

Journal of Foot and Ankle Research

Contested role boundaries and professional title: Implications of the independent review of podiatric surgery in Australia --Manuscript Draft--

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Manuscript Number: | |
| Article Type: | Original Research |
| Corresponding Author: | Catherine Bowen, PhD University of Southampton Southampton, Hampshire UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND |
| Corresponding Author E-Mail: | c.j.bowen@soton.ac.uk;cjb5@soton.ac.uk |
| Order of Authors: | Alan Borthwick Susan Nancarrow, PhD Ivan Bristow, PhD Catherine Bowen, PhD |
| Keywords: | Podiatric surgeon, podiatric surgery, symbolic capital, medical dominance, interprofessional conflict |
| Manuscript Classifications: | policy and delivery of services; foot surgery |
| Abstract: | <p>Introduction In October 2023, the Podiatry Board of Australia commissioned an independent review of the regulation of podiatric surgery in Australia, with a remit to re-evaluate the regulatory framework, identify any risks to patient safety and recommend improvements to public protection. It reported in March 2024, and set out 14 key recommendations. The review was prompted by a number of complaints about podiatric surgeons, but also reflected calls for reform by the medical profession and several critical media reports. This paper sets out to examine the review report, alongside the concerns of the medical profession and the media articles expressed within it, through the lens of an established sociological framework focused on inter-professional conflict and the contested use of professional titles.</p> <p>Methods As a review rather than research paper, the Independent Review of Podiatric Surgery (the 'Paterson Report') served as data for the sociological analysis, adopting a Neo-Weberian and Bordieuan framework to examine the strategies adopted by the medical profession and media reports cited in the report, consistent with the exercise of professional power.</p> <p>Results The sociological analysis provides insights into the ways in which professions seek to maintain symbolic, social, cultural and economic privileges and rewards through the exclusion of competitors, using strategies such as social closure, symbolic violence, symbolic devaluation, gatekeeper roles, and jurisdictional disputes.</p> <p>Conclusions The review report acknowledges the influence of the medical profession and its opposition to the practice of podiatric surgery and use of the title 'podiatric surgeon'. The arguments made and strategies deployed are consistent with those found in the wider literature. In light of these findings, the implications for the future of podiatric surgery are considered in terms of professional practice, use of professional title, and access to public funding.</p> |
| Suggested Reviewers: | Matthew Fitzpatrick, MSc Ziauddin University mtjfitzpatrick@gmail.com As Chair of Clinical Senate RCPod UK, Mathew has extensive experience in this field as he led on the strategic review of UK podiatric surgery and registration with HCPC. |
| | Karl Landorf, PhD Associate Dean Research and Industry Engagement, La Trobe University |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>K.landorf@latrobe.edu.au Karl is a Professor of Podiatry and is internationally-known for his research, with a particular interest in investigating musculoskeletal disorders of the foot and ankle. In addition, he is the Associate Dean, Research and Industry Engagement in the School of Allied Health, Human Services and Sport at La Trobe University.</p> |
| Opposed Reviewers: | |
| Author Comments: | |
| Additional Information: | |
| Question | Response |
| Please submit a plain text version of your cover letter here. | <p>We are delighted to submit our study titled: Contested role boundaries and professional title: Implications of the independent review of podiatric surgery in Australia by Alan Borthwick, Susan Nancarrow, Ivan Bristow and Catherine Bowen for consideration as a Research Article in the Journal of Foot and Ankle Research. Our paper examines the Podiatry Board of Australia commissioned independent review of the regulation of podiatric surgery in Australia, alongside the concerns of the medical profession and the media articles expressed within it, through the lens of an established sociological framework focused on inter-professional conflict and the contested use of professional titles.</p> <p>This manuscript is not under consideration by any other journal and all authors have given their approval for submission. Thank you for taking the time to consider our study for publication in the Journal of Foot and Ankle Research and we look forward to your reply.</p> |
| Do you or any of your co-authors have a conflict of interest to declare? | Yes |
| Please state: as follow-up to "Do you or any of your co-authors have a conflict of interest to declare?" | Alan Borthwick and Catherine Bowen are emeritus editors of the Journal of Foot and Ankle Research. All other authors on this paper declare no conflicts of interest. |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Contested role boundaries and professional title: Implications of the independent review of podiatric surgery in Australia

