



Routledge Studies in Health Management

MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

CONFLICTS AND QUANDARIES IN MEDICAL PRACTICE

Edited by
Kathleen Montgomery and Wendy Lipworth



Medical Professionals

Medical Professionals: Conflicts and Quandaries in Medical Practice offers a fresh approach to understanding the role-related conflicts and quandaries that pervade contemporary medical practice. While a focus on professional conflicts is not new in the literature, what is missing is a volume that delves into medical professionals' own experience of the conflicts and quandaries they face, often as a result of inhabiting multiple roles. The volume explores these experiences and also the ways in which conflicts and quandaries are exacerbated by broader societal forces, including changing scientific and technological paradigms, commercialization, and strengthened consumer movements, which simultaneously expand the scope of roles and responsibilities that medical professionals are expected to fulfil, and make it more difficult to do so.

Several empirical chapters analyze data from qualitative interview studies with clinicians and other stakeholders. The studies highlight the burdens on clinicians who are expected to make informed and justified judgements and decisions in the midst of competing pressures; authors describe the methods that clinicians use to address the associated tensions within specific contexts. Two conceptual chapters follow that offer innovative ways to think about the challenges facing medical professionals as they strive to make sense of the changing landscape within healthcare. The first reflects on the challenges to clinical practice of shifting and often competing definitions of disease and associated ideologies of care. The second reflects more broadly on the utility of value pluralism as a framework for conceptualizing and working through moral and professional quandaries. The book concludes with a chapter containing suggestions for how members of the medical profession might reframe their thinking about their roles, responsibilities, and decision-making in the midst of inevitable quandaries such as those presented here.

This book will be important reading for academics, researchers, educators, postgraduate students, and interested healthcare practitioners and administrators.

Kathleen Montgomery is Professor of the Graduate Division and Emerita Professor of Organizations and Management at the University of California, Riverside.

Wendy Lipworth is a bioethicist and health social scientist and Associate Professor at The University of Sydney, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney Health Ethics.

Routledge Studies in Health Management

Edited by Ewan Ferlie

The healthcare sector is now of major significance, economically, scientifically, and societally. In many countries, healthcare organizations are experiencing major pressures to change and restructure, while cost-containment efforts have been accentuated by the global economic crisis. Users are demanding higher service quality, and healthcare professions are experiencing significant reorganization whilst operating under increased demands from an ageing population.

Critically analytic, politically informed, discursive and theoretically grounded, rather than narrowly technical or positivistic, the series seeks to analyze current healthcare organizations. Reflecting the intense focus of policy and academic interest, it moves beyond the day to day debate to consider the broader implications of international organizational and management research and different theoretical framings.

Analysing Health Care Organizations

A Personal Anthology

Ewan Ferlie

Managing Modern Healthcare

Knowledge, Networks and Practice

Mike Bresnen, Damian Hodgson, Simon Bailey, Paula Hyde and John Hassard

Challenging Perspectives on Organizational Change in Health Care

Louise Fitzgerald and Aoife McDermott

Healthcare Entrepreneurship

Ralf Wilden, Massimo Garbuio, Federica Angeli, and Daniele Mascia

Medical Professionals

Conflicts and Quandaries in Medical Practice

Edited by Kathleen Montgomery and Wendy Lipworth

Medical Professionals

**Conflicts and Quandaries
in Medical Practice**

**Edited by Kathleen Montgomery
and Wendy Lipworth**

First published 2019
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2019 Taylor & Francis

The right of Kathleen Montgomery and Wendy Lipworth to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-55011-7 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-71222-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

We dedicate this volume to the medical professionals and patients whose participation in the empirical research presented herein has been invaluable.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>List of Illustrations</i> | ix |
| <i>Foreword</i> | x |
| | |
| PART I | |
| Overview | 1 |
| | |
| 1 Role-Related Conflicts and Value-Laden Quandaries Confronting Today's Medical Professionals | 3 |
| KATHLEEN MONTGOMERY AND WENDY LIPWORTH | |
| | |
| PART II | |
| Empirical Explorations of Conflicts and Quandaries | 11 |
| | |
| 2 Respecting Patient Autonomy: Some Telling Challenges for Medical Professionals Who Treat Seriously Ill Patients | 13 |
| CHRISTOPHER JORDENS AND KATHLEEN MONTGOMERY | |
| | |
| 3 Off-Label Prescribing: The Borderlands Between Clinical Practice and Experimentation | 28 |
| NARCYZ GHINEA, IAN KERRIDGE, AND WENDY LIPWORTH | |
| | |
| 4 Clinical Quandaries Associated With Accelerated Access to Medicines | 48 |
| JESSICA PACE, NARCYZ GHINEA, MIRIAM WIERSMA, BRONWEN MORRELL, IAN KERRIDGE, AND WENDY LIPWORTH | |
| | |
| 5 Managing and Regulating Conflicts of Interest in Medicine | 67 |
| WENDY LIPWORTH AND KATHLEEN MONTGOMERY | |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 6 | Medical Professionals as Expert Advisors in Macroallocation: Problems of Dual Agency and Conflict of Interest | 88 |
| | SIUN GALLAGHER | |

PART III

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| | Reconceptualization and Concluding Observations | 105 |
|--|--|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 7 | After Dominance: The Elastic Politics of Medicine | 107 |
| | CHRISTOPHER JORDENS | |

| | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| 8 | Value Pluralism—The Bare Bones | 125 |
| | MILES LITTLE | |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 9 | Making Sense of Professional Conflicts and Quandaries | 145 |
| | WENDY LIPWORTH AND KATHLEEN MONTGOMERY | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|
| | <i>Contributor Biographies</i> | 151 |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|

| | | |
|--|--------------|------------|
| | <i>Index</i> | 154 |
|--|--------------|------------|

Illustrations

Table

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 5.1 | Levels and Sources of Regulation of Professional Behaviour | 81 |
|-----|--|----|

Figure

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 7.1 | Three Main “Vectors” of the Expansion of Medicine Beyond Disease | 120 |
|-----|--|-----|

Foreword

I was delighted to be asked by the editors to write a foreword to this interesting and thought-provoking edition. It explores some value-related dilemmas, tensions, and conflicts in current medical practice, and does this in an original and wide-ranging manner.

So the central theme of the book is the analysis of a set of role-related conflicts and quandaries apparent within contemporary medical practice. Along with role-related conflicts, tensions between different values and ideas emerge as important. The word “quandary” is repeatedly used in the edition and is in itself an interesting term as the conditions of perplexity and value-laden tension—or even conflict—found in the health service arenas described are not easily resolved. A “quandary” is highly non-linear in shape and form, suggesting that ready or unchallengeable solutions will be hard to find. It is most unlikely, for instance, that a simple “intervention” will solve these complex and deep problems.

The edition helpfully combines a suite of empirical chapters on key aspects of the broader themes introduced earlier (using mainly qualitative and interpretive methodologies which helpfully get the voice of practitioners into the conversation) with a couple of more theoretical chapters, along with a reflective introduction and conclusion from the editors. This is an important contribution to the field, as the editors rightly argue in their introduction: “what has been missing, however, is a volume that delves into medical professionals’ own experiences of, ways of thinking about, and ways of responding to the challenges that they confront as they are expected to make informed and justified decisions in the face of competing professional roles and responsibilities” (this volume, 3).

A range of key topics is explored in the chapters: the pressures on medical professionals caused by new models of service delivery such as patient-centred care, informed consent, and shared decision-making; issues of off-label prescribing and early access to new but high-cost drugs; possible conflict of interest when clinicians become involved in the pharmaceuticals sector and role conflicts when they become engaged in policy around the macroallocation—including rationing—of resources. Subgroups of clinicians may then hold two or more different roles, which may well be in tension. They may need to operate in different worlds, each with their own values and logics.

I am, furthermore, very pleased that the editors and the authors of the chapters are drawn mainly from Australia (notably Sydney Health Ethics) but also the United States. This edition helpfully creates a greater international dimension to the series, going beyond the initial monographs which were based on work from the United Kingdom.

Ewan Ferlie
General Series Editor
May 8, 2018



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Part I

Overview



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1 Role-Related Conflicts and Value-Laden Quandaries Confronting Today's Medical Professionals

Kathleen Montgomery and Wendy Lipworth

This book is designed to offer a fresh approach to understanding the role-related conflicts and quandaries that pervade contemporary medical practice, including problems of conflicts of interest, resource allocation, experimental medical practices, and determinations of futility. The volume also explores the ways in which these conflicts and quandaries are exacerbated by broader social forces, including changing scientific and technological paradigms, commercialization, and strengthened consumer movements, all of which simultaneously expand the scope of roles and responsibilities that medical professionals are expected to fulfil and make it more difficult to do so.

There exist many publications examining the medical profession, from the early work of Talcott Parsons (1939) and Eliot Freidson (1970a, 1970b) to more recent volumes such as *The Healthcare Professional Workforce* (Hoff, Sutcliffe, and Young 2016). Whereas Parsons and others of his generation (e.g. Carr-Saunders and Wilson 1933) defended the lofty status and power of the medical profession as functionally necessary for the good of society, Freidson introduced a new perspective that critically examined the profession's power and the strategies the profession adopts to develop and reinforce its status and legitimacy in the eyes of the state and the general public. Much of the work that has followed has explored the various conflicts confronting health professionals, primarily emanating from intra- and inter-professional jurisdictional battles (introduced in Abbott's classic *The System of Professions*, 1988) and from professional–organizational struggles to reconcile claims to professional autonomy and bureaucratic control (e.g. Starr 1982; Montgomery 1992; Scott et al. 2000; Currie et al. 2012).

Thus, a focus on professional conflicts is not new in the literature. What has been missing, however, is a volume that delves into medical professionals' own experiences of, ways of thinking about, and ways of responding to the challenges that they confront as they are expected to make informed and justified decisions in the face of competing professional roles and responsibilities. While such conflicts might be managed with relatively little cognitive dissonance, they can also generate *quandaries*—commonly understood to be *states of perplexity or uncertainty over what to do in difficult situations*

where there is, by definition, no straightforward resolution. Quandaries are often *value-laden*—a feature that, in the context of value pluralism, makes them particularly intractable.

