.106	.111
40	.000	.105	.795	.012	.042	- .018
41	.474	.130	.004	- .209	- .107	.195
42	.108	.037	.191	.171	.200	.002
43	.018	.185	.695	.011	.233	- .003
44	.362	.342	- .054	- .122	- .246	.029
45	.606	.282	.112	- .261	- .015	.084
46	.027	.101	.264	.140	.270	.510
47	.370	.363	.093	- .293	- .290	.201
48	- .301	.039	.169	.022	.556	.105
49	.045	.164	- .016	- .002	.487	.098

structure of the professionalism general component, if such exists. Thus, the first factor clearly shows the existence of a collective professional image revealing the occupation, which values autonomy, takes care of professional purity and serves the public interest. It may be called: *General Professional Orientation* (GPO).

The second factor has a very simple and clearcut structure. It consists of 11 items which clearly pertain to the domain of the professionalism sacral dimension: *Commitment to a Calling* (CC). In table 3 it will be seen that this factor almost completely incorporates items that were theoretically designated to measure the very same dimension.

The third factor is the only non-normative factor. It speaks about a pattern of out of the job friendship among professionals. It shows a pattern of mutual associativness, the traditional index of professional community. It may be termed: *Mutual Associativeness* (MA). Originally, it has been designed as a sub-dimension of the PCMRP.

Table 2. *Interfactor correlations*

Factors No.				Factors No.		
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
I						
II	.153					
III	.030	.137				
IV	.164	.036	.007			
V	.032	.134	.141	.123		
VI	.174	.082	.035	.006	.027	

Activistic Orientation (AO) is the synthetizing dimension of items making up the structure of the fourth empirical factor. It refers to the beliefs and values placed upon active participation in the professional world, either on the individual or collective level. It consists of items that were originally linked to IPF and SO. In a more general sense it points to the need for promoting individual and collective standing in terms of professional quality and status. Thus, it represents an important aspect of professional mobilization, and underlines an inherent link between the structural, cognitive and ideological foundations of professionalism.

The next factor is mainly made up of items related to belief in the social importance of the profession; that is, the functional significance of the occupation to the society. Moreover, it stresses the belief in indispensability and exclusiveness: it sees the profession as being set apart by possessing certain outstanding qualities. Thus, it is labelled *Consciousness of the Social Exclusivity* (CSE).

Finally, the sixth factor has a very clear structure. Items that are included in this factor clearly revolve around the value of the *Peer Control of Professional Standing* (PCPS).

Summing up the analysis of the empirical scale of judges' professionalism it can be stated that it consists of the following dimensions:

–General Professional Orientation (GPO)
–Commitment to a Calling (CC)
–Mutual Associativeness (MA)
–Activistic Orientation (AO)
–Consciousness of the Social Exclusivity (CSE)
–Peer Control of the Professional Standing (PCPS)

In terms of "fit" between the theoretical and the empirical professionalism scale, there seems to be a general agreement between the two. A more detailed examination presented in Table 3. reveals this structural similarity.

The results shown in table 3. reveal that there is indeed a notable structural similarity between the two professionalism scales. Out of a total of 49 items, 29 (59 %) belong to the same empirical and theoretical space. It should be noted that new professionalism factors emerge, either as synthetizing or particularistic. Thus, items designed to measure the theoretical dimension of *Autonomy* are clustered, almost without exception, under the empirical dimension, coined the *General Professional Orientation*. On the other hand, items measuring *Mutual Associativeness* as the subdimension of the original dimension *Professional Colleagues as the Major Referent Point*, have formed an independent professionalism dimension. Some items clearly are multidimensional, measuring more than one empirical dimension. Others, e.g. 47, 37, 44, 32, although pertaining to different empirical dimensions than originally designated, also partly fit their original space.