Alan M Borthwick, Susan A Nancarrow, Ivan Bristow and Catherine Bowen

Professor Alan M Borthwick OBE PhD DP(Hon) FRSA
Emeritus Professor, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Southampton; Adjunct Professor, School of Clinical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Australia.

Professor Susan Nancarrow PhD
CEO, HealthWork International; Allied Health Services Researcher; Adjunct Professor, Southern Cross University, Lismore, Australia.

Dr Ivan Bristow PhD, FRCPodM,
Private Practitioner, Dorset; Honorary Professor, Health Sciences University, Bournemouth; Adjunct Associate Professor, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

Professor Catherine Bowen PhD CSci FRCPodM FFPM RCPS (Glasg)
Professor of Podiatry, NIHR Senior Investigator, NIHR Wessex Deputy Director and Academic Career Development Lead, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Southampton.

Corresponding author:

Professor Catherine Bowen PhD CSci FRCPodM FFPM RCPS (Glasg)
Professor of Podiatry, NIHR Senior Investigator, NIHR Wessex Deputy Director and Academic Career Development Lead, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Southampton.
Email: c.j.bowen@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

Introduction

In October 2023, the Podiatry Board of Australia commissioned an independent review of the regulation of podiatric surgery in Australia, with a remit to re-evaluate the regulatory framework, identify any risks to patient safety and recommend improvements to public protection. It reported in March 2024, and set out 14 key recommendations. The review was prompted by a number of complaints about podiatric surgeons, but also reflected calls for reform by the medical profession and several critical media reports. This paper sets out to examine the review report, alongside the concerns of the medical profession and the media articles expressed within it, through the lens of an established sociological framework focused on inter-professional conflict and the contested use of professional titles.

Methods

As a review rather than research paper, the Independent Review of Podiatric Surgery (the 'Paterson Report') served as data for the sociological analysis, adopting a Neo-Weberian and Bordieuan framework to examine the strategies adopted by the medical profession and media reports cited in the report, consistent with the exercise of professional power.

Results

The sociological analysis provides insights into the ways in which professions seek to maintain symbolic, social, cultural and economic privileges and rewards through the exclusion of competitors, using strategies such as social closure, symbolic violence, symbolic devaluation, gatekeeper roles, and jurisdictional disputes.

Conclusions

The review report acknowledges the influence of the medical profession and its opposition to the practice of podiatric surgery and use of the title 'podiatric surgeon'. The arguments made and strategies deployed are consistent with those found in the wider literature. In light of these findings, the implications for the future of podiatric surgery are considered in terms of professional practice, use of professional title, and access to public funding.

Keywords

Podiatric surgeon, podiatric surgery, symbolic capital, symbolic violence, symbolic devaluation, social closure, medical dominance, jurisdictional disputes, interprofessional conflict, gatekeeper.

