



Three Lenses on Occupations and Professions in Organizations: Becoming, Doing, and Relating

Michel Anteby, Curtis K. Chan & Julia DiBenigno

To cite this article: Michel Anteby, Curtis K. Chan & Julia DiBenigno (2016) Three Lenses on Occupations and Professions in Organizations: Becoming, Doing, and Relating, The Academy of Management Annals, 10:1, 183-244, DOI: [10.1080/19416520.2016.1120962](https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2016.1120962)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2016.1120962>



Accepted author version posted online: 23 Nov 2015.
Published online: 16 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 376



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

Three Lenses on Occupations and Professions in Organizations

Becoming, Doing, and Relating

MICHEL ANTEBY*† 

Boston University

CURTIS K. CHAN†

Harvard University

JULIA DIBENIGNO†

MIT Sloan School of Management

Abstract

Management and organizational scholarship is overdue for a reappraisal of occupations and professions as well as a critical review of past and current work on the topic. Indeed, the field has largely failed to keep pace with the rising salience of occupational and professional (as opposed to organizational) dynamics in work life. Moreover, not only is there a dearth of studies that

*Corresponding author. Email: manteby@bu.edu

†All authors contributed equally to this article.

explicitly take occupational or professional categories into account, but there is also an absence of a shared analytical framework for understanding what occupations and professions entail. Our goal is therefore two-fold: first, to offer guidance to scholars less familiar with this terrain who encounter occupational or professional dynamics in their own inquiries and, second, to introduce a three-part framework for conceptualizing occupations and professions to help guide future inquiries. We suggest that occupations and professions can be understood through lenses of “becoming”, “doing”, and “relating”. We develop this framework as we review past literature and discuss the implications of each approach for future research and, more broadly, for the field of management and organizational theory.

Introduction and Motivation

Management and organizational scholarship is overdue for a reappraisal of the role of occupations and professions in workplaces as well as a critical review of past and current research on the topic. Indeed, recent scholarship suggests occupations and professions are gaining prominence in the labor market. Occupations and professions have long served as sweeping forces of rationalization in society (Ritzer, 1975; Weber, 1968) while simultaneously providing their members with essential affiliations (Durkheim, 1984/1933; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984). But even more so now, they have come to be stabilizing fixtures of contemporary employment, especially in light of destabilizing forces on workers' organizational affiliations. Firms' internal labor markets have withered, turnover has risen appreciably, careers increasingly span multiple organizations, and contingent work unconstrained to any given organization has become prevalent (Bidwell & Briscoe, 2010; Bidwell, Briscoe, Fernandez-Mateo, & Sterling, 2013; Cappelli, 2001; George & Chattopadhyay, 2005). As an illustration, a recent longitudinal survey of employed Americans born between 1957 and 1964 reported that an average person had held 11.7 jobs—defined in the study as an uninterrupted period of work with a particular employer—by the age of 48 years old (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). Also, the U.S. General Social Survey estimates the number of those employed in alternative work arrangements (including freelancing and independent contracting) was as high as 40.4% in 2010 (Government Accountability Office, 2015, p. 4), and nonstandard work arrangements that loosen the attachment between employee and employer seem to be on the rise (Ashford, George, & Blatt, 2007).

It is important to consider the possibility that, as organizational affiliation wanes, occupational affiliation may fill the void. Barley and Kunda (2004) write, “census data clearly indicate that occupational forms of organizing are becoming more prominent”, noting that the ratio of “occupationally organized work” (i.e. employment in craft, professional, and technical lines of work) to “hierarchically organized work” (i.e. all other work categories) has been

increasing from 0.38 to 0.56 between 1900 and 1998 (pp. 305–306). Furthermore, many workers have relatively higher levels of commitment to their profession and occupation than their organization. For example, a study by the National Commission for Employment Policy found that in the 1970s male workers were more likely to change their occupation than change their employer, but by the 1980s and early 1990s, this pattern reversed: changing employers became more common than changing occupations (Rose, 1995). As Tolbert argues, “occupations will become increasingly more important” (1996, p. 332) in defining career pathways and boundaries. The “organization man” (Whyte, 1956) who traded loyalty for lifetime employment is being replaced in many industries by someone who specializes in an occupation and moves between organizations over the course of his or her career or works outside of formal organizations—what we might call an “occupation (wo)man”.

More generally, studies suggest a rise of important professional and occupational forces. While in 1950, for instance, only 5% of workers held an occupational certification, today nearly one third of workers have an occupational certification (Kleiner & Krueger, 2010). Over the years, strikingly powerful occupational affiliations have been observed in a wide range of industries. As examples, “hired hands” and “mercenaries” in high-tech and military industries (Barley & Kunda, 2004; Baum & McGahan, 2013), software programmers (O’Mahony & Ferraro, 2007), and journalists (Boczkowski, 2010) all identify strongly with their occupations. Even people performing stigmatized “dirty work” (such as sanitation workers and correctional officers) demonstrate surprisingly strong identification with their occupations (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Additionally, as a recent study puts it, today’s workers are “attached more to the occupations they will fill than the industries in which they work” (Carnevale, Rose, & Cheah, 2011, p. 2).