This is not to say that physicians have no guidance in the management of conflicts and quandaries. Medical education and advanced training provide physicians with a foundation of knowledge about clinical decision-making, professional associations develop and promote codes to guide normative choices, and healthcare organizations draw up policies and protocols that mandate particular kinds of physician behaviour. However, the kinds of conflicts and quandaries that today's medical professionals encounter all too often fall outside their educational backgrounds, professional codes, organizational policies, and standard operating procedures. Contributions in this volume expose some very real, but under-discussed, conflicts and quandaries, with the goal of encouraging deeper discussion among health professionals, policymakers, and consumers.

The core of the volume consists of five empirical chapters that describe the results of qualitative research undertaken by researchers based at, or affiliated with, the University of Sydney, Sydney Health Ethics (SHE—formerly, the Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine or VELiM). The centre, founded in 1995, is the leading centre in Australia for social science and ethics research in health and medicine. The centre's work is distinguished by its interdisciplinarity and strong tradition of both national and international collaboration. The qualitative studies reported here involved interviews with individuals in Sydney and elsewhere in New South Wales. Nevertheless, the kinds of conflicts and quandaries that health professionals wrestle with have implications for health professionals in many Western societies, despite variations in healthcare systems.

The first three empirical chapters examine the conflicts and quandaries that present themselves at the micro level of patient care, while the next two focus on the macro level of policy and regulation. However, the reality is that all of these conflicts and quandaries span both micro and macro levels of concern. This is because it can be impossible to isolate challenging decisions that occur at the bedside from the broader meso and macro organizational, health system, and societal influences that both enable and constrain clinical decisions and actions.

The complexities of relationships across the micro, meso, and macro levels have been elucidated by institutional theorists (Scott 2008). A central premise of institutional theory is that the norms, beliefs, and rules espoused by actors in a particular environment play a key role in shaping behaviours of others in the environment. To depict these effects (following Leahey and Montgomery 2011), one can envision a set of actors within concentric rings, with permeable boundaries across the rings.

The innermost ring is the personal relationship between a particular doctor and a particular patient. This core relationship—the foundation of healthcare—is nested within a wider set of actors who may have a direct,

indirect, or distant relationship with the doctor and patient. For example, actors in the adjacent ring are the patient's family and members of the healthcare team, who may interact with, and whose actions may directly affect, the doctor–patient relationship. That is, beliefs of family members may strongly influence a patient's decisions about treatment, and practice norms among the healthcare team may facilitate or otherwise affect the clinician's behaviour in a particular doctor–patient interaction. The next ring includes those with a more indirect, but still influential, impact upon the doctor and patient, including professional associations and professional peers, healthcare organizations, medical researchers, and academic publishers. Pressures from actors at this meso level can take the form of informal peer expectations of appropriate professional behaviour, more formal professional codes of ethics and health service policies, and broader norms and guidelines governing the generation, dissemination, and translation of biomedical research. The outermost ring includes those with the most distant connection to a particular doctor–patient relationship but whose influence nonetheless can be far-reaching. These include regulators, accrediting bodies, the courts, health-related industries, the media, and consumer advocacy groups.

The result of this complex environment, with behavioural expectations and pressures from multiple actors, is that adhering to even the most taken-for-granted principles of patient care in Western medicine today—for example, respecting patient autonomy, giving priority to patients' interests and needs, ensuring that patients have access to and receive the highest quality treatment available—can generate conflicts and, in some cases, quandaries for clinicians. Indeed, many of the respondents interviewed for the studies in this volume speak passionately about their efforts to satisfy the expectations of multiple, and often conflicting, role responsibilities; they also reflect on their frustrations and discomfort when unable to do so, along with their strategies for managing associated cognitive dissonance.

In Chapter 2, Jordens and Montgomery demonstrate the difficulties in adhering to ever-growing ethical expectations and legal requirements for respecting patient autonomy. They observe that early paternalistic models of patient care have been replaced by newer approaches that emphasize greater patient involvement through informed consent, shared-decision making, and patient education. Such innovations are often subsumed under the rubric of “patient-centred care,” an appealing mantra adopted by healthcare organizations around the globe, espoused as the antidote to paternalism by giving priority to patient values, preferences, and decisions. Drawing on studies of clinicians and participants in the context of bone marrow transplantation, Jordens and Montgomery demonstrate the difficulties and frustrations for clinicians that arise when the ethical principles and ideal models of care do not readily translate into practice. One consequence is what the authors call the “paradox of autonomy,” where clinicians go to great lengths to educate patients about the proposed treatment prior to obtaining a patient's

consent, but patients make limited efforts to become educated about what they are consenting to. Ironically, by choosing to disregard key elements of the consent process, patients autonomously short-circuit a process that is designed to protect and increase their autonomy. A related observation from the study is the recognition of limits of shared decision-making, bounded on one side by patients' unilateral refusals to consent to potentially beneficial treatment and on other side by clinicians' unilateral refusal to offer interventions that they believe would be futile.

In Chapter 3, Ghinea and colleagues investigate the practice of "off-label" prescribing—that is, prescribing in a manner that is inconsistent with the indications approved by a medicines regulatory body. The authors begin by discussing the ambiguity surrounding the phrase and the resulting controversy about whether off-label prescribing constitutes inappropriate experimentation of an unlicensed investigational product or whether it is a legitimate extrapolation from approved uses of a medicine. They review the policies and politics involved in regulating medicines, along with the existing literature that reports that off-label prescribing appears to be a common practice, especially for certain groups of patients such as children and the elderly. The authors point out the potential quandary for clinicians, who may have good reason for prescribing off label but risk being placed in legal jeopardy for deviating from evidence-based and approved uses of certain medicines. Drawing from interviews with clinicians, the authors show how doctors balance the need for evidence about a medicine's efficacy with their own expertise and tacit knowledge about how patients respond to various treatments, in a way that allows them to defend their prescribing decisions. The authors conclude with reference to two case studies that reveal the limitations of efforts to arrive at formalized definitions of "evidence," "experimentation," and "expertise" in the context of prescribing behaviour.

Chapter 4 also is concerned with access to medicines, in this case cancer medicines. Pace and colleagues provide examples of several new cancer medicines which have therapeutic value but which have not been proven to be entirely safe and effective and/or come at huge cost. The authors explore several challenges facing clinicians as they consider therapy options for their patients. At the micro level, clinicians face the need to provide their patients with hope and compassionate care while ensuring that the medicines they prescribe are sufficiently safe and effective. This is particularly challenging when medicines are new and may not have a substantial evidence base but to which patients are nonetheless demanding access. At the macro level, clinicians have to contend with a duty to the broader community to use scarce resources responsibly while still advocating for individual patients. Pace and colleagues provide data from interviews with clinicians to illustrate their recognition of and, in some cases, discomfort with, these challenges. They conclude with some examples of ways in which clinicians avoid or manage the cognitive dissonance such quandaries generate, including a variety of possibilities for making medicine more affordable and accessible.

In Chapter 5, Lipworth and Montgomery continue the investigation of conflicts and quandaries involving pharmaceuticals. In this chapter, however, the focus shifts from patient care and resource allocation to the relationships that clinicians have with the pharmaceutical industry—in this case as collaborators with, or employees of, the industry. Many observers argue that professional–industry relationships place clinicians in a position of conflict of interest. To explore the different positions taken by key actors regarding these relationships, the authors first discuss a case study of a controversial debate about academic–industry collaboration that played out in the pages of premier academic journals. This case illustrates divergent and strongly held opinions about the appropriate role for clinicians who engage in research with pharmaceutical firms and who seek to publish review articles in academic journals. Next, the authors present interview data from clinicians who are employees of pharmaceutical companies. Using the framework of professional regulation, Lipworth and Montgomery compare the attitudes of practicing clinicians to those of health professionals employed by industry. They find that the former group tends to view regulation through an adversarial lens. In contrast, those in the latter group embrace multiple levels of regulation as facilitators of their roles and as potential ways to navigate the quandaries posed by potential conflicts of interest.

In Chapter 6, Gallagher explores the conflicts and quandaries that arise for clinicians when they serve as technical expert advisors in decisions about allocation of health resources at the population level. She describes the potential conflicts of interest and problems of dual agency that can arise for individuals in this position. Drawing on interview data from clinicians who occupy such roles, she describes their recognition of the importance of clinician input into resource allocation decisions while recognizing the difficulties of serving simultaneously as dual agents on behalf of their individual patients and on behalf of patient populations. Gallagher also reveals the potential for conflicts of interest should clinicians engage in these roles primarily for personal advancement or for promoting a particular self-serving resource allocation goal. Gallagher describes respondents' efforts and strategies to navigate the potential tensions inherent in occupying dual roles. In particular, she describes respondents' confidence that the social processes of macroallocation and priority setting are best viewed not as issues of distributive justice but as ones best resolved by attention to procedural justice.

The five empirical chapters are followed by two conceptual chapters, which bring together and extend the observations presented in the data. While both conceptual chapters draw heavily on the sociological and philosophical literature, they offer fresh and distinctive approaches to understanding professional conflicts. Chapter 7, by Jordens, reflects on the challenges faced by clinicians who find themselves in the midst of shifting and often competing definitions of disease and associated ideologies of care which are, in turn, shaped by complex power dynamics. He emphasizes the inevitable

political aspects of healthcare, many of which are reflected in the preceding chapters, including decisions about treatment options and resource allocation. He argues that paradigm shifts in the theory and practice of care can function as positive signs of a medical profession responsive to criticism, while also serving as a source of conflict.

In Chapter 8, Little explores the possibilities of value pluralism as an approach to the kinds of conflicts and quandaries that members of the medical profession encounter in their work. Drawing on empirical material from the preceding chapters, he highlights the (often under-recognized) values that underpin the various conflicts and quandaries, whether they pertain to patient autonomy, conflict of interest, resource allocation, or evidence-based medicine. Little argues that these conflicts and quandaries do not readily lend themselves to satisfactory resolution agreeable to all parties, precisely because of the pluralism of values that actors bring to their understanding of the problems. Instead, Little proposes a mode of discourse informed by value pluralism, a heuristic that enables parties to engage reasonably in dialog, without resorting to absolutism and polemic. As he notes, value pluralism requires scepticism and reflection, along with restrained partisanship in argument. It does not seek end-points that are either right or wrong but suggests pragmatic solutions that may work “for the moment.” In so doing, Little offers a cautious but optimistic approach to thinking about and moving forward in the midst of seemingly intractable, value-laden quandaries.