Background and context

In March 2024 an independent review of the regulation of podiatric surgery in Australia was published, having been commissioned by the Podiatry Board of Australia (PBA) and the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) ¹. It was “triggered by the high rate of complaints or notifications about podiatric surgeons” and followed in the wake of “media articles and calls for reform - mainly from orthopaedic surgeons”, drawing into question the registration of podiatric surgeons under the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme ¹. Interprofessional competition within healthcare is widely acknowledged ²⁻⁹, and tensions specifically between orthopaedic and podiatric surgeons have been recognised over many years ¹⁰⁻¹⁶. Examining the recent review (the ‘Paterson Report’) through the lens of an explanatory sociological framework focused on inter-professional tension sheds light on the strategies adopted in areas of dispute ²⁻⁹. ‘Jurisdictional disputes’ ² tend to focus on contested task domains and role boundaries as well as use of titles, which are defended by deploying ‘social closure’; a means to ensure the exclusion of competitors from access to these privileges ³. This is achieved through defining recognised expert credentials and titles, obtaining legislative or regulatory controls, and controlling the profession’s narrative with government, state authorities and public ³. Ultimately, success depends upon the ability of a profession to harness the support of these ‘powerful elites’, which are sufficiently influential to ensure the profession’s narrative is accepted ¹⁷. Medicine exerts considerable social and cultural authority (as the hegemonic authority in healthcare) that has been effective in protecting its pre-eminence, often referred to as medical dominance ³⁻⁵. Interprofessional competition has been characterised as “regulated peaceful conflict”, reflecting the way in which professions act to defend their role boundaries or symbolic capital (titles), in clear contrast to contemporary demands for workforce flexibility in the face of staff shortages and increasing demand from an ageing population ^{18,19}.

These two drivers collide - the professional desire for exclusive monopolistic control over key professional boundaries and titles, ranged against the need for health services to adapt to meet demand ²⁰⁻²². One seeks the maintenance of long-established hierarchical norms, the other demands new and innovative solutions in which the medical profession does “not have a monopoly on care” ²³.

Main Text

The Paterson review aimed to clarify and examine the basis of the concerns expressed, through an information gathering exercise and public consultation, including the views of patients and the wider public, regulatory authorities, the medical profession, the podiatry profession, insurance companies and relevant education providers ¹. Deploying Neo-Weberian and Bordieuan sociological theory reveals the complex mix of motives and strategic responses that characterise interprofessional disputes, and the arguments presented in the report mirror many of the same concerns found in other cases, such as in the UK ^{11,12,14,16}.

1 Indeed, the review demonstrates that, whilst jurisdictional disputes continue to be a
2 “fundamental fact of professional life”², the practice of podiatric surgery is firmly established
3 as a viable, safe and effective option. Attempts by the medical profession to exclude, control
4 or limit podiatric surgery in Australia have largely failed, mirroring the UK, where
5 contemporary opposition is now more focused on the use of professional title^{11,14}. Whilst at
6 face value the review may appear to challenge some aspects of podiatric surgical practice, on
7 closer inspection it clearly offers support for its continued growth, as well as tacit support for
8 future public funding as part of an integrated public service. However, significant challenges
9 lie ahead, given the ‘gatekeeper’ role of the medical profession.

14 **The Paterson Report: ‘Gatekeeping’ and the future of podiatric surgery**

16 Full and effective utilization of health practitioners requires access to appropriate training,
17 regulation, and funding. The Patterson report demonstrates that podiatric surgeons have
18 successfully negotiated the first two of these requirements¹. They have established an
19 accredited and recognized training programme and achieved professional closure through
20 regulation with AHPRA. However, they are still restricted from working to their full capacity
21 due to a lack of access to government (Medicare) funding for their services and restrictions
22 on access to public hospitals.

26 This is where the concept of the gatekeeper becomes crucial²⁴. While the scope of practice
27 of podiatric surgeons has effectively met the training and regulatory requirements necessary
28 to practice, the medical profession still holds significant power to restrict the work practices
29 of other professions. They act as gatekeepers, controlling access to essential tools and
30 resources, including government funding and hospital privileges.

34 To understand these constraints, it is crucial to consider Bourdieu’s concept of the field²⁴.
35 This framework emphasizes the dynamic relationships that give rise to social action within a
36 given social space. According to Bourdieu, any social action can be understood by identifying
37 the relations and structures of domination in that particular field. All fields are sites of
38 struggle, constituted by a set of relations between various positions that reproduce the field
39 itself.

