

3. Work and social theory. 28 JANUARY 2015

Abstract

This chapter identifies some of the most important theoretical debates within the sociology of work and employment. It provides an historical context by introducing the key theoretical approaches that marked the birth of sociology. The chapter shows the importance of this theoretical canon for developments in a discipline that span over two hundred years. Yet it also highlights absences from the canon, and identifies some of the most important theoretical ideas for the contemporary sociological understanding of work and employment that have emerged since. The chapter starts and ends by pointing readers to the contested meaning of the very concept of work. It concludes by reflecting on the purpose of social theorising.

Key words/phrases/topics 5-10 Alienation; anomie; the protestant ethic; rationalisation and bureaucracy; social closure; intersectionality; domestic work; public sociology

Introduction

In over two centuries of sociological thinking, theorists have differed markedly in their approaches to, and their understandings of the role that work plays in society and in peoples' everyday lives. As Budd (2011) discusses, the role of work has been understood in remarkably different ways. Work is seen by some writers as curse, by others as freedom. It has been viewed alternately as a commodity and a route to citizenship; as a disutility and as the basis of both personal fulfilment and identity

formation. Work can be understood as a social relation, as caring for others, and a service. Even more fundamentally still, 'work' is understood in considerably different ways by social theorists. 'Work' for sociology often refers to labour market outcomes; social behaviour in the workplace; and practices and arrangements that occur inside organizations, show Korczynski et al. (2006). In Pettinger et al's (2006) reflections on the meaning of the concept of work, they argue instead that sociology must explore the interconnectedness between work in all its different spheres: the public and private, paid and unpaid, divisions of labour within and across these domains; as well as legal and illegal markets. The meaning of 'work' has changed over time and varies across space and place, while the organization and experience of work is neither fixed, determined, unchanging or uniform.

Given the complexity in our topic under study, it should not be a surprise that there is no single uniform social theory of work and employment that we can summarise neatly in this chapter. There are instead major theories that can be seen to be competing, collaborating, and reinforcing, as Cappelli (2007) states. The theories of work and employment that we draw upon include a long established, though highly debated, classical canon that is associated with the birth of sociology, as well as major theories that developed throughout the twentieth century, stimulated by radical change, alongside continuities, in worlds of work. Different theories have waxed and waned in the influence that they exert on the sociology of work and employment. At certain time periods some theories have dominated our sub-discipline, losing their popularity over time, perhaps regaining it later.

The founding theorists

The discipline of sociology emerged in response to a rapidly changing world, as theorists reacted to and tried to understand major developments in Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries. This period of so-called modernity was launched by ‘great transformations’, according to Polanyi (1944), namely the multiple interlinked developments of industrialization, mechanization, a more specialized division of labour, proletarianization and urbanization. A key site for these changes was the world of work. The three theorists who were living at this time of transformation who have most informed the sociological analysis of work are Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. These so-called founding ‘fathers’ were united in a fascination with the causes of radical societal changes and in the ramifications of these changes both for the structure of society and for the everyday lives of ordinary people. None of these men were ‘sociologists of work and employment’ as such. Instead all offered much larger academic projects that talk to the sociology of work. Marx, Durkheim and Weber differed in just how much of their writing was explicitly concerned with work and employment, nevertheless paid work was crucial to the theories of all three (Offe 1985). Lastly, the three founders held contrasting views as to whether the changes they were studying signalled societal progress or a step backwards. In the next section, we summarise the main contributions that these three theorists have made to social theorising around work and employment. We pinpoint three main ideas from each, and their later influence on the discipline.

Karl Marx (Germany 1818 – 1883)

a. The centrality of work

For Marx, work is fundamental to our humanity, it sets humans apart from other animals. His belief in the centrality of work forms the bedrock of the contributions from Marx to social theorising around work and employment. Though labour was central to humanity for Marx, his specific focus (in Volume 1 of *Capital*) was on 'labour power'. Under the new capitalist mode of production, workers and capitalists entered into an employment contract. In this contract, for a wage, workers do not exchange their labour, as such, but their labour power or their ability to work. According to Jessop (2008), the 'commodification of labour power' was the distinguishing feature of capitalism for Marx.

b. The labour process

Because the profit motive was pivotal, Marx argued, the bourgeoisie sought out strategies to increase the productivity of their employees and so increase profits. Workplaces were thus managed more and more carefully in order to make efficiency gains and to monitor the workplace closely. Via the specialisation and simplification of tasks, work could be carried out more rapidly, learning times were reduced, and a less skilled and more readily replaceable workforce could be developed.

Marx's analysis of changes to the 'labour process' under capitalism came to dominate the sociology of work in the 1970's. Fundamental to the intense interest in labour process theory (LPT) was Harry Braverman's (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, with its central features, as Thompson and Smith (2009: 915) put it: the dynamics of control, consent and resistance at the point of production. LPT 'virtually redefined'

the British industrial sociology that dominated in the 1970's (Gallie 2011; Ingham 1996: 562). A range of criticisms have been levelled at it (Attewell 1987; Burawoy 1979; Edgell 2012; Friedman 1966; Littler and Salaman 1982) but LPT remains very influential, now extended beyond studies of production work, as Chapter 15 shows.

c. Alienation

Marx's reflections on the labour process under capitalism led him to develop one of the most influential concepts in the sociology of work and employment: alienation. Since it was creative and purposeful work that made workers fully human, the degrading conditions of work that Marx was witnessing were dehumanizing the workers.

Alienation reappears in the work of many sociologists, but perhaps most innovatively in theories of emotional labour. Hochschild's (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* identified a number of forms of emotional labour occurring in the workplace. She, and many others since (see for example Bolton, 2005) have shown that emotional labour is a formal requirement in many jobs, particularly in the service sector, and that there has been an expansion in managerial attempts to prescribe, supervise and measure its performance. Hochschild was interested in the ways in which service workers, from air flight attendants to debt collectors, had to manage their own emotions and those of their customers or clients. For Hochschild, having to perform emotional labour is exhausting and, because their feelings are being commodified, workers experienced heightened levels of alienation. Emotional labour theorists have gone on to query the extent to which workers are

powerless and necessarily degraded in their performance of emotional labour, as Hochschild proposed. Bolton (2005) and Korczynski (2003) have argued that workers can find their emotional labour enjoyable, meaningful and fulfilling.