The editors conclude by drawing together the empirical studies to elucidate commonalities and variation in (1) the types of role-related conflicts that can arise in medical practice, (2) the ways physicians experience these conflicts, and (3) suggestions for managing role-related conflicts that emerge from the studies. The editors then briefly review the contributions of the two conceptual chapters, noting that each offers an innovative framework through which to understand the variety of role-related conflicts and quandaries confronting today’s medical professionals.

References

- Abbott, A. 1988. *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Carr-Saunders, A., and P. Wilson, 1933. *The professions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Currie, G., A. Lockett, R. Finn, G. Martin, and J. Waring. 2012. Institutional work to maintain professional power: Recreating a model of medical professionalism. *Organization Studies* 33(7): 937–962.
- Freidson, E. 1970a. *The profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead.
- . 1970b. *Professional dominance: The social structure of medical care*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.
- Hoff, T., K. Sutcliffe, and G. Young, eds. 2016. *The healthcare professional workforce: Understanding human capital in a changing industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Leahey, E., and K. Montgomery. 2011. The meaning of regulation in a changing academic profession. In *The American academic profession: Changing forms and functions*, edited by J. Hermanowicz, 295–311. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Montgomery, K. 1992. Professional dominance and the threat of corporatization: The impact of physicians as the administrative elite in health care. *Current Research on Occupations and Professions* 7: 221–280. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Parsons, T. 1939. The professions and social structure. *Social Forces* 17(4): 457–467.
- Scott, W. 2008. Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society* 37(5): 427–442.
- Scott, W., M. Ruef, P. Mendel, and C. Caronna. 2000. *Institutional change and health-care organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Starr, P. 1982. *The social transformation of American medicine: The rise of the sovereign profession and the making of a vast industry*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Role-Related Conflicts and Value- Laden Quandaries Confronting Today's Medical Professionals

- Abbott, A. 1988. *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Carr-Saunders, A. , and P. Wilson , 1933. *The professions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Currie, G. , A. Lockett , R. Finn , G. Martin , and J. Waring . 2012. Institutional work to maintain professional power: Recreating a model of medical professionalism. *Organization Studies* 33(7): 937–962.
- Freidson, E. 1970a. *The profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead.
- Freidson, E. . 1970b. *Professional dominance: The social structure of medical care*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.
- Hoff, T. , K. Sutcliffe , and G. Young , eds. 2016. *The healthcare professional work-force: Understanding human capital in a changing industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leahey, E. , and K. Montgomery . 2011. The meaning of regulation in a changing academic profession. In *The American academic profession: Changing forms and functions*, edited by J. Hermanowicz , 295–311. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Montgomery, K. 1992. Professional dominance and the threat of corporatization: The impact of physicians as the administrative elite in health care. *Current Research on Occupations and Professions* 7: 221–280. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Parsons, T. 1939. The professions and social structure. *Social Forces* 17(4): 457–467.
- Scott, W. 2008. Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society* 37(5): 427–442.
- Scott, W. , M. Ruef , P. Mendel , and C. Caronna . 2000. *Institutional change and health-care organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Starr, P. 1982. *The social transformation of American medicine: The rise of the sovereign profession and the making of a vast industry*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Respecting Patient Autonomy

- Barry, M.J. , F.J. Fowler , A.G. Mulley , and J.V. Henderson . 1995. Patient reactions to a program designed to facilitate patient participation in treatment decisions for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Medical Care* 33(8): 771–782.
- Beauchamp, T. , and J. Childress . 1979. *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 1st ed. New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- J. Childress . 2013. *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 7th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bone Marrow Transplant Network NSW . 2006. *Allogeneic bone marrow transplant: A patient's guide*. Sydney: Bone Marrow Transplant Network NSW.
- Bosk, C. 2010. Bioethics, raw and cooked: Extraordinary conflict and everyday practice. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 51(SI): S133–S146.
- Christie, F. , and J. Martin , eds. 1997. *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*. London and New York, NY: Continuum.
- Delbanco, T. , D. Berwick , J. Boufford , 2001. Healthcare in a land called People-Power: Nothing about me without me. *Health Expectations* 4(3): 144–150.
- DiMatteo, M.R. , P. Giordani , H. Lepper , and T. Croghan . 2002. Patient adherence and medical treatment outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Medical Care* 40(9): 794–811.
- Ferguson, P. , C. Jordens , and N. Gilroy . 2009. Patient and family education in HSCT: Improving awareness of respiratory virus infection and influenza vaccination. A descriptive study and brief intervention. *Bone Marrow Transplantation* 45(4): 656–661.
- Flexner, A. 1910. *Medical education in the United States and Canada*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation.

Freidson, E. 1970. *The profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gerteis, M.S. , S. Edgman-Levitan , J. Daley , and T. Delbanco . 1993. *Through the patient's eyes: Understanding and promoting patient-centered care*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Haug, M. 1973. Deprofessionalization: An alternative hypothesis for the future. *The Sociological Review Monograph* 20(S1): 195–211.

Hibbard, J. 2007. Consumer competencies and the use of comparative quality information: It isn't just about literacy. *Medical Care Research and Review* 64(4): 379–394.

Institute of Medicine . 2001. *Crossing the quality chasm: A new health system for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Jones, J. 1981. *Bad blood: The Tuskegee syphilis experiment*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Jordens, C.F.C. , K. Montgomery , and R. Forsyth . 2013. Trouble in the gap: A bio-ethical and sociological analysis of informed consent for high-risk medical procedures. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 10(1): 67–77.

Kerridge, I.H. , M. Lowe , and C. Stewart . 2013. *Ethics and law for the health professions*, 4th ed. Sydney: The Federation Press.

Kite, S. , and S. Wilkinson . 2002. Beyond futility: To what extent is the concept of futility useful in clinical decision-making about CPR? *The Lancet Oncology* 3(10): 638–642.

Korsch, B.M. 1989. Current issues in communication research. *Health Communication* 1(1): 5–9.

Little, M. , C. Jordens , C. McGrath , 2008. Informed consent and medical ordeal: A qualitative study. *Internal Medicine Journal* 38(8): 624–628.

Löfmark, R. , and T. Nilstun . 2002. Conditions and consequences of medical futility: From a literature review to a clinical model. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 28(2): 115–119.

Martin, J.R. 1996. Register and genre: Modelling social context in functional linguistics—narrative genres. *Discourse analysis: Proceedings of the international conference on discourse analysis*. University of Lisbon, Portugal, Colibri/Portuguese Linguistics Association.

Martinez, K. , A. Kurian , S. Hawley , and R. Jagsi . 2015. How can we best respect patient autonomy in breast cancer treatment decisions? *Breast Cancer Management* 4(1): 53–64.

McNeill, P. 1993. *The ethics and politics of human experimentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oppenheim, D. , O. Hartmann , A. Ablin , and B. Sourkes . 2002. A child and parent illustrating non-compliance with treatment: Understanding non-compliance with treatment. *Bulletin du Cancer* 89(6): 643–647.

Parsons, T. 1951. Illness and the role of the physicians: A sociological perspective. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 21(3): 452–460.

Roter, D. , and J. Hall . 2006. *Doctors talking with patients: Patients talking with doctors*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Sadegh-Zadeh, K. 2015. Medical decision-making. In *Handbook of analytic philosophy of medicine*, 2nd ed., edited by K. Sadegh-Zadeh , 699–703. Dordrecht: Springer International Publishing.

Stein, M. , R. Wells , S. Stephenson , and L. Schneiderman . 1998. Decision making about medical care in an adolescent with a life-threatening illness. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* 19(5): 355–358.

Off-Label Prescribing

Ballard, C.D. , G.M. Peterson , A.J. Thompson , and S.A. Beggs . 2013. Off-label use of medicines in paediatric inpatients at an Australian teaching hospital. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health* 49(1): 38–42.

Bazzano, A.T. , R. Mangione-Smith , M. Schonlau , M.J. Suttrop , and R.H. Brook . 2009. Off-label prescribing to children in the United States outpatient setting. *Academic Pediatrics* 9(2):