44 In healthcare, the key actors include individual medical doctors, government ministers, other
45 health professionals and organisations such as specialist colleges, pharmaceutical companies,
46 professional associations and insurers. These actors hold varying degrees of power and
47 influence, often rooted in historical and structural advantages. The medical profession, in
48 particular, has long held a dominant position, enabling it to control decision-making
49 processes that affect other health professions.

55 For example, the medical profession’s influence over government policy can impact which
56 services are eligible for Medicare funding. Without Medicare funding, podiatric surgeons find
57 it challenging to offer their services to a broader population, limiting their practice to private
58 patients who can afford out-of-pocket costs. Similarly, restrictions on access to public
59

1 hospitals prevent podiatric surgeons from performing surgeries in these settings, further
2 limiting their practice scope and the public’s access to their specialised services.
3

4 These gatekeeping actions are not merely bureaucratic hurdles but are rooted in the power
5 dynamics within the healthcare field. By controlling access to critical resources, the medical
6 profession maintains its dominance, reinforcing a hierarchical structure that perpetuates
7 inequality among health professions. Addressing these issues requires a re-examination of
8 the power relations within the healthcare field and implementing policies that ensure
9 equitable access to training, regulation, and funding for all health practitioners.
10

11 In conclusion, while podiatric surgeons have demonstrated their competence through
12 rigorous training and regulatory compliance[∞], their full and effective utilization is hindered by
13 systemic gatekeeping. Understanding and addressing these barriers through the lens of
14 Bourdieu’s concept of the field can help promote a more equitable and efficient healthcare
15 system.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Although careful to state that it is “beyond the scope” of the review to make a formal
23 recommendation on public funding for podiatric surgery, it is viewed as a goal worth
24 pursuing, as the review recommends that the PBA and AHPRA “write to health ministers”,
25 and, with their support “work with the Australian Government...to explore options to
26 integrate...into the broader healthcare system”¹.
27
28
29
30

31 **The Paterson Report: further points** 32

33 Certain further points merit attention. The recommendation that mandatory endorsement
34 for scheduled medicines certification (or ESM) should be introduced reflects the importance
35 of non-medical allied health prescribing to effective patient management, now widely
36 supported in the literature ²⁵⁻³².
37
38
39

40 Importantly, medical power is also exercised through its ability to control the media narrative.
41 Articles in the Sydney Morning Herald and The New Age, published between December and
42 March 2024, cited by Paterson, report patient cases of surgical complications which are
43 directly linked to concerns over podiatric surgical education and training, most notably the
44 absence of ‘medical degrees’ held by podiatric surgeons ³³⁻³⁶. This argument reflects the way
45 the media broadly accepts and reproduces the medical narrative in matters of healthcare,
46 sometimes called “doctoring the media” ^{37,38}. Equating surgical complications in podiatric
47 surgery with a lack of education and training in medicine is premised on the notion that a
48 surgeon without a medical degree is unqualified ¹⁴. Full training in podiatric surgery is not
49 deemed sufficient or acceptable. For Bourdieu, this is a manifestation of symbolic
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 [∞] As noted throughout the Paterson Report: “...there is no basis for a restriction of the scope of practice of podiatric
59 surgeons”; “...concerns about the quality of education and training of podiatric surgeons are not supported by the
60 evidence”; “...there is not sufficient evidence of non-compliant advertising leading to harm to warrant an audit” ¹
61
62
63
64
65

1 devaluation, deployed by a more established profession to undermine a threat from a less
2 powerful profession ³⁶⁻⁴⁰.