Hochschild also drew on the work of symbolic interactionist Irving Goffman here. In his 'the Presentation of Self in Everyday Life' (1959), Goffman developed a 'dramaturgical' analysis of everyday social interactions that used an analogy of actors in a theatre: who sometimes work front- and other times back-stage. Goffman considered the way that individuals in 'ordinary work situations' perform and present themselves to others, and how the worker 'guides and controls the impression' others form of her/him (1959: preface). Hochschild was influenced, in particular, by Goffman's discussion of acting and of the diversity in workers' beliefs in their own performances. He had pinpointed two extremes: being cynical about the performance and being 'taken in' by one's own act (Goffman 1959: 11). So Hochschild asked similarly whether workers were engaged in 'surface' or 'deep' acting when they performed their emotional labour.

Emile Durkheim (France 1858 – 1917)

a. The division of labour

Durkheim was motivated by an interest in the transitioning of society. Work was key to his wider analysis of societal change and the ramifications of this change for social cohesion and social order. In 'the Division of Labour' (1893), Durkheim argued that the societal division of labour is fundamental to social order. The division of labour

was simple in traditional societies, marked by similarity in the labour that people were engaged in. As societies become increasingly complex, a more specialised division of labour is required. According to Durkheim, this diversity in specialised roles necessitates a new form of social order and so 'mechanical solidarity' based on similarity is replaced by 'organic solidarity' based on heterogeneity coupled with interdependence.

b. Anomie

Durkheim was aware that the society he was living in was far from harmonious and collaborative and he discussed more problematic forms of the division of labour. The anomic division of labour (from the Greek *anomia* when standards of conduct are weak in a society) can occur because of too rapid social change: there are no taken for granted rules and workers' activity is unregulated. Durkheim argued that this anomie could be 'cured' (Lukes 1973) by improving socialisation and regulating society more clearly, including support provided by democratically formed occupational or professional groups (Ritzer 1992).

Durkheim's theoretical work was influential in the 1960's (Eldridge 1971; Johnson 1972; see McDonald 1995) but there are fewer contemporary work sociologists who draw directly on his work than do on Marx. Durkheim's writing was a direct influence on Goffman, in particular on the importance of rituals for maintaining order in everyday life. As we saw, Goffman examined everyday face-to-face interactions between people, asserting that they both reflect the moral order of a society and create and maintain it. In his 1952 analysis of 'adapting to failure', Goffman considers how

an individual copes with perceived failure, including in the workplace. These ideas, and his dramaturgical analysis, influenced Hochschild's theory of emotional labour.

c. Positivism

Sociology is the scientific study of society, according to Durkheim. Influenced by the positivism espoused by August Comte, Durkheim (1895) was a strong advocate of adapting the dominant methodological approaches of the natural sciences for the sociological study of society. He argued that society was a 'thing' to be studied; 'social facts' could be identified and analysed; and societal laws developed. Durkheim's (1897) 'secondary' analysis of existing data on suicide is a well-known example of this methodological approach.

A large number of statistics and data-sets are routinely drawn upon and analysed critically by work sociologists. These range from the statistics on work and employment that are released regularly by governments (including the Office for National Statistics in the UK and the Bureau for Labour Statistics in the USA) as well as data provided by such international organizations as the International Labour Organization and the OECD. As is clear throughout this handbook, many innovative sociological studies of work and employment have drawn upon data that were collected via large-scale social surveys. In Britain numerous data-sets are available for secondary analysis, housed at the 'UK Data Archive'. Similar archives exist in many countries, for example the 'Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives' holds data from thirteen countries across Europe.

Max Weber (Germany 1864 –1920)

a. Religion and the economy

In his 1904 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' Weber compared belief systems across the world. He concluded that Protestantism was core to the emergence of capitalism in the west. Weber did not argue that religious beliefs caused capitalism, rather he proposed that there was an 'elective affinity' between the tenets of ascetic Protestantism and the conditions needed for the development of a capitalist system. What was particularly decisive was the 'protestant work ethic': the belief that a religious life should be guided by a strong ethos of hard work, self-control and self-denial.

Weber's analysis of the importance of work in signalling that a person was leading a 'good life' has shaped a whole sociology of work that is dedicated to exploring why we work and what we gain from our jobs. An important debate has been whether workers enter employment purely for the money (gaining 'extrinsic' rewards only) or whether 'intrinsic' rewards are also important such as the satisfaction gained from doing a job well and developing skills. Moreover, work, for sociology, can be more than what we 'do'. It can also be about who we 'are' or who we aspire to be in our lives. We will return to the topic of work identity. If a society has a strong work ethic then there can be serious consequences for those who do not 'work'. Sociologists remain very interested in the personal (and wider) ramifications of living in a society with a strong work ethic for those who do not have a job (See Chapter 31).

b. Rationality

According to Weber, capitalism was a system in which rational conduct prevailed: a rational pursuit of profit via the calculation of the most effective means to meet that specified end (Beetham 1985). Weber argued that as societies developed, peoples' actions became less shaped by religion and more rationalised. He argued that bureaucracies were the most rational form of organizational working, offering the best potential for the most efficient and fair workplaces. At the same time, he feared that a bureaucracy could deprive work of its meaning. Creativity could be stifled within an 'iron cage' with a 'casing as hard as steel'. As he put it, workers could become 'specialists without spirit'. How might these problems be counteracted? Weber's solutions lay in the role of independent and charismatic leaders who would provide the spirit, within a pluralist democratic system.

Drawing directly on Weber's theory of rationalization, George Ritzer's (1998) *McDonaldization* thesis includes a well-known analysis of how the fast-food chain applies the 1880's ideas of FW Taylor (Taylorism) to food production. Taylor's methods involved the meticulous planning and precise calculations of all the steps that are necessary in the process to make, for example, a car or, for Ritzer, a cheeseburger and fries. Ritzer argued that the steps have been planned rationally: they are logical, output is measured carefully, and productivity and profit are monitored closely. He identified the key dimensions of the process as: efficiency; calculability; predictably; control; and the replacement of humans with technology. Like Weber, Ritzer also critiqued the dehumanizing workplace, identifying such negative consequences as deskilled 'Mc-workers' and customers whose interaction with the workers is fleeting.

c. Social closure

Weber added the concepts of 'status' and 'party' to Marx's class. He thought that stratification was too complex, multidimensional and cross-cutting for a purely material class-based explanation. Status (social esteem, prestige and honour) and 'party' (groups that come together to acquire power and advance their cause) also shape life chances. In his concept of 'social closure', Weber analysed the mechanisms that are developed by such groups to restrict access to resources and opportunities to their members (Parkin 1982). 'Exclusionary closure' occurs when a 'positively privileged' group is able to create a group who are classed as outsiders/ineligible. These 'negatively privileged' groups are not totally powerless, however. They can engage in collective attempts to win a greater share of resources via a process of 'usurpation' in response to their exclusion.