- The CATT Research Group . 2011. Ranibizumab and bevacizumab for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *New England Journal of Medicine* 364: 1897–1908.
- Chalumeau, M. , J.M. Treluyer , B. Salanave , 2000. Off label and unlicensed drug use among French office based paediatricians. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 83(6): 502–505.
- Charmaz, K. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Chen, D.T. , M.K. Wynia , R.M. Moloney , and G.C. Alexander . 2009. U.S. physician knowledge of the FDA-approved indications and evidence base for commonly prescribed drugs: Results of a national survey. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 18(11): 1094–1100.
- Chen, H. , A.D. Deshpande , R. Jiang , and B.C. Martin . 2005. An epidemiological investigation of off-label anticonvulsant drug use in the Georgia Medicaid population. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 14(9): 629–638.
- Chen, H. , J.H. Reeves , J.E. Fincham , W.K. Kennedy , J.H. Dorfman , and B.C. Martin . 2006. Off-label use of antidepressant, anticonvulsant, and antipsychotic medications among Georgia Medicaid enrollees in 2001. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 67(6): 972–982.
- Cohen, D. 2015a. GMC is criticised for refusing to disclose reasons behind its advice to support prescribing for Lucentis rather than Avastin for wet AMD. *British Medical Journal* 350: h1981.
- Cohen, D. . 2015b. Why have UK doctors been deterred from prescribing Avastin? *British Medical Journal* 350: h1654.
- Conti, R.M. , A.C. Bernstein , V.M. Villaflor , R.L. Schilsky , M.B. Rosenthal , and P.B. Bach . 2013. Prevalence of off-label use and spending in 2010 among patent-protected chemotherapies in a population-based cohort of medical oncologists. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 31(9): 1134–1139.
- Czarniak, P. , L. Bint , L. Favier , R. Parsons , J. Hughes , and B. Sunderland . 2015. Clinical setting influences off-label and unlicensed prescribing in a paediatric teaching hospital. *PLoS ONE* 10(3): e0120630.
- Demonaco, H.J. , A. Ali , and E. Hippel . 2006. The major role of clinicians in the discovery of off-label drug therapies. *Pharmacotherapy* 26(3): 323–332.
- Dickson, N. 2015. The GMC's stance on Avastin. *British Medical Journal* 350: h2043.
- Donovan, P.J. , J. Iedema , D.S. McLeod , P. Kubler , and P. Pillans . 2013. Off-label use of recombinant factor VIIa in two tertiary hospitals in Queensland. *ANZ Journal of Surgery* 83(3): 149–154.
- Dooms, M. , D. Cassiman , and S. Simoons . 2016. Off-label use of orphan medicinal products: A Belgian qualitative study. *Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases* 11(1): 144.
- Ekins-Daukes, S. , P.J. Helms , M.W. Taylor , and J.S. McLay . 2005. Off-label prescribing to children: Attitudes and experience of general practitioners. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 60(2): 145–149.
- Ellul, I. , V. Grech , and S. Attard-Montalto . 2016. Maltese prescribers use of off-label and unlicensed medicines in children: Perceptions and attitudes. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 38(4): 788–792.
- Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group . 1992. Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. *JAMA* 268(17): 2420–2425.
- Food and Drug Administration . 2014a. Guidance for industry: Distributing scientific and medical publications on unapproved new uses—recommended practices (draft). www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM387652.pdf. Accessed January 20, 2018.
- Food and Drug Administration . 2014b. “Off-label” and investigational use of marketed drugs, biologics, and medical devices—information sheet. www.fda.gov/RegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm126486.htm. Accessed January 20, 2018.
- Fukada, C. , J.C. Kohler , H. Boon , Z. Austin , and M. Krahn . 2012. Prescribing gabapentin off label: Perspectives from psychiatry, pain and neurology specialists. *Canadian Pharmacists Journal (Ottawa)* 145(6): 280–284.

Fulford, K.W.M. 2014. Values-based practice: The facts. In *Debates in values-based medicines: Arguments for and against*, edited by M. Loughlin , 3–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ghinea, N. , I. Kerridge , M. Little , and W. Lipworth . 2017. Challenges to the validity of using medicine labels to categorize clinical behavior: An empirical and normative critique of “off-label” prescribing. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 23(3): 574–581.

Haines, I. 2016. St Vincent’s scandal: What’s the protocol for chemotherapy and are low doses less effective? *The Conversation*, August 4.

Hamel, S. , D.S. McNair , N.J. Birkett , D.R. Mattison , A. Krantis , and D. Krewski . 2015. Off-label use of cancer therapies in women diagnosed with breast cancer in the United States. *SpringerPlus* 4(1): 209.

Herring, C. , A. McManus , and A. Weeks . 2010. Off-label prescribing during pregnancy in the UK: An analysis of 18,000 prescriptions in Liverpool Women’s Hospital. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice* 18(4): 226–229.

Horton, R. 1998. The grammar of interpretive medicine. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 159(3): 245–249.

Kamble, P. , J. Sherer , H. Chen , and R. Aparasu . 2010. Off-label use of second-generation antipsychotic agents among elderly nursing home residents. *Psychiatric Services* 61(2): 130–136.

Krause, E. , S. Malorgio , A. Kuhn , C. Schmid , M. Baumann , and D. Surbek . 2011. Off-label use of misoprostol for labor induction: A nation-wide survey in Switzerland. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 159(2): 324–328.

Leslie, D.L. , and R. Rosenheck . 2012. Off-label use of antipsychotic medications in Medicaid. *American Journal of Managed Care* 18(3): e109–e117.

Lindell-Osuagwu, L. , M.J. Korhonen , S. Saano , M. Helin-Tanninen , T. Naaranlahti , and H. Kokki . 2009. Off-label and unlicensed drug prescribing in three paediatric wards in Finland and review of the international literature. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 34(3): 277–287.

Lipworth, W. 2011. Counting the cost of off-label prescribing. *MJA Insight*, June 27.

Little, M. , W. Lipworth , J. Gordon , P. Markham , and I. Kerridge . 2012. Values-based medicine and modest foundationalism. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 18(5): 1020–1026.

Lock, D. 2015. Avastin and Lucentis: A guide through the legal maze. *British Medical Journal* 350: h1377.

Logan, A.C. , V. Yank , and R.S. Stafford . 2011. Off-label use of recombinant factor VIIa in U.S. hospitals: Analysis of hospital records. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 154(8): 516–522.

Magalhaes, J. , A.T. Rodrigues , F. Roque , A. Figueiras , A. Falcao , and M.T. Herdeiro . 2015 Use of off-label and unlicensed drugs in hospitalised paediatric patients: A systematic review. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 71(1): 1–13.

Marchese, D. 2017. Chemotherapy dosage controversy: Doctor John Grygiel settles unfair dismissal case. *ABC News*, March 24.

Mellor, J.D. , K.E. Bensted , and P.L. Chan . 2009. Off label and unlicensed prescribing in a specialist oncology center in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Oncology* 5(4): 242–246.

Mellor, J.D. , P. Van Koeverden , S.W. Yip , A. Thakerar , S.W. Kirs , and M. Michael . 2012. Access to anticancer drugs: Many evidence-based treatments are off-label and unfunded by the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. *Internal Medicine Journal* 42(11): 1224–1229.

Morse, J.M. 1994. “Emerging from the data”: The cognitive process of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*, edited by J.M. Morse , 23–43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neubert, A. , I.C. Wong , A. Bonifazi , 2008. Defining off-label and unlicensed use of medicines for children: Results of a Delphi survey. *Pharmacological Research* 58(5–6): 316–322.

NSW Ministry of Health . 2016. Inquiry under section 122 of the Health Services Act 1997: Off-protocol prescribing of chemotherapy for head and neck cancers. www.health.nsw.gov.au/patients/cancertreatment/pages/cancer-patients-inquiry.aspx. Accessed January 20, 2018.

Palmaro, A. , R. Bissuel , N. Renaud , 2015. Off-label prescribing in pediatric outpatients. *Pediatrics* 135(1): 49–58.

Peacock, M. 2016. Up to seventy cancer patients given wrong dose for three years at Sydney's St Vincent's Hospital. ABC News, February 19.

Radley, D.C. , S.N. Finkelstein , and R.S. Stafford . 2006. Off-label prescribing among office-based physicians. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 166(9): 1021–1026.

Shah, S.S. , M. Hall , D.M. Goodman , 2007. Off-label drug use in hospitalized children. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 161(3): 282–290.

Soares, M. 2005. "Off-label" indications for oncology drug use and drug compendia: History and current status. *Journal of Oncology Practice* 1(3): 102–105.

Tonelli, M.R. 2009. Evidence-free medicine: Forgoing evidence in clinical decision making. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 52(2): 319–331.

Toulmin, S. 2009. *Return to reason*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Upshur, R. 2002. If not evidence, then what? Or does medicine really need a base? *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practicing* 8(2): 113–119.

Upshur, R. . 2014. Does medicine need a base? A critique of modest foundationalism. In *Debates in values-based practice: Arguments for and against*, edited by M. Loughlin . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wasserman, E. 2015. European pharma lobby says "non" to French funding for off-label Avastin. *FiercePharma*, September 2.

Weiss, E. , M. Hummer , D. Koller , H. Ulmer , and W.W. Fleischhacker . 2000. Off-label use of antipsychotic drugs. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology* 20(6): 695–698.

Wong, J. , A. Motulsky , M. Abrahamowicz , T. Eguale , D.L. Buckeridge , and R. Tamblyn . 2017. Off-label indications for antidepressants in primary care: Descriptive study of prescriptions from an indication based electronic prescribing system. *British Medical Journal* 356: j603.

Clinical Quandaries Associated With Accelerated Access to Medicines

ABIM Foundation, ACP-ASIM Foundation, and European Federation of Internal Medicine . 2002. Medical professionalism in the new millennium: A physician charter. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 136(3): 243–246.

Accelerated access review: Final report. 2017. London: Crown Copyright.

Applbaum, A.I. 1999. *Ethics for adversaries: The morality of roles in public and professional life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Australian Medical Association . 2016. AMA code of ethics 2004. Editorially revised 2006. Revised 2016. Canberra: Australian Medical Association.
https://ama.com.au/sites/default/files/documents/AMA%20Code%20of%20Ethics%202004.%20Editorially%20Revised%202006.%20Revised%202016_0.pdf. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Australian Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee . 2015. Availability of new, innovative and specialist cancer drugs in Australia. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Bach, P.B. , S.A. Giral , and L.B. Salt . 2017. FDA approval of Tisagenlecleucel: Promise and complexities of a \$475000 cancer drug. *JAMA* 318(19): 1861–1862.

Banzi, R. , C. Gerardi , V. Bertele , and S. Garattini . 2015. Approvals of drugs with uncertain benefit-risk profiles in Europe. *European Journal of Internal Medicine* 26(8): 572–584.

Cancer Drugs Alliance . 2018. Demand access to timely and affordable medicines. Sydney: Cancer Drugs Alliance. www.cancerdrugsalliance.org.au. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Cashin, C. , Y.-L. Chi , P. Smith , M. Borowitz , and S. Thomson . 2014. *Paying for performance in health care: Implications for health system performance and accountability*. New York, NY: WHO.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention . 2017. Health expenditures. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/health-expenditures.htm. Accessed

January 25, 2018.

Charmaz, K. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Chee, T.T. , A.M. Ryan , J.H. Wasfy , and W.B. Borden . 2016. Current state of value-based purchasing programs. *Circulation* 133(22): 2197–2205.

Crowe, K. 2017. Alexion Pharmaceuticals ordered to lower price of Soliris in Canada. CBC News, September 27. www.cbc.ca/news/health/solaris-pmprb-1.4310249. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Davis, C. , H. Naci , E. Gurpinar , E. Poplavska , A. Pinto , and A. Aggarwal . 2017. Availability of evidence of benefits on overall survival and quality of life of cancer drugs approved by European Medicines Agency: Retrospective cohort study of drug approvals 2009–13. *British Medical Journal* 359: j4530.