Not only is occupational and professional affiliation prevalent and strong, it is also consequential. Such affiliation is important for a variety of outcomes. At the individual-level, a meta-analysis finds that occupational commitment is positively related to job involvement and job satisfaction, in addition to job performance and lack of turnover intention (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). Also, despite variation across groups, professions and occupations often provide members vehicles through which to enact prized collective identities (Anteby, 2008a, 2008b; Becker & Carper, 1956; Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006; Sainsaulieu, 1988). Professional and occupational affiliation is also important for workers’ material rewards—the first five years of occupational tenure in the U.S. labor force is associated with a 12–20% increase in wages, while organizational tenure has little effect on wages once occupational tenure has been taken into account (Kambourov & Manovskii, 2009).

Occupations and professions also matter in shaping many organizational outcomes (e.g. Bechky, 2011). The professional background composition—or

professional demography—of powerful organizational members can shape an organization's strategy and performance (Tilcsik, 2010) through the professional logics and cognitive models carried by these executives (Almandoz, 2012, 2014). At a more macro-level, powerful professional and occupational associations influence wide-reaching regulations by legitimating certain innovations over others (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002) and by controlling occupational certifications which affect the supply and cost of labor for many organizations (Kleiner & Krueger, 2010; Weeden, 2002). Finally, some professional groups, like professional and academic economists, are so powerful as to hold sway over entire organizational fields and societies through influence over government policies (Fourcade, 2009).

Though management and organizational scholarship has engaged extensively with many features of the post-industrial economy, it has largely failed to keep pace with the rising salience of occupational and professional dynamics in work life as well as with the surge in studies on these topics. As others have noted, studies focusing on occupations, professions, and work have remained largely consigned to disciplinary outlets (Barley & Kunda, 2001; Okhuysen et al., 2013), and given the multi- and inter-disciplinary nature of management research, it is easy for such studies to be overlooked. And yet, there is a theoretical danger of not keeping up to date with contemporary professional and occupational dynamics. Without understanding occupations, the scholarly field is at risk of misinterpreting organizational dynamics. Put otherwise, antiquated images of occupations can hamper the development of management and organizational theory. As Barley argued two decades ago, without an updated understanding of work, "organizational theorists risk building theories . . . around terms with shallow content" (1996, p. 408). For example, a study of an organization's culture that ignores occupations might mischaracterize the culture as incoherent even though the organization may be comprised of multiple, highly coherent occupational sub-cultures. Furthermore, if workers are increasingly committed to their occupations and professions, there are numerous implications for organizational dynamics, including hiring and retention. For these reasons, it is an ideal time for a review and reappraisal of past work on professions and occupations.

Critically, the field lacks a recent review of occupational research that captures the vibrancy of research in this area, particularly as it relates to management and organizational scholarship. Existing reviews seem to be either dated or more disciplinarily constrained (e.g. Abbott, 1993; Hall, 1983). Moreover, we lack an encompassing analytical framework to comprehend the rich and evolving landscape of occupational and professional scholarship. To fill this gap, we present a three-part framework for conceptualizing occupations and professions. Occupations, we suggest, can be understood through three lenses: a "becoming", "doing", or "relating" lens. We believe bringing to bear distinct analytical lenses will yield different conceptualizations of occupations,

just as other scholars have constructed multiple perspectives on organizations (Scott & Davis, 2007). We intend for these three lenses to: (a) provide analytically productive views on the different aspects of occupations; (b) facilitate comprehension of the occupational and professional literature for scholars who are less familiar with the field; and (c) organize and synthesize past literature on occupations in a way that allows management and organizational scholars to bring occupational dynamics back into their studies.

In this article, we first consider the definition of an occupation and related scope issues of this review. Second, we introduce our framework of three scholarly lenses on occupations. Third, we review the literature by giving each lens an overview as well as discussing a set of typical areas of inquiry, methodological considerations, and theoretical implications along with avenues for future research. Fourth, we historically situate each lens and compare the lenses to one another to note salient trends and patterns. We conclude by considering the implications of our review and framework for management and organizational theory more broadly.