Weber's theory of social closure was to shape a central question in the sociology of the professions: how do certain white-collar occupations, but not others, achieve professional status? Central to 'professionalisation' is exerting control over entry to the profession (including limiting the number of entrants, commonly by the use of credentials. Parkin 1982). These debates on closure were largely class-based, but in 1992 Witz explored gender and professionalisation. Focusing on the medical profession, she discussed the 'demarcationary closure' within the broad medical field that works to differentiate the gendered occupations of doctors from nurses, paramedics and so on. Witz also considers the practices of 'usurpation' that have been employed by the excluded groups: their battles for recognition and inclusion, and the

strategies that have been taken up when inclusion is resisted successfully by the dominant group.

A critique of the classical canon I: gender and work

These three founders of sociology have had a profound impact on our discipline and many of their ideas still shape how it understands work and employment. Yet their writings have been debated heavily over time, and have fallen in and out of favour. Perhaps the most sustained, dominant critique of the classical canon is for its male-domination: for the neglect of gender in the founders' theories and for their sexism when they did discuss women (Kandal 1988; Marshall and Witz 2004; Schwendinger and Schwendinger 1971; Sydie 1987). Women were writing on issues pertinent to the social theory and work before and in the same time period as Marx, Weber and Durkheim, but their voices have been remarkably absent from much sociological teaching (Thomas and Kukulian 2004). This chapter can only cite a few examples, pointing here to the women's writings specifically around work and employment.

- Harriet Martineau (England, 1802-1876) has been described as one of the first founding mothers of sociology (Hoecker-Drusdale 1992). She wrote about slavery, capital and labour. She explored the degradation of women in society, and wrote about the work conditions of female employees, particularly working class women. She noted the extremely different life worlds of domestic servants and their employers.
- Charlotte Perkins Gilman (USA, 1860-1935) wrote about gender and work, amongst other topics, in her critique of the 'androcentric society'. Gilman argued that women's confinement to the home and the amount of time they were expected

to spend on domestic work and caring restricted their opportunities for developments beyond the private sphere (Lengermann and Niebrugge 1998). She supported removing tasks such as child caring and cooking from the daily duties of every woman, and advocated instead their performance outside the home by specialist workers. Lengermann and Niebrugge (2001) note how Gilman employed an analysis of women's production of food within the home, including its unpaid nature and the social isolation of the work, to reflect on power imbalances in society.

- Marianne Schnitger Weber (Germany, 1870-1954) researched women's position in society, including their work within the home and diversity amongst women in their working lives. Rather than argue that women should enter into paid employment, as Gilman did, Weber pointed to the harsh conditions experienced by the working class under capitalism, and to the double burden of work facing female employees.
- Olive Schreiner (South Africa, 1855-1920) was a sociologist who studied inequalities of sex and labour, as well as 'race'. Her collection of writings on women and labour, for example (Stanley and Dampier 2012), analyse women's work as servants and domestic workers; the sexualisation of black women's labour; and the impact that a heavy burden of domestic work has on women's capacity for intellectual thought.

The study of gender inequalities was an absence in an early sociology that was class-dominated. Class was so powerful that the early theorists who did explore gender inequalities often used a class framework to do so, just adding women in and

‘stirring’, as Sandra Harding (1991) put it. What was needed instead, according to writers like Dorothy Smith, was a transformation of sociological thinking. Smith (1988) argued that sociology can and should be done differently. She made the case for our discipline to fundamentally ‘see the everyday as problematic’. In this way, sociology would also emerge from the analysis of women’s everyday lives.

There is no one theory that we can apply neatly to understanding gender, work and employment. There are theories that have been labelled ‘feminist’ that look directly at gender inequalities, but not all sociologists who explore gender inequalities would self-define as feminists. Further, there is no one single ‘feminist theory’ (Gottfried 2006). Rather than attempt to provide an over-simplified version of ‘this is what x versus y feminist theory tells us about work’, this section instead pinpoints three important ideas from feminist social theory, broadly defined, that have impacted the way that we understand work and employment: debates over continuity and change in gender inequalities; intersectionality; domestic work.

a. Gender inequalities: continuity and change

Feminist theorists have shown that sex (female/male) derives from biology but gender (feminine/masculine) is socially constructed and, as such, is not constant but can vary and change (Butler 1990; Delphy 1993; Oakley 1972). Gender is performed and done. It is not something that we ‘are’. These ideas were boosted by Candace West and Don Zimmerman’s (1987) influential ‘doing gender’ thesis. They drew closely upon ethnomethodology, a theory that analyses how people make sense of their lives in everyday micro interactions. The importance of ‘doing gender’ for the sociology of

work and employment is that it stresses that work is a main site in which people are gendered everyday: gender is 'enforced, performed and recreated' in the work tasks we do, as Weeks argued (2011: 9. And see Harding 2013). 'Doing gender' is highly influential but ideas around 'undoing gender' (Butler 2004) contribute more clearly to the sociological interest in identifying the conditions for potential change in the gendering of work (Deutsch 2007; Risman 2009). The 'undoing gender' perspective features, for example, in Sullivan's (2004) call for a theoretical framework to address what might the conditions be for the accomplishment of change in the gendering of unpaid domestic work.

Ideas of gender, change and continuity also feature in more macro analyses of gender inequalities in work. In 1984, Sylvia Walby drew on theories of 'patriarchy' to develop a model that could be applied to understand societal gender inequalities, including in work and employment. She was influenced by Heidi Hartmann (1979) who argued that patriarchy, a system in which men controlled the work of women and children in their family, had both shaped capitalism and was itself changed with the advent of capitalism. In response to criticisms of the concept of patriarchy (Gottfried 1998; Pollert 1996), including that it was ahistorical and neglected variation, Walby elaborated her theory to better include diversity across place and over time: 'differentiated patriarchies' (Walby 1997). Many different versions of patriarchy have been elaborated including public and private, capitalist, welfare state, feudal and reorganised patriarchies.

Patriarchy(ies) remains key to much feminist theorising, including of work and employment, but alternative theories of gender inequalities have emerged. Theories of 'gender systems', 'gender orders' and 'gender regimes' have been particularly important for the study of change in gender, work and employment. Developed by Swedish historian Hirdmann (1988) and in sociology by Connell (1995) such theories aim to better capture commonality and diversity in systems of gender inequality. Hirdmann's analysis has been influential because it expressly considered the potential for change in gender systems by analysing how a society like Sweden could develop so rapidly from a society with a 'housewife contract' in the 1960's to an 'equal status contract' by the 1980's.