3
4 Whereas the review considers the accreditation standards for the education and training
5 programmes to be “broadly consistent with” those used by the Australian Medical Council, it
6 identifies a need to strengthen the accreditation assessment teams to include a member with
7 surgical training and experience (implying a medical professional). Whilst the review views
8 this as an opportunity for more collaborative working relationships with the medical
9 profession, it nonetheless acknowledges that “Vehement opposition from orthopaedics...and
10 resistance from podiatric surgeons to the involvement of a competing speciality” makes the
11 prospect “unrealistic”. It cleverly envisages an alternative option, where individuals “from
12 other medical specialties would be willing to help”. Indeed, the review broadly acknowledges
13 the “outright hostility from orthopaedic surgeons”, and urges caution and a “need for
14 proportionality in the regulatory responses” to orthopaedic complaints about podiatric
15 surgery. Thus, there is a tacit understanding of the underlying strategies at work when groups
16 compete over role boundaries and task domains.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **The issue of title: ‘Podiatric Surgeon’**

24
25 On the matter of professional title, the review recommends that the PBA seeks health
26 ministers’ approval to change the professional title from “podiatric surgeon” to an alternative,
27 such as “surgical podiatrist”. The specialist title of “podiatric surgeon” is recognised in the
28 Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (2009), but has consistently been opposed by the
29 medical profession ¹. Title was the “single biggest issue raised by orthopaedic surgeons” in
30 their submissions to the review consultation ¹. The review concludes that patients may be
31 confused by the title “podiatric surgeon”, and do “believe and expect” that their podiatric
32 surgeon will “have a degree in medicine”. However, the review is mindful of the fact that a
33 similar argument was used in 2009 during the consultation phase leading up to the
34 introduction of the National Scheme. The Australian Orthopaedic Association claimed the
35 title would mislead patients and compromise patient safety, but the Australian Workforce
36 Ministerial Committee “rejected” those assertions ¹.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 In the current context the medical profession can, however, point to the changes made to the
45 National Law in 2023, which *do* limit the use of the title “surgeon” to those medical
46 practitioners who are registered in one of the specialties of surgery, obstetrics and
47 gynaecology, or ophthalmology (in a bid to better regulate cosmetic surgery) ^{44,45}. However,
48 this provision applies only to medically qualified doctors, and not to podiatric or dental
49 surgeons (which are omitted). Nevertheless, it allows the medical profession to argue that
50 securing such a change enhances the likelihood that the public will expect anyone using the
51 title “surgeon” to be medically qualified ¹.
52
53
54
55
56

57 Titles are important assets to professions (symbolic capital), reflecting power, prestige and
58 status. Bourdieu’s conceptual framework permits a crystal-clear analysis of the dispute
59 between two competing professions over the use of professional title ³⁹⁻⁴³. Titles are symbolic
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 capital, and are defended through the exercise of “symbolic violence”^δ 39-43. This allows the
2 medical profession to reassert its cultural and symbolic authority over the domain of surgery.
3 It acts to reinforce the taken-for-granted assumption that those practising surgery must
4 obviously be medically qualified, thus concealing the underlying exercise of power (the
5 “doxa” in Bordieuan parlance)^{39,40,42}. This enables the dominant profession to assert that the
6 use of the title by competitors is misleading. One effective means of achieving this aim is to
7 devalue the competing profession (symbolic devaluation), commonly manifest as pejorative
8 criticisms, implying wilful deceit, incompetence or inadequate training⁴⁰. This is illustrated in
9 the alternative titles suggested by orthopaedic surgeons in their submissions to the review,
10 such as “podiatric technician”, or in describing the notion that podiatric surgical training is
11 safe as “ridiculous”⁴⁶.

12 There is an important corollary to the claim that the title “podiatric surgeon” is protected
13 under the National Law. The Act explicitly lists its protected titles, including “podiatrist” and
14 “chiropracist”. However, “podiatric surgeon” is not included in this list; instead, it is
15 recognised via a slightly different mechanism within the Act^{*}. The Health Ministers Meeting
16 (formerly the Ministerial Council) provides separate approval for specialist titles, usually
17 granted on the recommendation of a National Board⁴⁷. Such an approval may therefore, in
18 theory, be revoked via the same mechanism (by a decision of the HMM), without altering the
19 text of the National Law[°]. This may allow effective lobbying to influence the final Ministerial
20 decision.