Department of Health . 2018. *Pharmaceutical benefits fees, patient contributions and safety net thresholds*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

www.pbs.gov.au/info/healthpro/explanatory-notes/front/fee. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Dore, G. , and M. Martinello . 2016. Weekly dose: Sofosbuvir: What's the price of a hepatitis C cure? *The Conversation*, August 3. <https://theconversation.com/weekly-dose-sofosbuvir-whats-the-price-of-a-hepatitis-c-cure-63208>. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Edwards, B. 2016. Cancer drugs: The case for Keytruda. *NBR*, March 3. www.nbr.co.nz/opinion/nz-politics-daily-cancer-drugs-case-keytruda. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Fojo, T. , S. Mailankody , and A. Lo . 2014. Unintended consequences of expensive cancer therapeutics: The pursuit of marginal indications and a me-too mentality that stifles innovation and creativity: The John Conley lecture. *JAMA Otolaryngol— Head and Neck Surgery* 140(12): 1225–1236.

Gallagher, S. , and M. Little . 2017. Doctors on values and advocacy: A qualitative and evaluative study. *Health Care Analysis* 25(4): 370–385.

Gallego, G. , S.J. Taylor , and J.-A. Brien . 2007. Provision of pharmaceuticals in Australian hospitals: Equity of access? *Pharmacy World and Science* 29(2): 47–50.

Ghinea, N. , W. Lipworth , R. Day , A. Hill , D.J. Dore , and M. Danta . 2017. Importation of generic hepatitis C therapies: Bridging the gap between price and access in high-income countries. *Lancet* 389(10075): 1268–1272.

Ghinea, N. , W. Lipworth , and M. Little . 2017. Access to high cost cancer medicines through the lens of an Australian senate inquiry: Defining the “goods” at stake. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 14(3): 401–410.

Goldhill, O. 2015. 25,450 Americans will die this year waiting for cancer drugs that could treat them. *Quartz*, November 22. <https://qz.com/556638/25450-americans-will-die-this-year-waiting-for-cancer-drugs-that-could-treat-them/>. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Health Services Research Association of Australia and New Zealand . 2016. *Health expenditure Australia 2014–15*. Canberra: Health Services Research Association Australia and New Zealand, October 6. www.hsraanz.org/health-expenditure-australia-2014-15/. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Hirschler, B. 2016. Biden vows to expedite approval of cancer therapies. *Huffington Post*, January 20. www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/biden-pledges-faster-us-approval-for-cancer-drug-cocktails_us_569fb82fe4b0875553c28338. Accessed January 25, 2018.

Holm, S. 2011. Can “giving preference to my patients” be explained as a role related duty in public health care systems? *Health Care Analysis* 19(1): 89–97.

Huddle, T.S. 2005. Viewpoint: Teaching professionalism: Is medical morality a competency? *Academic Medicine* 80(10): 885–891.

Huddle, T.S. 2011. Perspective: Medical professionalism and medical education should not involve commitments to political advocacy. *Academic Medicine* 86(3): 378.

Huddle, T.S. 2013. The limits of social justice as an aspect of medical professionalism. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 38(4): 369–387.

Huddle, T.S. 2014. Political activism is not mandated by medical professionalism. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 51–53.

Joffe, S. , and H.F. Lynch . 2018. Federal right-to-try legislation: Threatening the FDA's public health mission. *New England Journal of Medicine* 378(8): 695–697.

- Jordens, C.F.C. 2000. Outcome studies: An ethical perspective. In *Surgery, ethics and the law*, edited by B. Dooley , M. Fearnside , and M. Gorton , 63–73. Melbourne: Blackwell Science Asia.
- Kaplan, S. 2017. Who you calling “slow”? FDA may bristle at Trump’s latest dig. *STAT News*, March 1. www.statnews.com/2017/03/01/fda-trump-approval-process/. Accessed January 25, 2018.
- Kim, C. , and V. Prasad . 2015. Cancer drugs approved on the basis of a surrogate end point and subsequent overall survival: An analysis of 5 years of US Food and Drug Administration approvals. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 175(12): 1992–1994.
- Kopelman, L.M. 1999. Help from Hume reconciling professionalism and managed care. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 24(4): 396–410.
- Light, D.W. , and D. Hughes . 2001. Introduction: A sociological perspective on rationing: Power, rhetoric and situated practices. *Sociology of Health & Illness* 23(5): 551–569.
- Medical Board of Australia . 2014. Good medical practice: A code of conduct for doctors in Australia. Melbourne: Medical Board of Australia. www.medicalboard.gov.au/Codes-Guidelines-Policies/Code-of-conduct.aspx. Accessed January 25, 2018.
- Montgomery, K. , and E.S. Schneller . 2007. Hospitals’ strategies for orchestrating selection of physician preference items. *Milbank Quarterly* 85(2): 307–335.
- Morse, J.M. 1994. “Emerging from the data”: The cognitive processes of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*, edited by J.M. Morse , 23–43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- OECD . 2016. Health at a glance: Europe 2016— State of health in the EU cycle. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2017. Pharmaceutical spending. Geneva: OECD Publishing. <https://data.oecd.org/healthres/pharmaceutical-spending.htm>. Accessed January 25, 2018.
- Pace, J. , S.-A. Pearson , and W. Lipworth . 2015. Improving the legitimacy of medicines funding decisions: A critical literature review. *Therapeutic Innovation and Regulatory Science* 49(3): 364–368.
- Paige, L. 2015. Value-based payments: But is there any value for doctors? *Medscape*, October 8. www.medscape.com/viewarticle/848306. Accessed January 25, 2018.
- Pellegrino, E.D. 1986. Rationing health care: The ethics of medical gatekeeping. *Journal of Contemporary Health Law and Policy* 2: 23–45.
- Pray, L.A. 2008. Gleevec: The breakthrough in cancer treatment. *Nature Education* 1(1): 37.
- Rupp, T. , and D. Zuckerman . 2017. Quality of life, overall survival, and costs of cancer drugs approved based on surrogate endpoints. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 177(2): 276–277.
- Sansom, L. , W. Delaat , and J. Horvath . 2015. Review of medicines and medical devices regulation: Report on the regulatory framework for medicines and medical devices. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Health.
- Tilburt, J.C. 2014. Addressing dual agency: Getting specific about the expectations of professionalism. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 29–36.
- Veatch, R.M. 1990. Physicians and cost containment: The ethical conflict. *Jurimetrics* 30(4): 461–482.
- Veatch, R.M. 2009. The sources of professional ethics: Why professions fail. *The Lancet* 373 (9668): 1000–1001.
- Veatch, R.M. 2012. Hippocratic, religious, and secular ethics: The points of conflict. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 33(1): 33–43.

Managing and Regulating Conflicts of Interest in Medicine

- 1 Boring Old Man . A narrative.... 1 Boring Old Man, May 24. <http://1boringoldman.com/index.php/2015/05/24/a-narrative/>. Accessed January 23, 2018.
- American Medical Student Association . 2016. AMSA scorecard 2016. <http://amsascorecard.org/>. Accessed October 28, 2017.

Angell, M. 2004. *The truth about the drug companies: How they deceive us and what to do about it*. New York, NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Angell, M. 2009. Drug companies & doctors: A story of corruption. *The New York Review of Books* 56(1): 8–12.

Avorn, J. 2005. *Powerful medicines: The benefits, risks and costs of prescription drugs*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Barton, D. , T. Stossel , and L. Stell . 2014. After 20 years, industry critics bury skeptics, despite empirical vacuum. *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 68(6): 666–673.

Brownlee, S. 2015. The conflict denialists strike back. Lown Institute Blog, May 29. <http://lowninstitute.org/news/the-conflict-denialists-strike-back/>. Accessed January 23, 2018.

Califf, R. , D.A. Zarin , J.M. Kramer , R.E. Sherman , L.H. Aberle , and A. Tasneem . 2012. Characteristics of clinical trials registered in ClinicalTrials.gov, 2007–2010. *JAMA* 307(17): 1838–1847.

Chapman, E.N. , A. Kaatz , and M. Carnes . 2013. Physicians and implicit bias: How doctors may unwittingly perpetuate health care disparities. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 28(11): 1504–1510.

Chapman, S. , B. Morrell , R. Forsyth , I. Kerridge , and C. Stewart . 2012. Policies and practices on competing interests of academic staff in Australian universities. *Medical Journal of Australia* 196(7): 452–456.

Charmaz, K. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Dana, J. , and G. Loewenstein . 2003. A social science perspective on gifts to physicians from industry. *JAMA* 290(2): 252–255.

Davies, E. 2013. Investigating the fallout of a suicide. *BMJ* 347: f6039.

Dean, J. 2015. Private practice is unethical: And doctors should give it up. *BMJ* 350: h2299.

DeAngelis, C.D. 2017. Medicine: A profession in distress. *The Milbank Quarterly*, November 14, online exclusive. www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/medicine-profession-distress/

Doran, E. , I. Kerridge , P. McNeill , and D. Henry . 2006. Empirical uncertainty and moral contest: A qualitative analysis of the relationship between medical specialists and the pharmaceutical industry in Australia. *Social Science & Medicine* 62(6): 1510–1519.

Drazen, J.M. 2015. Revisiting the commercial: Academic interface. *New England Journal of Medicine* 372(19): 1853–1854.

Dunn, A.G. , E. Coiera , K.D. Mandl , and F.T. Bourgeois . 2016. Conflict of interest disclosure in biomedical research: A review of current practices, biases, and the role of public registries in improving transparency. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 1(1): 1.

The Editors . 2015. Walking the tightrope of academia-industry relationships. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 163(6): 477–478.

Elliott, C. 2010. *White coat, black hat: Adventures on the dark side of medicine*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Farkas, J. 2015. Dear NEJM: We both know that conflicts of interest matter. *Pulmcrit Blog*, May 31. <https://emcrit.org/pulmcrit/dear-nejm-we-both-know-that-conflicts-of-interest-matter/>. Accessed January 24, 2018.