The work of Connell is also valuable for debates over gender, work and (potential) change. Because gender is socially constructed, gender arrangements can change and so, for Connell, gender may have an end. What is interesting is why and how, despite this, gender persists. Connell refers to gender regimes to answer this question. These refer to the state of play in gender relations within an institution as shaped by three sets of relations: production, power and emotions. A gender order is the relationship between different gender regimes and refers to 'the current state of play in the macro-politics of gender' (Connell, 1987: 20. See its applicability in Connell 2006; Acker 1994). Like Hirdmann, Connell has influenced theoretical attempts to depict and explain variation and commonality in the gendering of work cross-nationally such as in the 'carer/breadwinner models' of Lewis (1992) and the 'gender arrangements' of Pfau-Effinger (2004).

Connell also developed the highly influential idea of 'hegemonic masculinity' to explore what practices create and maintain the institutionalization of men's dominance over women. Innovatively, Connell (1987) argued here that there are gender inequalities amongst men and amongst women, not just between women and men. Further, rather than gender being reduced to singular versions of 'femininity' versus 'masculinity', there are multiples of both. Connell, and other writers influenced by this writing, have dedicated most attention to plural 'masculinities'. 'Subordinate masculinities' have been identified that are distinct from and inferior to the hegemonic version. Connell drew upon Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony that analysed how the dominant class ensures, or tries to ensure, that its own ideologies (or ways of seeing the world) are accepted by the subordinate class. Connell argued that hegemonic masculinity 'embodied the currently most honored way of being a man', and that hegemony was achieved largely through 'culture, institutions, and persuasion' (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 832). We can see the influence of these ideas for the sociology of work and employment in Acker's (2004) analysis of the various forms of hegemonic masculinity at play in global organizations including the 'hegemonic hyper masculinity' of global players like Rupert Murdoch (and see Goodwin's (2002) study of men's working lives in unemployment-hit Dublin and Sang et al's (2014) study of masculinities within the creative industries). Finally, because hegemonic masculinity is socially constructed, it may change: it is 'perhaps possible that a more humane, less oppressive, means of being a man might become hegemonic, as part of a process leading toward an abolition of gender hierarchies' (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 833).

b. Multiple social divisions: intersectionality

Social theories have faced the challenge of taking into account diversity amongst women as a group, and amongst men, which results from the interplay of multiple 'social divisions'. Social divisions include but are not restricted to class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, disability, religion and nation. Intersectionality is a term attributed to Kimberlé Crenshaw (1988), a USA professor of Law. It reflects the argument being made at that time by Black academics and activists that feminist theory 'theoretically erased' black women. It is now well accepted that understanding inequalities in the working lives of women and men necessitates moving beyond analysing only gender and onto considering how social divisions intersect (Gottfried 2008; Yuval-Davis 2006). Intersections of multiple divisions are seen very clearly in analysis of the globalised division of work, such as global care chains (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002) and the global production (and consumption) of products from mobile phones, chocolate, fish, clothes and bananas through to the sex trade (Edwards and Wajcman 2007). Reflecting this development of intersectionality, West (with Sarah Fenstermaker 1995: 30) elaborated the above 'doing gender' thesis to also include 'doing race' and 'doing class'. Work is a way of 'doing' other divisions like class and 'race' too. In 'doing difference', they aimed to show how these three social divisions, and their intersections, are all 'on-going accomplishments'.

c. Domestic work

An important contribution from feminist theories has been to critique the very sites and subjects of sociology, as Kathi Weeks puts it (2011). In their focus on restricted units of analysis, early sociologists neglected a major form of work from their

theorising: unwaged work in the home. The early attempts to fill this gap and to theorise 'housework' drew heavily on Marxian ideas. Marxist feminists were innovative in using Marxist theories of waged labour in the public sphere to explore unwaged work within the private sphere (the home), but they had to make the case that this type of work was 'socially necessary' labour, essential to capitalism (see Dalla Costa and James 1973; Gardiner 1975). In the 1970's, UK feminist Oakley (1974) criticised mainstream sociology for ignoring domestic work and dismissing it merely as a 'natural' part of women's sex roles.

Unwaged work in the home has gone on to shape a growing number of social theories around the gender division of domestic labour and the extent to which gender inequalities might be narrowing. This question is highly debated. Hochschild (1997) proposed that the 'gender revolution stalled' when it came to the work that is carried out within the home, but others have argued that we are seeing a gradual change towards more gender equality, albeit in a slow process (Gershuny et al. 1984; Sullivan 2004). Sociologists have also used intersectionality to question who is paid to 'do the dirty work' in the homes of others (Anderson 2000) and who does the domestic and caring work for whom in global care chains (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002).

A critique of the classical canon II

Women and gender inequalities in work are not the only glaring absences from the classical sociological canon. In the USA, African-American WEB du Bois (1868-1963), had had a wide-ranging academic and literary output that covered religion, family, and culture, as well as work and employment (Zamir 2008). On work, he

explored the role of black men in the workplace, and his PhD thesis examined the African slave trade (Rabaka 2010). Though he was employed as an academic sociologist, Du Bois also spent much of his life engaged in political activism, including helping to establish *the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People* (NAACP) in the US.

There are a number of other influential theorists who were contemporaries of the three founders and who have also impacted the central themes of sociology. Vilfredo Pareto (Italy 1848-1923), for example, provided an influential analysis of the power, prestige and wealth of different types of elite groups (Pareto 1901). Thorstein Veblen's (USA 1857-1929) 1989 discussion of the 'leisure class' is another influential addition to the sociology of the privileged minority: an elite class who associate paid work with weakness, inferiority and unworthiness. In recent decades, however, the intense privilege at the top of the class structure or, more specifically for our interests in the sociology of work, the very top of the occupational hierarchy, has received far less attention from sociologists than the experiences of those in lower level occupations (Scott 2008). Indeed some theorists argued that sociology should be the study of the 'under' and not the 'over' dog (see the discussion in Gouldner 1973). We return to the purpose of sociology to end this chapter.