21 Conclusion

22 The Podiatry Board has accepted all the recommendations in the review^{48,49}. It must first
23 undertake a full consultation before seeking Health Ministers’ approval^{48,49}. This will enable
24 each case to be made in advance, either to retain the title or remove it. Given the nature of
25 symbolic violence, a challenge to the dominant discourse of medicine may seem an
26 insurmountable challenge. Yet, as the review points out, earlier challenges have been
27 successfully resisted. It also acknowledges the fact that podiatric surgeons have
28 “legitimately” used the title for the last 15 years or more¹. Interestingly, the assertion that
29 the title “surgical podiatrist” would reduce consumer confusion remains debatable. There is
30 no real evidence to support such a claim, nor that “podiatric technician” or “operative
31 podiatrist” would bring greater clarity.

32 The review report sheds light on contemporary interprofessional conflicts, and the pursuit of
33 exclusive privileges by one group at the expense of another. As in the UK, challenges to the
34 scope of practice of podiatric surgery are no longer sustainable or successful¹⁴. Thus, the

35 ^δ Symbolic violence is the imposition of systems of symbolism and meaning (i.e. culture) upon groups in such a
36 way that they are experienced as legitimate. The legitimacy obscures the power relations. (See Jenkins, R.
37 Pierre Bourdieu. London: Routledge. 2002).

38 ^{*} Part 2, Section 13, 2(b).

39 [°] Thanks are due to Mr Nick Studdert, Consultant Podiatric Surgeon and former lawyer, for his advice on this
40 point.

1 conflict is now focused on the struggle for symbolic legitimacy via professional title, which
2 acts as a “distinctive mark” that draws its value from its position within a hierarchically arranged
3 system of titles⁴¹. As Bourdieu himself stated,

4 “... it is not the relative value of the work that determines the value of the name, but the
5 institutionalised value of the title that can be used as a means of defending or maintaining the value
6 of the work”⁴¹.
7
8
9

10 11 12 References

- 13 1. Paterson R, Independent review of the regulation of podiatric surgeons in Australia. Commissioned by
14 the Podiatry Board of Australia and the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. Melbourne:
15 March 2024. URL: www.podiatryboard.gov.au
- 16 2. Abbott, A. The system of professions - An essay on the division of expert labour. Chicago: University of
17 Chicago Press. 1988.
- 18 3. Saks M. Professions and power: a review of theories of professions and power. In: Dent M, Bourgeault
19 IL, Denis JL, Kuhlmann E, editors. The Routledge Companion to the Professions and Professionalism.
20 Abingdon: Routledge; 2016.
- 21 4. Larkin, GV. Occupational Monopoly and Modern Medicine. London: Tavistock. 1983.
- 22 5. Willis, E. Medical Dominance: The division of labour in Australian healthcare. London: George Allen &
23 Unwin. Revised Edition. 1990.
- 24 6. Pickard, S. The role of governmentality in the establishment, maintenance and demise of professional
25 jurisdictions: The case of geriatric medicine. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2010, 32(7), 1072–1086.
- 26 7. Macdonald, KM. The Sociology of the Professions. London: Sage. 1995.
- 27 8. Liljegren A. Key metaphors in the sociology of the professions: occupations as hierarchies and
28 landscapes. In: Liljegren A, Saks M, editors. Professions and Metaphors: Understanding professions in
29 society. Abingdon: Routledge; 2017.
- 30 9. Turner, B. Medical power and social knowledge. London: Sage. 1995.
- 31 10. Bell, D. Podiatrists and surgeons. *British Journal of Chiropody*, 1982, 47(6), 112.
- 32 11. Borthwick, A. Challenging Medicine: The case of podiatric surgery. *Work, Employment and Society*,
33 2000, 14(2), 369–383.
- 34 12. Borthwick, AM. Occupational imperialism at work: The case of podiatric surgery. *British Journal of*
35 *Podiatry*. 2001,4(3): 70-79.
- 36 13. Borthwick, A., & Dowd, O. Medical dominance or collaborative partnership? Orthopaedic views on
37 podiatric surgery. *British Journal of Podiatry*, 2004, 7(2), 36–42.
- 38 14. Borthwick AM, Nancarrow SA, Boyce RA. **Symbolic power and professional titles: the case of 'podiatric**
39 **surgeon'**, *Health Sociology Review*, 2015, 24 (3): 310 – 322. DOI:[10.1080/14461242.2015.1051081](https://doi.org/10.1080/14461242.2015.1051081)
- 40 15. Isaac, A., Gwilym, S. E., Reilly, I.N., Kilmartin, T. E., & Ribbans, W. J. Interprofessional relationships
41 between orthopaedic and podiatric surgeons in the UK. *Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of*
42 *England*, 2008, 90: 663–670.
- 43 16. Nancarrow S, Borthwick A. Interprofessional working for the health professions: From fried eggs to
44 omelettes? In: Dent M, Bourgeault I, Kuhlmann E, editors. The Routledge Companion to the Professions
45 and Professionalism. London: Routledge; 2016. p. 343–54.
- 46 17. Saks M. Professions: A Key Idea for Business and Society. London: Routledge; 2021
- 47 18. Berlant JL. Profession and Monopoly: A Study of Medicine in the United State and Great Britain.
48 London: University of California Press. 1975.
- 49 19. Elston MA. The politics of professional Power. In Gabe J, Calnan M, Bury M. The Sociology of the Health
50 Service. London: Routledge. 1991.
- 51 20. Huby, G., Harris, F. M., Powell, A. E., Kielman, T., Sheikh, A., Williams, S., & Pinnock, H. Beyond
52 professional boundaries: relationships and resources in health services' modernisation in England and
53 Wales. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2014, 36(3), 400–415.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