Conclusion and Suggestions

From the methodological point of view some questions can be asked. It is a well known fact that professionalism scales (or for that matter, any scale) constructed by the method of factor analysis tend to be unstable. Thus, it is suggested that scales should be tested on different populations. Comparative professionalism scales seem to have somewhat better predictive power for the phenomenon under study and less predictive power for the population under study. This problem has no universal solution. Most probably the solution depends on the goal of the research. In our study the aim has been to empirically assess the major dimensions of judges' professionalism or their professional ideology. In terms of that task it seems that the scale is well founded. However, as expected, due to the uniform properties of the population under study (education, status, insititutional setting) and "conformity" biased content of the ideology, the scale is not discriminative within the population. Therefore, from the comparative point of view a serious limit to the profes-

Table 3 *Empirical and the theoretical professionalism factors compared*

Items No.	Empirical factor	Factor loadings	Theoretical factor	Congru-ence-dif-ference
1.	Commit. (CC)	.364	Commit (CC)	+
2.	Commit. (CC)	.276	Colleag. (PCMRP)	.051
3.	Active. (AO)	-.506	Import. (IPF)	-.218
4.	Commit. (CC)	.400	Commit. (CC)	+
5.	Active. (AO)	-.552	Service. (SO)	.216
6.	Active. (AO)	-.404	Import. (IPF)	.092
7.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.491	Colleag. (PCMFP)	+
8.	Prof.Or (GPO)	.432	Autonomy (A)	+
9.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.484	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
10.	Commit. (CC)	.563	Commit (CC)	+
11.	Active. (AO)	-.605	Service (SO)	.216
12.	Assoc. (MA)	.577	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
13.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.466	Autonomy (A)	+
14.	Conscio. (CSE)	.467	Import. (IPF)	+
15.	Conscio. (CSE)	.368	Commit. (CC)	.287
16.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.448	Colleag (PCMRP)	+
17.	Commit. (CC)	.320	Service (SO)	.260
18.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.400	Autonomy (A)	+
19.	Commit. (CC)	.617	Commit. (CC)	+
20.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.345	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
21.	specific	.576	Commit. (CC)	.009
22.	specific	.526	Service (SO)	.060
23.	Assoc. (MA)	.542	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+

sionalism scale lies with population idiosyncracies and homo-
genity of the phenomenon (ideology).

Testing a fit between empirical and theoretical dimensions
showed that although the two overlap to some degree, there are
differences. The empirical scale is a notable betterment of the
theoretical one. Yet, there are certain difficulties with items, and
thus, there is a definite need for extensive item content modi-
fication. The results obtained may be of great help for item
modification.

In future research with modified items and dimensions, we
will test the scale on public prosecutors, physicians (who are
socialized in Yugoslavia), engineers, and attorneys in private
practice (free independent operators). That will be the test of the
comparative predictive power of the scale.

From the theoretical point of view, the major finding is that
there is such a thing as a patterned professional ideology of
judges. It seems to be similar to the one attributed to traditional

24.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.604	Autonomy (A)	+
25.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.473	Colleag. (PCMRP)	.203
26.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.469	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
27.	Commit. (CC)	.457	Commit. (CC)	+
28.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.534	Colleag. (PCMRP)	.149
29.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.545	Service (SO)	+
30.	Commit. (CC)	.600	Commit. (CC)	+
31.	Conscio. (CSE)	.490	Import. (IPF)	+
32.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.635	Commit. (CC)	.335
33.	Conscio. (CSE)	.325	Autonomy (A)	.057
34.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.643	Service (SO)	+
35.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.653	Colleag. (PCMRP)	.133
36.	Commit. (CC)	.639	Commit. (CC)	+
37.	Commit. (CC)	.384	Import. (IPF)	.371
38.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.678	Service (SO)	+
39.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.652	Autonomy (A)	+
40.	Assoc. (MA)	.795	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
41.	Commit. (CC)	.474	Commit. (CC)	+
42.	specific	.191	Autonomy (A)	.100
43.	Assoc. (MA)	.695	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
44.	Prof.Or (GPO)	.362	Commit. (CC)	.342
45.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.606	Service (SO)	+
46.	Peer Co. (PCPS)	.510	Colleag. (PCMRP)	+
47.	Prof.Or. (GPO)	.370	Commit. (CC)	.363
48.	Conscio. (CSE)	.556	Colleag. (PCMRP)	.105
49.	Conscio. (CSE)	.487	Service (SO)	.045