Contemporary sociology in general suffers from a 'glaring invisibility of elites', Savage and Williams have suggested (2008: 2). Nevertheless questions about the 'ownership and control' of industry, as Scott (1996) put it, are surely central to the sociological analysis of work and employment (and see Scott 2008). Recent decades

marked by neo-liberalism, financialization, the rise of the super rich and the causes of and fallout from a global economic crisis have reinvigorated sociological interest in the privileged. Pareto's account of the processes by which ruling elites lose their legitimacy appears especially prescient for economic (and political) sociology (Engelen et al. 2012; Daguerre 2014). The rise of the working rich is also of interest to the sociology of work. Piketty's (2014) economic analysis of the history of wealth, income and inequality is highly influential here. It explores the growth of a super wealthy 'managerial elite' after the 1970s, a group able to set their own wages (see the special symposium of the *British Journal of Sociology* 2014 that is dedicated to Piketty). Savage and Williams (2008: 10) also point to changes over time in what the working rich actually do for their superior remuneration packages: with an expansion in the number of very highly paid workers whose role is not to manage 'men (sic) and things', as the highly paid have tended to do, but to service the flow of money.

Post- developments: three key ideas

The final influential group of theories that this chapter discusses are often grouped under a 'post-' badge. Post-modernist theories are underpinned by the idea that there have been such large societal transformations since the birth of sociology that the founding theories can no longer be meaningfully applied to help us understand contemporary society. Savage (2009: 219) identifies a range of 'epochal' theories that are based on the 'claim that we now live in a new kind of society which departs in fundamental ways from previous modes of social ordering'. He lists post-industrial (Bell 1973), disorganized capitalism (Lash and Urry, 1987), post-Fordism (Amin, 1990), individualization (Beck and Beck-Gersheim, 2001; Giddens, 1990),

reflexive/late modernity (Beck, 1992), risk society (Beck, 1992), globalization (Albrow, 1986), neo-liberalism (Rose, 1990), network society (Castells, 1996), and cosmopolitanism (Beck 2000). Thinking about work specifically, we could add in Kerr's (1973) post-industrial society; Gorz's (1982) death of the working class; Bluestone and Harrison's (1982) deindustrialisation (and Milkman 1997 too); Offe's (1985) disorganized capitalism; Gershuny's (1978) self-service society; Rifkin (1995) on the end of work; Beck's (2000) Brazilianisation of work; and Aronowitz and Cutler (1998) on post-work.

In contrast to epochal theories, many contemporary theoretical ideas have been founded upon a rejection of the search for large holistic theories of social change, or 'meta-narratives' (Lyotard 1984). This rejection is associated with post-structuralism, a philosophical movement that originated in France and that has been credited with bringing about a 'cultural turn' in social theory (Lash and Urry 1994). Post-structuralism promoted theories that espouse a plurality of contested meanings of key concepts and a focus on the construction of the self. Despite the importance of post-structural ideas for the social sciences, the sociology of work and employment was rather slow to engage with them (Casey 1995). Nevertheless, we cite three important developments in the field since the 1960's and 70's.

a. The 'end of work' and of work identity

The above 'epochal' social theories were reacting to what were perceived as radical changes in the organisation and experience of work and employment. These changes included the decline of manufacturing jobs in developed economies and the growth of

service sector employment; technological change; the speed up of work flows; increased global competition and the global mobility of capital, goods and workers; more flexibility in the workplace; and the erosion in job conditions. A number of theorists even predicted the end of work. As Granter (2009b) explains it, because of developments in technology and in how society can organize itself, there has been a large fall in the amount of work that a society needs. This situation was interpreted as a positive development by some writers because it created the potential for societal progress (see such commentators as Rifkin and Gorz, and sociologist Beck). Critical theorist Marcuse, for example, was inspired by Marx's theories on the importance of work for humanity. If what it is to be human is bound up with work, as Granter discusses, then for Marcuse technology can be used to eliminate degrading work that alienates workers.

Not all social theorists have interpreted these changes as positive developments for workers. Societies have been analysed as increasingly characterised by risky and precarious forms of work and so a major area of debate here concerns the ramifications of such (alleged) radical changes for identity formation, with men the main focus (see Chapter 10). In 1958 Hughes asserted that work, for a man: 'is one of the more important parts of his social identity, of his self; indeed of his fate in the one life he has to live' (1984 338–9). For many theorists since, work has lost its role as a source of identity formation. Sennett and Putnam both proposed that major transformations in the world of work have created an individualized outlook on work and life. Giddens (1991) argued that workers had greater opportunities for self-realisation and for creating their sense of self in an 'identity project' whilst Beck

contended that 'The idea that social identity and status depend only upon a person's occupation and career must be taken apart and abandoned, so that social esteem and security are really uncoupled from paid employment' (Beck 2000: 57). Bauman (1998) was also critical of work as means to identity formation. Work has been replaced by consumption, he argued, and those who are economically excluded from consuming ('flawed consumers') are accordingly deprived of identity.

The so-called 'end of work' theorists, and the related debates over work and identity, are usefully summarised and critiqued elsewhere (Granter 2009a; Strangleman 2005) and covered in detail in Chapter 39. For our focus on work and social theory in this chapter, it is important to note that proposals concerning an 'end of work' have critical ramifications for sociology as a discipline and for our specific sub-discipline that studies work. Offe (1985) argued that work was crucial to the birth of sociology and core to the theories of its founders. Indeed, work, for Offe, represented 'the key sociological category' in social theory (pp. 129-150). The importance of work for the discipline of sociology has been heavily debated in the past decades. Writers such as Castillo (1999), Halford and Strangleman (2009); Scott (2005); and Strangleman (2005) have noted, and questioned, whether and why the study of work has gone from the 'centre to the margin' of the discipline. We return to this development to end the chapter.

b. Surveillance and discipline

One key theorist who has been located under the 'post-' label, though he rejected it himself, was Foucault. His ideas on power, surveillance and discipline have had a

huge influence on the sociology of work and employment, in particular via his consideration of Bentham's panopticon in *Discipline and Punish* (1977). Burrell (2007) proposed that this is the single book 'that has affected our understanding in social science approaches to management more than any other'. In it, Foucault discussed Bentham's aim to design an institution where an observer could see all the 'inmates' but the observer could not be seen. The panopticon is most well known as a design for prisons, with guards and prisoners in the roles of observer and observed, but it can be applied to workplaces, schools and so on. It is based on the rationale that because a prisoner cannot tell at any one point whether s/he is being observed or not, s/he has to assume that s/he is being watched and so s/he will behave well to avoid punishment. In the panopticon: 'visible: the inmate will constantly have before his (sic) eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any one moment, but he must be sure that he may always be so' (1977: 201). Foucault argued that an outcome of living under this threat of constant surveillance is that the need for behaving well becomes internalised: prisoners become self-disciplining. Foucault's theory has influenced a wealth of case studies on work organization and management practices, on the labour process, and on the experiences of those working under surveillance. The 'electronic panopticon' experienced by call centre workers is an important example here (Bain and Taylor 2000).