21. Grant, S., Huby, G., Watkins, F., Checkland, K., McDonald, R., Davies, H., & Guthrie, B. The impact of pay-for-performance on professional boundaries in UK general practice: an ethnographic study. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2009, 31(2), 229–245.
22. Davies, C. *The future health workforce*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2003.
23. Metherill, M. Doctors do not have a monopoly on care: Roxon URL: <https://www.smh.com.au/national/doctors-do-not-have-monopoly-on-care-roxon-20080920-gdsvoh.html>
24. Collyer, F.M., Willis, K.F., Lewis, S., Gatekeepers in the healthcare sector: Knowledge and Bourdieu's concept of field, *Social Science & Medicine*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.06.004
25. Carey N, Edwards J, Otter S, Gage H, Williams P, Courtenay M, et al. A comparative case study of prescribing and non-prescribing physiotherapists and podiatrists. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2020;20(1):1–20.
26. Armstrong A, Manfrin A, Gibson J. Non-medical prescribing in primary care in the United Kingdom: an overview of the current literature. *J Prescribing Pract*. 2021;3(9):352–61.
27. Stenner K, Edwards J, Mold F, Otter S, Courtenay M, Moore A, et al. Medicines management activity with physiotherapy and podiatry: A systematic mixed studies review. *Health Policy*. 2018;122(12):1333–9.
28. Stenner K, van Even S, Collen A. Paramedic independent prescribing: a qualitative study of early adopters in the UK. *Br Paramedic J*. 2021;6(1):30–7.
29. Noblet T, Marriott J, Graham-Clarke E, Shirley D, Rushton A. Clinical and cost-effectiveness of non-medical prescribing: A systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(3):e0193286.
30. Hindi AM, Seston EM, Bell D, Steinke D, Willis S, Schafheutle EI. Independent prescribing in primary care: a survey of patients', prescribers' and colleagues' perceptions and experiences. *Health Soc Care Commun*. 2019;27(4):e459- e70.
31. Graham-Clarke E, Rushton A, Marriott J. A Delphi study to explore and gain consensus regarding the most important barriers and facilitators affecting physiotherapist and pharmacist non-medical prescribing. *PLoS ONE*. 2021;16(2):e0246273.
32. Graham-Clarke E, Rushton A, Noblet T, Marriott J. Facilitators and barriers to non-medical prescribing—A systematic review and thematic synthesis. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(4):e0196471.
33. Grieves, C. Title change push for controversial podiatric surgeons. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11th December 2023 : <https://www.smh.com.au/healthcare/title-change-push-for-controversial-podiatric-surgeons-20231207-p5epqp.html>
34. Grieves, C and Adams, A: Sole destroying: how surgeons wield scalpels without medical degrees. *The Age.com*, 3rd December 2023: <https://www.theage.com.au/healthcare/sole-destroying-how-surgeons-wield-scalpels-without-medical-degrees-20230526-p5dbog.html>
35. Editorial. We need our health watchdogs to protect us. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3rd December 2023: <https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/we-need-our-health-watchdogs-to-protect-us-20231202-p5eoiu.html>
36. Grieves, C. Deformed, shocked, unable to walk: When foot surgery goes wrong. *The Age.com*, 3rd December 2023: <https://www.theage.com.au/healthcare/deformed-shocked-unable-to-walk-when-foot-surgery-goes-wrong-20230526-p5dbog.html>
37. Gabe, J. Mediating illness: newspaper coverage of tranquilliser dependence. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 1991, 13(3), 332–353.
38. Karpf, A. *Doctoring the media*. London: Routledge. 1988.
39. Bourdieu, P. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge. 1986.
40. Bourdieu, P. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1977.
41. Bourdieu, P. The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, 1985, 14(6), 723–744.
42. Bourdieu, P. Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 1989, 7(1), 14–25.
43. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage. 1990.
44. Health Ministers Meeting. Medical practitioners' use of the title 'surgeon' under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law - Decision Regulation Impact Statement. Health Ministers Meeting December 2022.
45. Brown, A. Final report: independent review of the regulation of medical practitioners who perform cosmetic surgery, commissioned by AHPRA and the Medical Board. 2022. Available from <https://www.ahpra.gov.au/News/Cosmeticsurgery-independent-review-of-patient-safety.aspx>