The sign + indicates that empirical dimension corresponds to the theoretical one. Factor loadings at the side of theoretical dimension point to the item value on the empirical substitute of the appropriate original theoretical dimension.

free professions. Moreover, it is an ideology created by and constantly reinforced by the professional bureaucracy, the court. The historical development of the judiciary, its close dependence on the bureaucratic organization of the state, the content of the organizational ideology of the court (Freddi, 1978; Zvekić, 1982), and the structure of the empirically assessed professional ideology, mean that there is a high degree of compatibility of the professional ideology of judges and their organizational setting. Therefore, the professional ideology of judges is not the legacy of the past but genuinely developed with the structural element of the dominant modes of work organization (profession and bureaucracy). A final point is that the more organizational a profession is and the more professionalized (but less market dependent) the bureaucracy in which it works is, the more purely ideological do professional claims become, reflecting the structural conditions of professions' type of labour and role position.

Notes

1. In the sociology of Eastern European countries, including Yugoslavia and with the notable exception of Poland, professions are not set apart from other occupations. Therefore, there has been little interest in research on the phenomenon of professions there.
2. Within the frame of these theoretical positions, two methodological approaches exist. One states that an occupation is a true profession when it has all or some specific properties (Greenwood, 1957; Hall 1968). The second sees professionalism via a scale of attributes which are not of equal value (Moore, 1970).
3. In contrast to Hall (1968) we have not included professional association, since some occupations may be professions without a formal association or without a developed and truly significant one. For a true organizational profession, such as that of judges in Yugoslavia, professional association is not a hallmark, due to judges' high degree of identification with the professional bureaucracy, that is, the court. As a matter of fact, judges do not have their own professional association in Yugoslavia, although there is a General Lawyers Association.
4. Yugoslavia is divided into six republics and two autonomous provinces. Communal and District courts are trial courts, a place where judicial life goes on. However, District courts are, apart from having original jurisdiction, also appellate courts.
5. Item construction is based on the literature, Hall's professionalism inventory, results of previous studies and personal communication with a number of judges. From the Appendix, it can be seen that some items are directly or in modified version taken from Hall's professionalism inventory.

References

Abbott, Andrew (1981) "Status and Status Strain in the Professions" in *American Journal of Sociology* 86:819–835

Cogan, M.L. (1955) "The Problem of Defining a Profession". *The Annals of the American Academy* 297:105–111

Freddy, Giorgio (1978) *Tensione e Conflitto Nella Magistratura* Bari: Laterza

Greenwood, Ernest (1957) "Attributes of a Profession" in *Social Work* 2:45–55

Habenstein, R.W. (1963) "Critique of 'Professions' as a Sociological Category" in *Sociological Quarterly* 4:291–300

Hall, Richard (1968) "Professionalization and Bureaucratization" in *American Sociological Review* 33:92–104

Hogarth, John (1971) *Sentencing as a Human Process* Toronto: Toronto University Press

Illich, Ivan et al (1977) *Disabling Professions* London: Marion Boyars

Larson, Magali S: (1977) *The Rise of Professionalism; A Sociological Analysis* Berkeley: University of California Press

Mills, C. Wright (1956) *White Collar* New York: Oxford University Press

Moore, Wilbert E. (1970) *The Professions* New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Parsons, Talcott (1954) *Essays in Sociological Theory* New York: Free Press

Parsons, Talcott (1968) "Professions" in David L. Sills (ed) *Encyclopedia of the Social Science* New York: Macmillan & Free Press

Snizek, William W. (1972) "Hall's Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Reassessment" *American Sociological Review* 37:109–114

Sussman, M.B. (ed) (1965) *Sociology and Rehabilitation* Washington DC: American Sociological Association

Treiman, Donald J. (1977) *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective* New York: Academic Press