c. Embodied and aesthetic labour

Foucault's analysis of power and self-discipline has also shaped the study of the body at work. He discussed the 'docile body': a body 'that may be subjected, used,

transformed, and improved', using the example of how a soldier's body is created. The body is not new to theories of work. As Wolkowitz argues (2006), all workers are embodied in some way. The body appears in labour process theories: bodily movements were fundamental to Taylorism since the fragmentations of tasks included making them easier for bodies to perform. Taylor's scientific management techniques had even specified up to 600 bodily movements per working day (Bahnisch 2000: 62). Workplace ethnographies have long noted the exhausting impact on the body of having to work at speed, controlled by an assembly line (Cavendish 1982). The body appeared in Goffman's dramaturgical analysis when he argued that 'face work' and 'body work' are important in human interaction and that the body works to construct and reproduce the social world (Shilling 1993). Bourdieu's (1986) concept of embodiment also considered how class is lived through appearance and the body.

The body is present across social theories of work but the study of embodied labour was given a boost with post-structural theoretical developments. The gendered body has been an important theoretical advance. Acker (1990) offered a gendered analysis of the masculine work organization, and here she argued that the 'preferred' organizational body is of a disembodied man. Puwar (2004) added in ethnicity in her analysis of the preferred corporate body. Embodied labour has become central to studies of sex workers and to others whose job includes them doing work on the bodies of others: in hair and beauty work; as care workers; in the medical and health services; as well as shop assistants and undertakers (Wolkowitz et al. 2013).

Embodied labour has been elaborated further to take into account theories of 'aesthetic labour': 'the employment of workers with desired corporeal dispositions' (Warhurst and Nickson 2007: 107). As Pettinger has also argued, bodies are important to many service workers' daily jobs but so too are style and voice (Pettinger 2004). One study by Warhurst and Nickson (2007) identified job adverts that explicitly specified recruits must be 'well spoken', 'of smart appearance', 'well presented' and 'good looking'. Class was central to the first theories of aesthetic labour but class, gender, age, ethnicity and other social divisions come together in terms of assessing the 'attractiveness' that is explicitly required by many jobs in the service sector.

Conclusions

Work was core to the birth of sociology and to its founding theorists. In over two centuries of sociological thinking, the academic study of work has had to grapple with major societal changes as well as continuities in working lives. This chapter has pointed readers to some of the important theoretical ideas that have been applied to worlds of work.

Work is a vital subject area for sociology. Yet the prominence of the topic of work within the discipline has varied over time, waning after the 'golden age' of industrial sociology. Writers such as Scott, and Halford and Strangleman, have traced the developments in the centrality of the study of work within sociology that raise concerns for sociological theorising on work (see Chapter 2). On the discipline in general. Scott (2005: 7.2) proclaimed that sociology needs to unify itself, with sociologists coming together around their commitment to the 'study of society'.

Specifically on the sociology of work, Halford and Strangleman (2009: 822) call for a more 'self-consciously confident' sociology of work to take us forward. This forty-chapter state-of-the-art handbook meets those calls by informing, re-refreshing and re-invigorating our knowledge on the sociology of work and employment.

The chapter began by noting that the meaning of 'work' is contested. The varieties of work that social theorists address are far wider now than they were two centuries ago. There thus remain significant gaps in knowledge that sociologists are working to fill. Halford et al (2013) identified here what they call 'newly visible' forms of work: longstanding forms of work that have been under-researched as well as emerging work types, such as sex work, body work, informal work and creative work. These developments in the field offer new and exciting avenues for theorists of work and employment. Yet the theoretical questions that featured in the work of the founding theorists still remain core to our discipline too. After a period of sustained and intense economic crisis around the globe, we can certainly see their resonance in contemporary society. The crisis has also placed questions of elites, their composition and their work cultures more firmly back on the table for the contemporary sociologists of work.

This chapter also began by stating that social theorists have differed markedly in their approaches to work. It ends by reflecting on the role of social theory itself. A long-standing question is, put simply, whether the role of social theory is purely to theorise and so better understand the world of work or whether there is an onus on sociology to also improve workers' lives. Marx thought that the point of theory was not just to

understand the world but to change it for the better. Feminist theories of work are also patently rooted in a social movement that is committed to identifying and understanding gender inequalities so that progress towards gender equality can be achieved. Du Bois used his sociology as a means to campaign to improve the lives of Black people in the USA. C Wright Mills' (1959) 'the Sociological imagination' argued that the role of sociology should be to create an informed and radical public that will challenge the powerful and play a part in transforming society for the better. Bourdieu (1990) and Gramsci (1971) asked similar questions about the roles of 'intellectuals', and their engagement with wider publics.

Burawoy (2005) returned us to the key question: for whom and for what do we pursue sociology? His view is that the sociologist should be partisan and represent the public against market tyranny and state despotism. In addition, a 'public sociology' must engage publics with its theories and findings. The chapters in this handbook showcase just how well the sociology of work and employment is grappling with these fundamental challenges for the discipline in the twenty first century.

Word Count: 9,786 (including references)

References

- Acker, J. (1990) 'Hierarchies. Jobs. Bodies. A Theory of Gendered Organizations', *Gender and Society*, 4, 2, 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1994), 'The gender regime of Swedish banks', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 10, 2, 117-30.

- Acker, J. (2004) 'Gender, Capitalism and Globalization'. *Critical Sociology* 30 (1), pp. 17-41.
- Anderson, B. (2000) *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*, London: Zed Books.
- Attewell, P. (1987) 'The Deskillling Controversy', *Work and Occupations*, 14: 323-346.
- Bahnisch, M. (2000) 'Embodied Work, Divided Labour: Subjectivity and the Scientific Management of the Body in Frederick W. Taylor's 1907 'Lecture on Management'', *Body & Society*, 6, 51-68.
- Bain, P. and Taylor, P. (2000) 'Entrapped by the 'Electronic Panopticon'? Worker Resistance in the Call Centre,' *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 15, 1, 2-18.
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage.
- Beck, U. (2000): *The Brave New World of Work*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beetham, D. (1985) *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Bolton, S. (2005) *Emotion Management in the Workplace*, Basingstoke: Houndsmills.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital' in J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York, Greenwood, 241-258.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge: Polity

Braverman, H. (1974) *Labour and Monopoly Capitalism: the Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

British Journal of Sociology (2014) *Special Issue: Piketty Symposium*, 65, 4, 589–747.