Freidson, E. 1970. *The profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead.

Glaser, B.E. , and L.A. Bero . 2005. Attitudes of academic and clinical researchers toward financial ties in research: A systematic review. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 11(4): 553–573.

Godlee, F. 2015. Conflict of interest: Forward not backward. *BMJ* 350: h3176.

Grundy, Q. , L. Tierney , C. Mayes , and W. Lipworth . 2017. Health professionals “make their choice”: Pharmaceutical industry leaders’ understandings of conflict of interest. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 14(4): 541–553.

Healy, D. 2012. *Pharmageddon*. Berkeley, CA and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Horton, R. 2015. Offline: The BMJ vs NEJM—Lessons for us all. *The Lancet* 385(9984): 2238.

Institute of Medicine Committee on Conflict of Interest in Medical Research, Education, and Practices . 2009. Conflict of interest in medical research, education, and practice. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK22937/. Accessed October 10, 2015.

Leahey, E. , and K. Montgomery . 2011. The meaning of regulation in a changing academic profession. In *The American academic profession: Changing forms and functions*, edited by Joseph Hermanowicz , 295–311. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lenzer, J. , and S. Brownlee . 2015. Diverting attention from financial conflicts of interest. *BMJ* 350: h3505.

Lipworth, W. , K. Montgomery , and M. Little . 2013. How pharmaceutical industry employees manage competing moral commitments. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 10(3): 355–367.

Loder, E. , C. Brizzell , and F. Godlee . 2015. Revisiting the commercial: Academic interface in medical journals. *BMJ* 350: h2957.

Lundh, A. , S. Sismondo , J. Lexchin , O. Busuioac , and L. Bero . 2012. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 12.

McCarthy, M. 2015. New England Journal of Medicine reconsiders relationship with industry. *BMJ* 350: h2575.

Miller, S. 2009. *The moral foundations of social institutions: A philosophical study*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Molchan, S. 2015. Criticism of NEJM's defense of industry: Physician relations. *Health News Review Blog*, May 14. www.healthnewsreview.org/2015/05/criticism-of-nejms-defense-of-industry-physician-relations/. Accessed January 23, 2018.

Morse, J.M. 1994. "Emerging from the data": The cognitive processes of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*, edited by J.M. Morse , 23–43. Thousand Oaks, CA, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Norris, S.L. , H.K. Holmer , L.A. Ogden , S.S. Selph , and R. Fu . 2012. Conflict of interest disclosures for clinical practice guidelines in the national guideline clearinghouse. *PLoS ONE* 7(11): e47343.

Prasad, V. 2015. Why Lisa Rosenbaum gets conflict of interest policies wrong. *Lown Institute Blog*, May 28. <http://lowninstitute.org/news/why-lisa-rosenbaum-gets-conflict-of-interest-policies-wrong/>. Accessed January 23, 2018.

Prosser, H. , S. Almond , and T. Walley . 2003. Influence on GPs' decision to prescribe new drugs: The importance of who says what. *Family Practice* 20(1): 61–68.

Rockey, S.J. , and F.S. Collins . 2010. Managing financial conflict of interest in biomedical research. *JAMA* 303(23): 2400–2402.

Rodwin, M.A. 2012. Conflicts of interest, institutional corruption, and pharma: An agenda for reform. *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics* 40(3): 511–522.

Rosenbaum, L. 2015a. Beyond moral outrage: Weighing the trade-offs of COI regulation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 372(21): 2064–2068.

Rosenbaum, L. 2015b. Reconnecting the dots: Reinterpreting industry–Physician relations. *New England Journal of Medicine* 372(19): 1860–1864.

Rosenbaum, L. 2015c. Understanding bias: The case for careful study. *New England Journal of Medicine* 372(20): 1959–1963.

Scott, W.R. 2014. *Institutions and organizations*, 4th ed. Los Angeles, CA, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington, DC: Sage Publications.

Shaywitz, D. , and T. Stossel . 2009. It's time to fight the "pharmascolds." *The Wall Street Journal*, April 8. www.wsj.com/articles/SB123914780537299005. Accessed October 13, 2015.

Steensma, D.P. 2015. Key opinion leaders. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 33(28): 3213–3214.

Steinbrook, R. 2011. Future directions in industry funding of continuing medical education. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 171(3): 257–258.

Steinbrook, R. , J.P. Kassirer , and M. Angell . 2015. Justifying conflicts of interest in medical journals: A very bad idea. *BMJ* 350: h2942.

Steinman, M.A. , C.S. Landefeld , and R.B. Baron . 2012. Industry support of CME: Are we at the tipping point? *New England Journal of Medicine* 366(12): 1069–1071.

Stell, L.K. 2010. Avoiding over-deterrence in managing physicians' relationships with industry. *American Journal of Bioethics* 10(1): 27–29.

Steneck, N.H. 1999. Confronting misconduct in science in the 1980s and 1990s: What has and has not been accomplished? *Science and Engineering Ethics* 5(2): 161–175.

Stone, K. 2015. NEJM reignites conflict-of-interest debate with reader poll. *Health News Review*, June 2. www.healthnewsreview.org/2015/06/nejm-reignites-conflict-of-interest-debate-with-reader-poll/. Accessed March 07, 2018.

Stossel, T.P. , and L.K. Stell . 2011. Time to “walk the walk” about industry ties to enhance health. *Nature Medicine* 17(4): 437–438.

Taitsman, J.K. 2011. Educating physicians to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse. *New England Journal of Medicine* 364(2): 102–103.

Williams, J. , C. Mayes , P. Komesaroff , I. Kerridge , and W. Lipworth . 2017. Conflicts of interest in medicine: Taking diversity seriously. *Internal Medicine Journal* 47(7): 739–746.

Zinner, D.E. , C.M. DesRoches , M.S.J. Bristol , B. Claridge , and E.G. Campbell . 2010. Tightening conflict-of-interest policies: The impact of 2005 ethics rules at the NIH. *Academic Medicine* 85(11): 1685–1691.

Medical Professionals as Expert Advisors in Macroallocation

ABIM Foundation . 2004. Medical professionalism in the new millennium: A physicians' charter, September 2. www.abimfoundation.org/what-we-do/physician-charter. Accessed February 1, 2018.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare . 2014. Medical workforce 2012. In *National health workforce series*. Canberra: AIHW.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare . 2016. *Australia's medical workforce 2015*. Canberra: AIHW.

Australian Medical Association . 2017. AMA code of ethics 2004. Editorially revised 2006. Revised 2016. Australian Medical Association. ama.com.au/position-statement/ama-code-ethics-2004-editorially-revised-2006. Accessed April 22, 2017.

Bærøe, K. 2008. Priority setting in health care: On the relation between reasonable choices on the micro-level and the macro-level. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 29(2): 87.

Bagshaw, P. , and P. Barnett . 2017. Physician advocacy in Western medicine: A 21st century challenge. *The New Zealand Medical Journal* 130(1466): 83–89.

Belcher, H. 2014. Power, politics and health care. In *Second opinion: An introduction to health sociology*, edited by J. Germov , 356–379. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Cassel, C.K. 1985. Doctors and allocation decisions: A new role in the new medicare. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 10(3): 549–564.

Charmaz, K. 2014. *Constructing grounded theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Contandriopoulos, D. 2011. On the nature and strategies of organized interests in health care policy making. *Administration & Society* 43(1): 45–65.

Croft, D. , S.J. Jay , E.M. Meslin , M.M. Gaffney , and J.D. Odell . 2012. Perspective: Is it time for advocacy training in medical education? *Academic Medicine* 87(9): 1165–1170.

Daniels, N. 2016. Resource allocation and priority setting. In *Public health ethics: Cases spanning the globe*, edited by D.H. Barrett , L.H. Ortmann , A. Dawson , C. Saenz , A. Reis , and G. Bolan . Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Daniels, N. , and J. Sabin . 1997. Limits to health care: Fair procedures, democratic deliberation and the legitimacy problems for insurers. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 26(4): 303–350.

Danziger, M. 1995. Policy analysis postmodernized. *Policy Studies Journal* 23(3): 435–450.

de Kort, S.J. , N. Kenny , P. van Dijk , S. Gevers , D.J. Richel , and D.L. Willems . 2007. Cost issues in new disease-modifying treatments for advanced cancer: In-depth interviews with physicians. *European Journal of Cancer* 43(13): 1983–1989.

DuBois, J.M. 2017. Physician decision making and the web of influence. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 17(6): 24–26.

DuBois, J.M. , E.M. Kraus , A.A. Mikulec , S. Cruz-Flores , and E. Bakanas . 2013. A humble task: Restoring virtue in an age of conflicted interests. *Academic Medicine* 88(7): 924–928.

Duckett, S.J. 1984. Special issue: Health and health care in Australasia structural interests and Australian health policy. *Social Science & Medicine* 18(11): 959–966.

Dunn, M. , M. Sheehan , T. Hope , and M. Parker . 2012. Toward methodological innovation in empirical ethics research. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 21(4): 466–480.

Earnest, M.A. , S.L. Wong , and S.G. Federico . 2010. Perspective: Physician advocacy: What is it and how do we do it? *Academic Medicine* 85(1): 63–67.

Ebbesen, M. , and B.D. Pedersen . 2007. Using empirical research to formulate normative ethical principles in biomedicine. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 10(1): 33–48.

Gallego, G. , S. Fowler , and K. van Gool . 2008. Decision makers' perceptions of health technology decision making and priority setting at the institutional level. *Australian Health Review* 32(3): 520–527.

Gillon, R. 1986. *Philosophical medical ethics*. Chichester: Wiley.

Gottweis, H. 2007. Rhetoric in policy making: Between logos, ethos, and pathos. In *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics & methods*, edited by F. Fischer , G.J. Miller , and M.S. Sidney . Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis.

Gruen, R.L. , E.G. Campbell , and D. Blumenthal . 2006. Public roles of US physicians: Community participation, political involvement, and collective advocacy. *JAMA* 296(20): 2467–2475.

Homan, M.S. 2004. *Promoting community change: Making it happen in the real world*, Vol. 3. Belmont, CA: Thomson, Brooks, Cole.