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
46. Grieve, C. 'Confusing and problematic': Podiatric surgeons urged to change their name. Sydney Morning Herald. March 27, 2024. URL: <https://www.smh.com.au/healthcare/confusing-and-problematic-podiatric-surgeons-urged-to-change-their-name-20240326-p5ff7l.html>
 47. Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009. Current as at 20th September 2023. State of Queensland. URL: <https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-2009-045>
 48. Australian Medical Association. Podiatry Board of Australia to seek approval to change the title of podiatric surgeons URL: <https://www.ama.com.au/ama-rounds/29-march-2024/articles/podiatry-board-australia-seek-approval-change-title-podiatric>
 49. Podiatry Board of Australia. The Podiatry Board and AHPRA's joint response. 2024. URL: <https://www.podiatryboard.gov.au/News/Independent-review-for-podiatric-surgeons/Our-response.aspx>

Declarations

Ethical Approval and consent to participate

Not Applicable. No human participants were involved in this policy review paper.

Consent for publication

Not Applicable (no individual data is included)

Availability of data and materials

Not Applicable (as a review/policy paper)

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Not Applicable

Author contributions

AMB initiated the writing of the review article and AMB and SAN wrote the body of work. CB and IB oversaw the work, gave invaluable advice, commented and recommended revisions, amendments, and additions at every stage in the drafts and in the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not Applicable

Authors' information

AMB and SAN have authored several academic articles and book chapters focused on the sociological analysis of interprofessional conflict, and in particular that between orthopaedic and podiatric surgery. SAN is a health services researcher, and the CEO of HealthWorks International, focused on the allied health professions workforce. IB is an established academic author and has co-authored several works with AMB, in addition to an extensive publication record in the field of podiatric dermatology.