Budd, J.W. (2011) *The Thought of Work*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Burawoy, M. (1979) *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism*, London: University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, M. (2005) 'For Public Sociology', *British Journal of Sociology*, 56, 2, 259–294

Burrell, G. (2007) 'Foucauldian and Postmodern Thought and the Analysis of Work' in M. Korchynski et al. (eds). *Social Theory at Work*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butler, J. (2006/1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity*, New York: Abingdon.

Cappelli, P. (2007) 'Changes at Work and the Opportunities for Theory, in M. Korchynski et al. (eds). *Social Theory at Work*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Casey, C. (1995) *Work, Self and Society After Industrialism*, London, Routledge.

Castillo, J. J. (1999) 'Sociology of Work at the Crossroad', *Current Sociology*, 49, 2, 21–46.

Connell, R (1987) *Gender and Power*, Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, R. (1995) 'Gender regimes and the gender order' in *The Polity Reader in Gender Studies*, Cambridge: Polity.

- Connell, R. (2006) 'Glass Ceilings or Gendered Institutions? Mapping the Gender Regimes of Public Sector Worksites', *Public Administration Review*, 66, 6: 837–849.
- Connell, R.W. and Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005) 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society* 19, 6, 829-859.
- Crenshaw, K. (1988) 'Race, reform, and retrenchment: transformation and legitimation in anti- discrimination law', *Harvard Law Review*, 101, 1331–87.
- Daguerre, A. (2014) 'New corporate elites and the erosion of the Keynesian social compact', *Work, Employment and Society*, DOI: 10.1177/0950017013496303
- Dalla Costa, M. and James, S. (1972) *The Power of Women & the Subversion of the Community*, Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Delphy, C. (1993) 'Rethinking Sex and Gender', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 16, 1, 1-9.
- Deutsch, F. M. (2007). 'Undoing gender', *Gender and Society* 21, 1, 106-27.
- Doherty, M. (2009) 'When the working day is through: the end of work as identity?', *Work, Employment & Society*, 23, 1: 84-101.
- Durkheim, E. (1964/1893) *The Division of Labour in Society*, New York: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1982/1895) *The Rules of Sociological method*, London: MacMillan.
- Durkheim, E. (1992) *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*, London: Routledge.
- Durkheim, E. (2002/1897) *Suicide: a Study in Sociology*, London: Routledge.
- Edgell, S. (2012) *The Sociology of Work*, London: Sage.

Edwards, P. and Wajcman, J. (2007) *The Politics of Working Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ehrenreich, B. and Hochschild, A. (eds) (2002) *Global Women: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*, London: Granta.

Eldridge, J.E.T (1971) *Sociology and Industrial Life*, London: Joseph.

Engelen, E. Erturk, E., Froud, J., Johal, S., Leaver, A., Moran, M. and Williams, K. (2012) 'Misrule of experts? The financial crisis as elite debacle', *Economy and Society*, 41, 3, 360-381.

Foucault, M. (1975/91) *Discipline and Punish*, London: Penguin.

Freidson, E. (1986). *Professional Powers: A Study on the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Friedmann, A. (1977) *Industry and Labour: Class Struggle at Work and Monopoly Capitalism*, London: Macmillan

Gallie, D. (2011) 'Changing Perspectives in British Economic Sociology', *Sociological Research Online*, 16, 3, 19, <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/3/19.html>>

Gardiner, J. (1975) 'Women's Domestic Labour', *New Left Review* 1/89, 47-58.

Gershuny, J., Godwin, M. and Jones, S. (1994) 'The Domestic Labour Revolution: a Process of Lagged Adaptation' in M. Anderson., F. Bechhofer and J. Gershuny (eds.) *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press

- Glucksmann, M. aka Cavendish, R. (1982/2009) *Women on the Line*, London, Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1952) 'On Cooling the Mark Out. Some Aspects of Adaptation to Failure', *Psychiatry*, 15,4, 451-463.
- Goffman, E. (1969/1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Allen Lane.
- Gorz, A. (1999) *Reclaiming Work. Beyond the Wage-Based Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Gottfried, H. (1998) 'Beyond Patriarchy? Theorising Gender and Class', *Sociology*, 32, 3, 451-468.
- Gottfried, H. (2006) 'Feminist Theories of Work', in M. Korczynski et al. (eds) *Social Theory at Work*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gottfried, H. (2008) 'Reflections on Intersectionality: Gender, Class, Race and Nation', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 11, 23-40.
- Gouldner, A. (1973) *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gramsci, A. (2001) 'The Formation of Intellectuals' in V. Leitch (ed.) *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, New York: Norton.
- Granter, E. (2009a) 'Acceptable in the 1980s: Sociology and the End of Work', *Sociology*, 43, 5, 1014-1018.
- Granter, E. (2009b) *Critical Social Theory and the End of Work. Rethinking Classical Sociology*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Halford, S. and Strangleman, T. (2009) 'In search of the sociology of work: past, present and future', *Sociology*, 43, 5, 811-828.
- Halford, S., Hudson, M., Leonard, P., Parry, J. and Taylor, R. (2013) *The New Dynamics of Work: A Scoping Study*, Southampton: Work Futures Research Centre.
- Harding, N. (2013) *On Being At Work. The Social Construction of the Employee*, Routledge: New York and London.
- Harding, S. (1991) 'Comment on Hekman's "Truth and method: feminist standpoint theory revisited": whose standpoint needs the regimes of truth and reality?', *Signs*, 22, 2, 382-91.
- Hartmann, H. (1979) 'The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union', *Capital and Class*, 8: 1-33.
- Hirdmann, Y. (1988) 'Genussystemet - Reflexioner Kring kvinnors sociala underordning' (The gender system - reflections on women's social subordination) *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* 3, pp. 49-63.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialisation of Human Feeling*, London: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1989) *The Second Shift*, New York: Aron Books Inc.
- Hoecker-Drysdale, S. (1992) *Harriet Martineau: First Woman Sociologist*. Oxford: Berg.
- Hughes, E.C. (1984/1958) *Men and Their Work*, Glencoe: Free Press.
- Ingham, G. (1996) 'The "New Economic Sociology"', *Work, Employment and Society*, 10, 3, 549-64.

