

ON THE PROFESSIONAL REASONING

Prof. Horia Dumitru Cristea Ph.D
West University of Timișoara
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Timișoara, Romania

Abstract: This paper concerns the professional reasoning as an expression of the competence based on the scientific mastery of a certain field. Thus, we have approached competence as the skill of the capacity of the professional to give an opinion on a thing based on the profound knowledge of the problem. We have presented the professional reasoning as a logical train of judgements which lead to conclusions, one taking positive or negative decisions in line with the quality of these conclusions. We have underlined the necessity of the responsibility and moral conduct of the professional who must always come close to the truth.

JEL classification: B41, G38

Key words: reasoning, professionalism, competence, principles, opinions, solutions

1. GENERALITIES

- Any profession is valuable, in the network of professions.
- Professing is based on a basic principle, the one of the REASONING of the profession or the JUDGEMENT of the professional.
- THE JUDGEMENT, THE REASONING give the prestige to the professional.
- The reasoning can be a correct or incorrect one, a positive or a negative one, a light or a dark one and so on.
- The conclusions, as results of the reason, and formulated, can be correct or not, true or false.
- Therefore, the conclusion, as result, depends on the processed parameters and the processing model selected in the use.
- The manner of obtaining conclusions is a matter of professionalism as a corollary of the 3Rs, as ethical principles, namely:
 - **R1** = self-esteem,
 - **R2** = respect for others,
 - **R3** = responsibility of own actions.
- Each principle has a translation in the professional reasoning:
 - **R1** = is a matter of the training and behaviour of the professional,
 - **R2** = means that those who use the opinions of the professional can be certain that these are correct, that they are not fake reasoning destined to manipulation,
 - **R3** = reveals the capacity of the professional to assume the proposed solutions, the provided variants, not applying the law “the other one is to blame”.
- This is the only way we can talk about morality in the profession, whichever it may be.

- The reasoning is applied in an environment full of risks.
- Part of these risks are among the major ones:
 1. Legislation – incoherent, unstable, unclear, which leads to the lack of credibility and the increase of the scepticism and prudence in valorising the judgments and solutions of the professional.
 2. A second factor is the inconsistency which gives way to confusions and uncertainty for receivers, users. It is the result of precarious training or the use of means of alternation of the reasoning (see Lavinia Rorich: <New deformations of the reasoning>).
 3. INCOMPETENCE unknown, hidden. Here we confirm the truth that nothing is what it seems. “Not knowing the limits of the capacity to give an opinion on a thing, on an aspect based on a profound knowledge” (see DEX 2012, p.212).
 4. The fourth factor refers to the UNPROFESSIONALISM generated by the lack of a solid fundament of knowledge, of practice. It is a matter of the morality of the professional „Nothing is more immoral than practicing a profession we do not know” (Napoleon Bonaparte).
 5. Another major factor is the MENTALITY. It is important, because it is a matter of internal, strongly conservatory resorts.

The mentality is based on the ATTITUDE born of EDUCATION.

• Someone sent me, by electronic means, an interesting theme: “WHAT MAKES THE DIFFERENCE”, of which I selected the 10 rules related to the EDUCATION which, when observed and applied, support a healthy, credible reasoning:

1. ETHICS,
2. ORDER AND CLEANNESS,
3. INTEGRITY AND HONOUR,
4. PUNCTUALITY,
5. RESPONSIBILITY,
6. WISH OF PERFECTING ONESELF,
7. OBSERVING THE RULES AND REGULATIONS,
8. RESPECT FOR RIGHTS OF OTHERS,
9. LOVE FOR WORK,
10. EFFORT FOR SAVING AND WISE SPENDING.

• Nothing in the world of professions cannot be performed by itself. Only three things evolve like this, says Kotler, namely:

1. disorder,
2. frictions,
3. anti-performance.

• Or, when a professional is the one which produces the confusion, he becomes undesirable for the family he belongs to.

• the reasoning can be based on science, independence morality or it can be a deformed one, generating scepticism, suspicion and high prudence, namely a manipulative one.

• The reasoning in its turn can have different value degrees in line with the comparison landmark.

• A judgement can be correct or incorrect; right or wrong; true or false; certain or uncertain. And the binary values can continue.

2. BENEFICIARIES:

- Reasoning, as a judgement of something, is not something closed, something opaque. It is something offered to others, for different purposes. It is the judgement reached by the professional upon processing the information regarding something, judgement which he makes public, this judgement is in its turn analysed, interpreted by the users.

- The solutions, resulted upon applying the professional reasoning, can be very, very diverse. Some of them accepted with no reserves, some of them received with caution, with scepticism or with suspicion. Why? What could be the cause?

- The users may or may not have faith in the professional in question or in the applied models and its results and interpretations.

- One must not forget that „in order to reach a dignified purpose, one must use dignified means” (said J. Nehru).

- The dignity of the professionalism depends on many elements, many factors: fidelity, individual value, professionalism, sciences, independence, morality, etc.

- The reasoning based on the values of the professional ethics gives safety to the users and the recognition of the impartial competence of the professional.

- The competence is acquired, it is not begged for.

- But to be competent is not enough if there is independence and morality in making conclusions, solutions.

- The users do not accept damaged, manipulating, false reasoning which do not support, do not help them in what they wish to accomplish (whether it is good or bad).