Zvekić, Ugljesa (1982) *A False Dilemma: Between the Bureaucrat and the Professional-Role of Judges* Paper Presented at the 10th World Congress of Sociology, Mexico City

Zvekić, Ugljesa and Ksenija Savin (1981) "O profesiji-socioloska analiza" in *Sociologija* 1–2:59–93

Appendix

Professionalism Inventory
1. This profession asks for the whole being.
2. In my profession people are more influenced by the appropriate critique coming from their colleagues than by formal sanctions.
3. We, in this profession, do not really do much to emphasize its social importance.
4. In the course of professional education and training, high ideals are cherished.
5. Where the outcome of a case is relatively easy to predict, most colleagues mainly try to do the job with minimum effort.
6. Some other occupations are more important to society than mine.
7. Between my colleagues, it is known exactly how one stands in the profession, regardless of one's official position in the society or in the profession.
8. In our profession it is unrealistic to talk about a high degree of autonomy in decision-making.
9. There are no opportunities in which we can truly evaluate each other's competence.
10. For people in my profession, our professional calling is our whole life.
11. A minority of my colleagues are seriously engaged in cases which are not professionally challenging.
12. The majority of my friends are not from the circle of my professional colleagues.
13. I feel safer when sharing the responsibility for decisionmaking.

14. As a profession we had had to make lot of effort in order to make society and public understand our importance.
15. These things that we can feel – the true value of real rewards of my work, can't be felt by outsiders.
16. In this profession there is a pretty good insight in the competence of each colleague.
17. He (she) who is not willing to neglect his (her) own interests for benefit of society and clients does not deserve to be in this profession.
18. A majority of my colleagues, when dealing with a case, are influenced by the current political climate.
19. This calling is practiced out of love.
20. It is more important how your own colleagues evaluate you as an expert authority, rather than the formal position you hold.
21. In this profession there is as much enthusiasm as in any other.
22. The majority of my colleagues are fully engaged and apply all of their knowledge mainly in those cases which are considered to be of outstanding social importance.
23. In this profession there is frequent friendship between fellow professionals away from the job.
24. There are quite a few colleagues who in doing their job do not get influenced by various pressures coming from outside.
25. The real test of how good a person is in his field is the layman's opinion of him.
26. A real problem is that no one really knows what others are doing.
27. Most colleagues would stay in this profession even if making less money.
28. The majority of people in my profession don't pay much attention when their colleagues point out errors and behaviour against the professional norms and ethics.
29. Most colleagues are devoted, applying all of their knowledge they posses to those cases where adequate handling may bring about some social, material or professional credit.
30. It is wonderful to see the high level of idealism existing in this professional field.
31 Any weakening of the significance of the profession would be harmful for society.
32. For most of my colleagues one of the principal motives is making more money.
33. I can stand a lot of things, but I am awfully disturbed when someone interferes with my decisions.
34. As is the case with other occupations, in this profession the most important thing for the majority is their own interest.
35. People in my profession are generally not very sensitive even to the most serious condemnations passed by their own colleagues.
36. To devote one's life to this calling brings a genuine inner satisfaction.
37. My own profession, and several of similar importance, are indispensible to society.
38. Whether they will work with devotion, applying all of the knowledge they posses, for most colleagues depend on who is the client.

39. Majority from my profession do as they are told to do.
40. Even when I do not have to see my colleagues on professional matters, I enjoy being with them.
41. For most of my colleagues it is difficult to accept the hardships required by the profession.
42. In the course of work it is essential to make autonomous decisions.
43. The most stimulating periods are those spent with my fellow professionals.
44. I think that in reality the most appreciated rewards in this profession as well as in others are financial ones, i.e. income.
45. Only a small portion of colleagues are really trying to be of service to society and clients.
46. The best test of how good a person is in his field is the opinion of his fellow professionals.
47. Although many people talk about idealism in the profession, very few are really motivated by it.
48. It is essential in this profession that we ourselves judge the competence of each other.
49. For our professions it is of outmost importance to pay equal attention to the interests of both society and all parties involved.