- Jessop, B. (2008) 'Karl Marx', in R. Stones (ed) *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Basingstoke: Palgrave/MacMillan,
- Johnson, T.J. (1972) *Professions and Power*, London: Palgrave.
- Kandal, T. (1988) *The Woman Question in Classical Sociological Theory*, Miami: International University Press.
- Korczynski, M. (2003) 'Communities of Coping: Collective Emotional Labour in Service Work', *Organization*, 10, 1, 55-79.
- Korczynski, M., Hodson, R., Edwards, P. (2006)(ed) *Social Theory at Work*, Oxford University Press.
- Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1987) *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lengermann, P.M. and Niebrugge, G. (1998) *The Women Founders. Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*, Long Grover: Waveland Press.
- Lengermann, P.M. and Niebrugge, G. (2001) 'Classical Feminist Social Theory' in G. Ritzer and B. Smart (eds.) *Handbook of Social Theory*, London: Sage.
- Lewis, J. (1992) 'Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2, 3, 159-173.
- Little, C.R. and Salaman, G. (1982) 'Bravermania and Beyond: Recent Theories of the Labour Process', *Sociology* 16: 251-269.
- Lukes, S. (1973) *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work - An Historical and Critical Study*, New York: Harper and Row.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Marshall, B. and Witz, A. (2004) *Engendering The Social: Feminist Encounters with Social Theory*, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Marx, K. (1961/1867) *Capital, Volume 1*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Marx, K. (1964/1844) *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, New York: International Universities Press.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1964/1848) *The Communist Manifesto*, New York: Simon Schuster Inc.

McDonald, K. (1995) *The Sociology of the Professions*, London: Sage.

Mills, C. W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mills, C.W. (1956) *The Power Elite*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Oakley, A. (1972) *Sex, Gender and Society*, London, Maurice Temple Smith.

Oakley, A. (1974) *Housewife*, London: Allen Lane.

Offe, C. (1985) *Disorganized Capitalism: Contemporary Transformations of Work and Politics*, Cambridge: Polity.

Pareto, V. (2008/1901) *The Rise and Fall of Elites*. New York, NY: Transaction Publishers.

Parkin, F. (1982) *Max Weber*, London: Tavistock.

Pettinger, L., Parry, J., Taylor, R, and Glucksmann, M. (2006) *A New Sociology of Work?*. London: Routledge.

- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2004) 'Socio-historical paths of the male breadwinner model - an explanation of cross-national differences', *British Journal of Sociology* 55, 3, 377-399.
- Piketty, T. (2014) *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Polanyi, K. (2001/1944) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pollert, A. (1996) 'Gender and Class Revisited: or, the Poverty of 'Patriarchy'', *Sociology*, 30, 4, 639-59.
- Puwar, N. (2004) *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*, Oxford: Berg.
- Rabaka, R. (2010) *WEB Du Bois*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rifkin, J. (1995) *The End of Work. The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era*, New York: Putnam Publishing Group.
- Risman B. (2009) 'From doing to undoing: gender as we know it', *Gender and Society*, 23, 1, 81-84.
- Ritzer, G. (1992) *Classical Sociological Theory*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ritzer, G. (1998) *The McDonaldization of Society*, Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Runciman, W.G. (1978) *Max Weber. Selections in Translation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sang, K.J.C., Dainty, A.R.J. and Ison, S.G. (2014) 'Gender in the UK architectural profession: (re)producing and challenging hegemonic masculinity', *Work, Employment and Society* 28, 2, 247–264.
- Savage, M. (2009) 'Against Epochalism: An Analysis of Conceptions of Change in British Sociology', *Cultural Sociology*, 3, 2, 217-238.
- Schwendinger, J. and Schwendinger, H. (1971) 'Sociology's Founding fathers: Sexists to a Man', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 33, 4, 783-799.
- Scott, J. (1986) *Capitalist Property and Financial Power*, Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Scott, J. (2005) 'Sociology and its Others: Reflections on Disciplinary Specialism and Fragmentation', *Sociological Research Online*, 10, 1, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/scott.html>.
- Scott, J. (2008) 'Modes of power and the re-conceptualization of elites' In: Savage M and Williams K (eds) *Remembering Elites*. London: Blackwell, 27–43.
- Sennett, R. (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, London: Norton.
- Shilling, C. (1993) *The Body and Social Theory*, London: Sage.
- Smith, D. (1988) *The Everyday World as Problematic: Towards a Feminist Sociology*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Stanley, L. and Dampier, H. (2012) "'I just express my views & leave them to work': Olive Schreiner as a feminist protagonist in a masculine political landscape with figures and letters", *Gender and History*, 24, 3: 677-700.

Strangleman, T. (2005) 'Sociological Futures and the Sociology of Work', *Sociological Research Online*, 10, 4.

Sullivan, O. (2004) Changing gender practices within the household: A theoretical perspective. *Gender & Society* 18, 2, 207-22.

Sydie, R.A. (1987) *Natural Women, Cultured Men: A Feminist Perspective on Sociological Theory*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Thomas, J.E. and Kukulian, A. (2004) 'Why Don't I Know about These Women?: The Integration of Early Women Sociologists in Classical Theory Courses', *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 3, 252-63

Thompson, P. and Smith, C. (2009) 'Labour Power and Labour Process: Contesting the Marginality of the Sociology of Work', *Sociology*, 43, 5, 913-930.

Veblen, T. (1963/1899) *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: New English Library Limited.

Walby, S. (1984) *Patriarchy at Work*, Cambridge: Polity.

Walby, S. (1997) *Gender Transformations*, London: Routledge.

Warhurst, C. and Nickson, D. (2007) 'Employee Experience of Aesthetic Labour in Retail and Hospitality', *Work, Employment Society*, 21, 1, 103-120.

Weber, M. (1970/1904) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Unwin University Books.

Weber, M. (1978/1922) *Economy and Society*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weeks, K. (2010) *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics and Postwork Imaginaries*, Durham: Duke University Press.

West, C. and Fenstermaker, S. (1985) 'Doing difference', *Gender and Society*, 9, 1, 8-37.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987) 'Doing Gender', *Gender & Society*, 1, 2: 125-51.

Witz, A. (1992) *Professions and Patriarchy*, London: Routledge.

Wolkowitz, C. (2006) *Bodies at Work*, London: Sage.

Wolkowitz, C. Sanders, T. Cohen, R. L. and Hardy, K. (eds.)(2013) *Sex/Body/Work: Intimate, Sexualized and Embodied Labour*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006) 'Intersectionality and Feminist Politics', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13, 3, 193-209.

Zamir, S. (2008) *The Cambridge Companion to W.E.B. Du Bois*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.