Huddle, T.S. 2011. Perspective: Medical professionalism and medical education should not involve commitments to political advocacy. *Academic Medicine* 86(3): 378–383.

Huddle, T.S. . 2013a. The limits of social justice as an aspect of medical professionalism. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 38(4): 369–387.

Huddle, T.S. . 2013b. The limits of social justice as an aspect of medical professionalism. *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 38(4): 369–387.

Huddle, T.S. . 2014. Political activism is not mandated by medical professionalism. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 51–53.

Ives, J. , and H. Draper . 2009. Appropriate methodologies for empirical bioethics: It's all relative. *Bioethics* 23(4): 249–258.

Kenny, N. , and C. Joffres . 2008. An ethical analysis of international health priority-setting. *Health Care Analysis* 16(2): 145–160.

Kerridge, I.H. , M. Lowe , and C. Stewart . 2013. *Ethics and law for the health professions*. Annandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

Kesselheim, A.S. , and W.H. Maisel . 2010. Managing financial and nonfinancial conflicts of interest in healthcare delivery. *American Journal of Therapeutics* 17(4): 440–443.

Kilner, J.F. 2004. Healthcare resources, allocation of: I. Macroallocation. In *Encyclopedia of bioethics*, edited by S.G. Post , 1098–1107. New York, NY: Macmillan Reference USA.

Klein, R. , P. Day , and S. Redmayne . 1996. *Managing scarcity: Priority setting and rationing in the National Health Service*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Klugman, C. 2017. Shining light on conflicts of interest. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 17(6): 1–3.

Landwehr, C. 2010. Democratic and technocratic policy deliberation. *Critical Policy Studies* 3(3–4): 434–439.

Landwehr, C. , and D. Klinnert . 2015. Value congruence in health care priority setting: Social values, institutions and decisions in three countries. *Health Economics, Policy and Law* 10(2): 113–132.

Light, D.W. , and D. Hughes . 2001. Introduction: A sociological perspective on rationing: Power, rhetoric and situated practices. *Sociology of Health & Illness* 23(5): 551–569.

Lo, B. , and M.J. Field . 2009. *Conflict of interest in medical research, education, and practice*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Majone, G. 1989. *Evidence, argument, and persuasion in the policy process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Martin, D. , J. Abelson , and P. Singer . 2002. Participation in health care priority-setting through the eyes of the participants. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 7(4): 222–229.
- Martin, D. , M. Giacomini , and P. Singer . 2002. Fairness, accountability for reasonableness, and the views of priority setting decision-makers. *Health Policy* 61(3): 279–290.
- Mayes, C. , W. Lipworth , and I. Kerridge . 2016. Declarations, accusations and judgement: Examining conflict of interest discourses as performative speech-acts. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 19(3): 455–462.
- McKie, J. , B. Shrimpton , R. Hurworth , C. Bell , and J. Richardson . 2008. Who should be involved in health care decision making? A qualitative study. *Health Care Analysis* 16(2): 114–126.
- Oakley, J. 2014. A virtue ethics analysis of disclosure requirements and financial incentives as responses to conflicts of interest in physician prescribing. In *The future of bioethics: International dialogues*, edited by A. Akabayashi , 669–676. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pugh, J. 2018. Navigating individual and collective interests in medical ethics. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 44(1): 1–2.
- Ross, K.M. , and E. Bernabeo . 2014. When professional obligations collide: Context matters. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 38–40.
- Rumbold, B. , R. Baker , O. Ferraz , 2017. Universal health coverage, priority setting, and the human right to health. *The Lancet* 390(10095): 712–714.
- Sabin, J.E. 2000. Fairness as a problem of love and the heart: A clinician's perspective on priority setting. In *The global challenge of health care rationing*, edited by A. Coulter and C. Ham . Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Scheunemann, L.P. , and D.B. White . 2011. The ethics and reality of rationing in medicine. *Chest* 140(6): 1625–1632.
- Smith, N. , C. Mitton , A. Davidson , and I. Williams . 2014. A politics of priority setting: Ideas, interests and institutions in healthcare resource allocation. *Public Policy and Administration* 29(4): 331–347.
- Thistlethwaite, J. , and J. Spencer . 2008. *Professionalism in medicine*. Oxford: Radcliffe Publishing.
- Tilburt, J.C. 2014. Addressing dual agency: Getting specific about the expectations of professionalism. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 29–36.
- Tilburt, J.C. , and B. Brody . 2016. Doubly distributing special obligations: What professional practice can learn from parenting. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 44: 212–216.
- Ubel, P.A. 2014. Agency is messy: Get used to it. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 37–38.
- Wasserman, D. , and A. Wertheimer . 2014. In defense of bunkering. *American Journal of Bioethics* 14(9): 42–43.
- Whitty, J.A. , and P. Littlejohns . 2015. Social values and health priority setting in Australia: An analysis applied to the context of health technology assessment. *Health Policy* 119(2): 127–136.
- Williams, J.R. 2005. *Medical ethics manual*. Cedex, France: World Medical Association.

After Dominance

- Abbott, A. 1988. *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Amundson, R. 2000. Against normal function. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 31(1): 33–53.
- Boorse, C. 1975. On the distinction between disease and illness. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 5: 49–68.
- Boorse, C. . 1977. Health as a theoretical concept. *Philosophy of Science* 44(4): 542–573.
- Breggin, P.R. 1993. Psychiatry's role in the holocaust. *International Journal of Risk and Safety in Medicine* 4(2): 133–148.

Carter, S. , W. Rogers , C. Degeling , J. Douts , and A. Barratt . 2015. The challenge of overdiagnosis begins with its definition. *British Medical Journal* 350: h869.

Clarke, A.E. , J.K. Shim , L. Mamo , J.R. Fosket , and J.R. Fishman . 2003. Biomedicalization: Technoscientific transformations of health, illness, and U.S. biomedicine. *American Sociological Review* 68(2): 161–194.

Clouser, K.D. , and D.J. Hufford . 1993. Nonorthodox healing systems and their knowledge claims. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 18(2): 101–106.

Conrad, P. 2007. *The medicalization of society: On the transformation of human conditions into treatable disorders*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Engel, G. 1977. The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. *Science* 196(4286): 129–136.

Friedson, E. 1970. *Professional dominance: The social structure of medical care*. New York, NY: Atherton Press.

Foucault, M. 1973 [1963]. *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. London: Tavistock.

Gordon, C. 1980. Afterword. In *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–77* by Michel Foucault, edited by C. Gordon , 229–259. Sussex: Harvester Press.

Gullestad, A.M. n.d. Parasite. In *Political concepts: A critical lexicon*. www.politicalconcepts.org/issue1/2012-parasite/. Accessed April 26, 2018.

Heiskala, R. 2001. Theorizing power: Weber, Parsons, Foucault and neostructuralism. *Theory and Methods* 40(2): 241–264.

Illich, I. 1976. *Limits to medicine: Medical Nemesis: The expropriation of health*. London: Calder & Boyars.

Kleinman, A. 1988. *The illness narratives: Suffering, healing and the human condition*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

McKeown, T. 1976. *The role of medicine: Dream, mirage or nemesis?* London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust.

Moynihan, R. , and D. Henry . 2006. The fight against disease mongering: Generating knowledge for action. *PLoS Medicine* 3(4): e191.

Parens, E. 2013. On good and bad forms of medicalization. *Bioethics* 27(1): 28–35.

Parsons, T. 1951. Illness and the role of the physicians: A sociological perspective. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 21(3): 452–460.

Shelley, M.W. 1969 [1818]. *Frankenstein or the modern Prometheus*. Edited with an Introduction by M.K. Joseph . London: Oxford University Press.

Steiger, W.A. , F.H. Hoffman , A.V. Hansen , and H. Niebuhr . 1960. A definition of comprehensive medicine. *Journal of Health and Human Behaviour* 1(2): 83–86.

Sulmasy, D.P. 2002. A biopsychosocial-spiritual model for the care of patients at the end of life. *The Gerontologist* 42(S3): 24–33.

Szasz, T. 1960. The myth of mental illness. *The American Psychologist* 15(2): 113–118.

Weber, M. 1978 [1922]. *Economy and society: An outline of interpretative sociology*. Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich . Los Angeles, CA and London: University of California Press.

Welch, H.G. , L.M. Schwartz , and S. Woloshin . 2011. *Overdiagnosed: Making people sick in the pursuit of health*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

White, K.L. , J.S. Brown , and E.D. Wittkower . 1954. Comprehensive medicine. *The Canadian Medical Association Journal* 70(2): 115–122.

Willis, E. 1991. *Medical dominance: Division of labour in Australian health care*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

World Health Organization . 1948. Constitution. www.searo.who.int/about/about_searo_const.pdf. Accessed May 08, 2018.

Zola, I.K. 1972. Medicine as an institution of social control. *The Sociological Review* 20(4): 487–504.