- When the users notice that the results of the professional’s reasoning are substantiated, based on science and morality, the trust in the professional is a high one. But when the professional’s reasoning is not a deep one, it is superficial and guided by interests unrecognised by the profession, that one is a professional only by name, meaning that he is not what he seems to be. This leads us to the solidity of the thing well-done and to deceiving appearances: “remember: Noah’s ark was built by amateurs, the Titanic was built by professionals”. Each of us can interpret this fact.

3. SATISFACTIONS:

- The professional and the users too are glad when the former states that his opinions, solutions are appreciated, used by the users and the user through the satisfaction to have a support in solving their problem/problems.

- Satisfaction, as pleasing feeling, can be found both in the positive plan of values and also in the negative one. That means it is something which depends on what is correct, true, sincere or false, incorrect, forged in order to do something unjust.

- The satisfaction generated by the professional reasoning is also given by the reputation of the professional and its superposition in the plan of reality.

- Reputation can be, in its turn, a positive one, dedicated to good and a negative one, dedicated to evil (namely the lack of good).

- Reputation also involves trust, based on competence, continual and significant development also on interpersonal level where trust lies at the basis of success in the inter-human relations.

- Satisfaction is also given by the level of the prestige and authority of the professional as a result of the intersection of the three plans in which the reasoning is manifested namely: Competence, Independence, Responsibility.

Competence is the capacity of the professional to give an opinion on a thing based on a deep knowledge of the matter. His training in the field, throughout knowledge is in question.

- Competence has different value degrees (high, average, below average) being real or hypothetical (of surface or of makeup).

*Competence without **independence** does not provide the assurance of a reasoning based on integrity, objectivity, professionalism.*

Compromise erodes competences, independence, responsibility and therefore the prestige of the professional.

Compromise leads to corruption which in its turn alternates the trust and satisfaction of those around, placing them in the state of abnormality, of uncertainty.

- Judgement, reasoning which distances itself from the positive values of the Ethic Code and Deontology of profession leads to wrong, false, unreal solutions and conclusions which lead to decisions, deeds, facts with undesired, reprehensible effects.

- The users are deceived in their expectations. Appearances can be deceitful.

4. CONCLUSIONS:

- Reasoning is the expression of processing as “logic train of judgements, which leads to a conclusion” (DEX 2012, p.914).

- Conclusion, as a result, can be correct or incorrect, real or false, positive or negative.

- Those who use the conclusions, based on the argumentations of professionals, can make decisions with positive or negative effects for themselves and the ones around them.

- So the dilemma remains: accepting the competence, the independence and the responsibility in line with the given, known training or a certain dose of scepticism and suspicion for the arguments used by the professional in judging and supporting a point of view, of a solution or an opinion.

- How responsible and profound is the one called to judge a problem for the use of the ones around him? It is a question awaiting an answer.

- Responsibility gives the professional in terms of moral independence which depends on the professional ethics.

- In applying the professional reasoning, the Conduct of the professional is based on Mülendorf Decalogue which, with adequacies proper to the field, gives trust in the solutions offered to the ones around:

1. Serve the case in itself, not the person
2. Be above the parties, as the judge you support.
3. Do not let yourself intimidated by the personal attack in your objective and impartial activity.
4. Do not consider yourselves infallible.
5. Refuse the questions that surpass your answer.
6. Use the objections against your observations not to defend yourselves but to discover the truth.
7. Right any wrong, even when done by you.

8. Be just and clear.

9. Strive first to understand the matter, otherwise no one will understand your answer.

10. Defend the prestige of the profession.

- It is clear that the professional's reasoning depends on his moral depth of not harming the people around him.

- The value principles and features do not say who the professional is but how the professional who is to apply a correct reasoning in substantiating the solutions offered to the ones around them must be.

- The argued opinions, the formulated solutions, the reached conclusions must give certainty of the solidity of the thing made by the professional.

- There are not few examples in which the professional abandoned the principles to his own use, deeply damaging the ones he served.

- His goal can be noble, the path however can be wrong.

- Observing the principles depends on the education and training of the professional. Distancing oneself from them is equivalent to turning off the light of the profession and the death of the professional.

- Confusion must not dominate in the profession.

- Confusion impedes, affects the clarity both in formulating the conclusions, the opinions and the solutions promoted by the professional and also in their reception and use by the users, by the people interested.

- Suspicion occurs as lack of trust, of doubt regarding the correctness and logic of the reasoning applied by the professional.

- Distancing from principles and using "creative" arrangements leads to a disagreement with the ethical condition, to the exiting of the system of the professional ending up in manipulating the information and the users, to deceit and flawed presentation of his conclusions, solutions.

REFERENCES

1. Bunget, O.C., The independent auditor's Raport, a product of the Audit Cristea, D.H. engagement, AAP Conferance I, Timisoara, nov. 2012.
2. Cristea, H. Rationamente fiscale, Simpozionul Ciuce Pavel, Editia X-a, 2012, Arad-Moneasa (Fiscal reasoning Ciuce Pavel Symposium, 10th Edition, 2012, Arad-Moneasa).
3. Cristea, H., Doctrina si deontologie in profesia contabila din Romania, Editura Toma, M. CECCAR, Bucuresti, 2001 (Doctrine and deontology in the accounting profession in Romania, CECCAR Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001).
4. Span, G. A. Fundamentarea rationamentului profesional in Auditul statutar, Teza de doctorat, 2012, UBB (Substantiation of the professional reasoning in the statutory audit, Doctoral thesis, 2012, UBB).
5. * * * www.Codul etic national al profesionistilor contabili, 2007 (www. The national ethical code of the accounting professionals, 2007).