Value Pluralism—The Bare Bones

- Archer, M. , R. Bhaskar , A. Collier , T. Lawson , and A. Norrie , eds. 1998. *Critical realism: Essential readings*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Aristotle . 1976. *The ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean ethics*. Translated by J.A.K. Thomson . London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Audi, R. 2004. *The good in the right: A theory of intuition and intrinsic value*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Beauchamp, T.L. , and J.F. Childress . 2001. *Principles of biomedical ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berlin, I. 1969 [1958]. Two concepts of liberty. In *Four essays on liberty*, 162–166. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berlin, I. . 1991 [1950]. *The crooked timber of humanity: Chapters in the history of ideas*. London: Fontana Press.
- Bhaskar, R. 1998. Critical realism and dialectic. In *Critical realism: Essential readings*, edited by M. Archer , R. Bhaskar , A. Collier , T. Lawson , and A. Norrie , 599–605. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Blackburn, S. 2014. Human nature and science: A cautionary essay. *Behaviour* 151(2–3): 229–244.
- Blackwell, T. , and J. Seabrook . 1993. *The revolt against change: Towards a conserving radicalism*. London: Vintage Books.
- Blendon, R.J. , J.M. Benson , and J.O. Hero . 2014. Public trust in physicians: U.S. medicine in international perspective. *New England Journal of Medicine* 371(17): 1570–1572.
- Bond, M.H. , K. Leung , A. Au , 2004. Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their correlates across 41 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 35(5): 548–570.
- Breen, K.J. , V.D. Plueckhahn , and S.M. Cordner . 1997. *Ethics, law and medical practice*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Bushe, G.R. 2013. Generative process, generative outcome: The transformational potential of appreciative inquiry. In *Organizational generativity: The appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of transformation (Advances in Appreciative Inquiry, Vol. 4)*, edited by D.L. Cooperrider , D.P. Zandee , L.N. Godwin , M. Avital , and B. Boland , 89–113. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limit.
- Carter, S.M. , and M. Little . 2008. Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research* 17(10): 1316–1328.
- Cheung, M.W.L. , K. Leung , and K. Au . 2006. Evaluating multilevel models in crosscultural research: An illustration with social axioms. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* 37(5): 522–541.
- Christman, J. 2004. Relational autonomy, liberal individualism, and the social constitution of selves. *Philosophical Studies* 117(1–2): 143–164.
- Daniels, N. 1980. Reflective equilibrium and Archimedian points. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 10(1): 83–103.
- Daniels, N. . 1996. *Justice and justification: Reflective equilibrium in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniels, N. . 2000. Accountability for reasonableness: Establishing a fair process for priority setting is easier than agreeing on principles. *British Medical Journal* 321(7272): 1300.
- Daniels, N. , and J.E. Sabin . 2008. Accountability for reasonableness: An update. *British Medical Journal* 337: a1850.
- DePaul, M.R. 1993 [2001]. *Balance and refinement: Beyond coherence methods of moral inquiry*. London: Routledge.
- Dewey, J. 1941. Propositions, warranted assertibility, and truth. *The Journal of Philosophy* 38(7): 169–186.

Ehninger, D. 1970. Argument as method: Its nature, its limitations and its uses. *Communications Monographs* 37(2): 101–110.

Engelhardt, H.T. 2011. Confronting moral pluralism in posttraditional western societies: Bioethics critically reassessed. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 36(3): 243–260.

Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Feyerabend, P. 1993. *Against method*, 3rd ed. London: Verso.

Fisher, R.J. 2016. Generic principles for resolving intergroup conflict. In Ronald J. Fisher: A North American pioneer in interactive conflict resolution, 87–104. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Gabler, H.W. , G. Bornstein , and G. Borland Pierce . 1995. Contemporary German editorial theory. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Gallie, W.B. 1955. Essentially contested concepts. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56: 167–198.

Gallie, W.B. . 2002. *Liberal pluralism: The implications of value pluralism for political theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gee, J.P. 1990. *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology and discourses*. London: Falmer Press.

Geertz, C. 1964. Ideology as a cultural system. In *Ideology and its discontents*, edited by D.E. Apter , 47–76. Glencoe, IL: Free Press of Glencoe.

Gray, J. 1978. On liberty, liberalism and essential contestability. *British Journal of Political Science* 8(4): 385–402.

Gray, J. . 2016. *Straw dogs: Thoughts on humans and other animals*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and semantics III: Speech acts*, edited by P. Cole and J.L. Morgado , 41–58. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Haack, S. 1993. *Evidence and inquiry*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Habermas, J. 1991. Discourse ethics: Notes on a program of philosophical justification. In *The communicative ethics controversy*, edited by S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. . 1992. *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Translated by C. Lenhardt and S.W. Nicholsen . Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hart, H.L.A. 1977. Positivism and the separation of law and morals. In *The philosophy of law*, edited by R.M. Dworkin , 17–37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hogan, J.C. , and M.D. Schwartz . 1984. A translation of Bacon's maxims of the common law. *Law Library Journal* 77: 707–718.

Holloway, M. 1966. *Heavens on earth: Utopian communities in America, 1680–1880*. Mineola, NY: Courier Corporation.

Hui, V.K.Y. , M.H. Bond , and T.S. Ng . 2006. General beliefs about the world as defensive mechanisms against death anxiety. *Omega (Westport)* 54(3): 199–214.

Hulme, M. 2009. *Why we disagree about climate change: Understanding controversy, inaction, and opportunity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hume, D. 1991. *An enquiry concerning human understanding*. Edited by L.A. Selby-Bigge . Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Joshanloo, M. , S. Afshari , and P. Rastegar . 2010. Linking social axioms with indicators of positive interpersonal, social and environmental functioning in Iran: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Psychology* 45(4): 303–310.

Kant, I. 1824. Idea of a universal history on a cosmo-political plan. *London Magazine* 385–393.

Kantowitz, A. 1977. The science court experiment. *Jurimetrics Journal* 17(4): 332–341.

Kelly, K. 2014. The technium. A conversation with Kevin Kelly by John Brockman. Edge, March 2. www.edge.org/conversation/kevin_kelly-the-technium. Accessed April 08, 2018.

Kennedy, D. 2013. The international human rights regime: Still part of the problem? In *Examining critical perspectives on human rights*, edited by R. Dickinson , E. Katselli , C. Murray and O.W. Pedersen . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kerridge, I. , M. Lowe , and J. McPhee . 2005. *Ethics and the law for the health professions*. Sydney: The Federation Press.

Kuehberger, A. 1995. The framing of decisions: A new look at old problems. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes* 62(2): 230–240.

Kurman, J. , and C. Ronen-Eilon . 2004. Lack of knowledge of a culture's social axioms and adaptation difficulties among immigrants. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology* 35(2): 192–208.

Kymlicka, W. 1989. *Liberalism, community and culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lai, J. , M. Bond , and N. Hui . 2007. The role of social axioms in predicting life satisfaction: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 8(4): 517–535.

Leibniz, G.W. 1985. *Theodicy*. Translated by E.M. Huggard . Edited by A. Farrar . Chicago, IL: Open Court.

Leung, K. , M.H. Bond , S.R. DeCarrasquel , 2002. Social axioms: The search for universal dimensions of general beliefs about how the world functions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 33(3): 286–302.

Little, M. , C.F. Jordens , C. McGrath , K. Montgomery , I. Kerridge , and S.M. Carter . 2007. Pragmatic pluralism: Mutual tolerance of contested understandings between orthodox and alternative practitioners in autologous stem cell transplantation. *Social Science & Medicine* 64: 1512–1523.

Little, M. , W. Lipworth , J. Gordon , P. Markham , and I. Kerridge . 2012. Values-based medicine and modest foundationalism. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 18(5): 1020–1026.

Loughlin, M. , ed. 2014. *Debates in values-based medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Low, A. 1997. The return of dialectic to its place in intellectual life. *Rhetoric Review* 15(2): 365–381.

MacKenzie, C. , and N. Stoljar . 2000. *Relational autonomy: Feminist perspectives on autonomy, agency, and the social self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mandell, M. , R. Keast , and D. Chamberlain . 2017. Collaborative networks and the need for a new management language. *Public Management Review* 19(3): 326–341.

Markovits, E. 2006. The trouble with being earnest: Deliberative democracy and the sincerity norm. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 14(3): 249–269.

Martin, D.K. , M. Giacomini , and P.A. Singer . 2002. Fairness, accountability for reasonableness, and the views of priority setting decision-makers. *Health Policy* 61(3): 279–290.

Mazur, A. 1993. The science court: Reminiscence and retrospective. *Risk* 4: 161–170.

Mills, C. 2007. White ignorance. In *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*, edited by S. Sullivan and N. Tuana , 13–38. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Morgan, D.L. 2007. Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1(1): 48–76.

O'Neill, O. 1987. Abstraction, idealization and ideology in ethics. In *Moral philosophy and contemporary problems*, edited by J.D.G. Evans . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pinker, S. 2002. *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York, NY: Viking Press.

Pinker, S. . 2011. *The better angels of our nature: The decline of violence in history and its causes*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Pound, R. 1921. The maxims of equity. I of maxims generally. *Harvard Law Review* 34(8): 809–836.

Prasad, V. 2015. Why Lisa Rosenbaum gets conflict of interest policies wrong. Lown Institute Blog, May 28. <http://lowninstitute.org/news/why-lisa-rosenbaum-gets-conflict-of-interest-policies-wrong/>. Accessed January 23, 2018.

Rescher, N. 1992. *Pluralism: Against the demand for consensus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rorty, R. 1982. *Consequences of pragmatism (Essays: 1972–1980)*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rosenbaum, L. 2015. Beyond moral outrage: Weighing the trade-offs of COI regulation. *New England Journal of Medicine* 372(21): 2064–2068.

- Shermer, M. 2015. *The moral arc, how science makes us better people*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Steffen, W. , W. Broadgate , L. Deutsch , O. Gaffney , and C. Ludwig . 2015. The trajectory of the anthropocene: The great acceleration. *The Anthropocene Review* 2(1): 81–98.
- Stone, K. 2015. NEJM reignites conflict-of-interest debate with reader poll. *Health News Review*, June 2. www.healthnewsreview.org/2015/06/nejm-reignites-conflict-of-interest-debate-with-reader-poll/. Accessed March 07, 2018.
- Tauber, A.I. , and S. Sarkar . 1993. The ideology of the human genome project. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 86(9): 537–540.
- Tenner, E. 1997. *Why things bite back: New technology and the revenge effect*. London: Fourth Estate.
- Tetlock, P.E. 1986. A value pluralism model of ideological reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50(4): 819.
- Thornton, P.H. , and W. Ocasio . 1999. Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology* 105(3): 801–843.
- Thornton, P.H. , W. Ocasio , and M. Lounsbury . 2012. *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Toulmin, S.E. 1972. *Human understanding: The collective use and evolution of concepts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Toulmin, S.E. . 2009. *Return to reason*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walton, D. 1989. Dialogue theory for critical thinking. *Argumentation* 3(2): 169–184.
- Walton, D. . 1996. *Argument structure: A pragmatic theory* (Toronto Studies in Philosophy). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Walton, D. . 2006. Examination dialogue: An argumentation framework for critically questioning an expert opinion. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(5): 745–777.
- Walzer, M. 1995. *Spheres of justice: A defence of pluralism and equality*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weart, S.R. 2003. *The discovery of global warming*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.