Definitional and Scope Issues

To begin, we consider the question, “What are occupations?” Occupations are first and foremost social entities. That is, they are socially constructed as “reality” through patterns of human interaction over time (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). While the precise occupational codes (e.g. “automotive body and related repairer” or “code 49-3021”) used in the *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Occupational outlook handbook (2014)* might at first glance appear to define an occupation, these codes represent only a particular construction of an occupation, imposed over time by a governmental body. In fact, occupations have multiple “realities” that range from “categories of work” that constitute “areas of tasks in a division of labor” to “particular and enduring groups of people” who have sustained membership in these categories via the “institutions—associations, unions, friendly societies, licensing boards, and so on” that envelop and enact these categories (Abbott, 2005, p. 322). Following on this, we suggest that occupations are socially constructed entities that include: (i) a category of work; (ii) the actors understood—either by themselves or others—as members and practitioners of this work; (iii) the actions enacting the role of occupational members; and (iv) the structural and cultural systems upholding the occupation. The definition’s density justifies in part our desire to further unpack the concept of occupations in this article.

The scope of our review and reappraisal will therefore cover studies that examine the social entities that are occupations and their relation to management and organizational studies. To further specify our scope, though, we compare occupations with two related concepts. One related concept is that of professions. There have been a variety of scholarly perspectives on what

constitutes professions (see Etzioni, 1969; Hodson & Sullivan, 2012; Ritzer, 1975).¹ In common, however, is acknowledgment that professions encompass only a subset of occupations. Hodson and Sullivan (2012, p. 260) offer a succinct summary suggesting a profession is a “certain type of occupation” that has succeeded in convincing audiences they are characterized by “(1) abstract, specialized knowledge, (2) autonomy, (3) authority over clients and subordinate occupational groups, and (4) a certain degree of altruism”. In addition, professionals often rely on credentials to ascertain and showcase their specialized knowledge (Freidson, 1988, p. 59). As previously noted, only limited management and organizational scholarship considers occupations, but when it does, its emphasis tends to be only on professions, such as those involving lawyer and physicians. But occupational dynamics, more broadly, permeate organizations as well. For instance, radio broadcasters, despite lacking formal credentials, influence the way the music industry operates (Rossman, 2012). They are the ones selecting what music gets played and ultimately sold. We expand the scope of our review to occupations more broadly, rather than narrowly focusing on professions. In doing so, we signal the importance of both salient and less obvious occupational dynamics within and among organizations.

A second related concept is a job. Jobs are “bundles of tasks performed by employees under administrative job titles” (Cohen, 2013, p. 432); a given job is thus particular to a specific workplace, just as a job title is often particular to a specific workplace (Grant, Berg, & Cable, 2014). An occupation, on the other hand, is broader membership in a shared community that spans *across* jobs. A given occupation is therefore a category of work that is concretely instantiated as particular jobs in particular organizations under particular job titles. An example of the occupation that envelops the job of Executive Assistant to President at General Motors would be “secretaries and administrative assistants”. Furthermore, while jobs are typically seen as roles actors fill that entail responsibilities for performing bundles of tasks in a workplace, occupations are often regarded as social entities with some degree of agency themselves, as in when professions are understood as competing with one another (Abbott, 1988a). That said, the scope of our review, while dealing primarily with occupations, also covers jobs since we build on some studies examining occupational members working in particular jobs when elaborating our three-lens approach to occupations.

Introducing the Three Lenses on Occupations

In this section, we introduce the three lenses on occupations: the “becoming”, “doing”, and “relating” lenses. Each lens hones in on different aspects of occupations: respectively, how occupational members learn to be part of the collective, what activities they engage in, and how they relate to others outside their group. In each of these approaches, we use the word “lens” to highlight

different perspectives on occupations, with particular assumptions and scope of examination. Just as we see differently using distinct optical lenses, a scholar would notice different facets of occupations with the three lenses we provide. For example, through a becoming lens, scholars would notice the transformation of newcomers as they become socialized into an occupation. Using a doing lens, on the other hand, scholars would notice the tasks occupational members perform and claim jurisdiction to, as well as those they collectively avoid. Through a relating lens, scholars may notice the complexities of the relations members build to clients and other external stakeholders. Each lens focuses attention on different questions and levels of analysis in the study of occupations.

The three lenses have particular characteristics worth noting. First, there is considerable variation within each lens. Each lens is itself multifaceted, and so as a way of further organizing the literature, we inductively outline within each lens several sub-categories, which we call “lens-filters”. (In keeping with our optical metaphor, lens-filters are physical attachments to a lens that do not change the fundamental properties of the lens but offer further modifications of light capture.) For the becoming lens, for example, we use the lens-filters of “becoming socialized”, “becoming controlled”, and “becoming unequal”. The various filters within a lens bear approximate resemblance to and affinity for one another, and therefore are collected together under a single lens. They range enough, though, to cover a diversity of studies. Second, our categorization of studies is not meant to be mutually exclusive. A given study is not the domain of one lens at the complete exclusion of another. While occupational studies often take a primary perspective from one lens out of the three, many studies utilize more than one lens. When various lenses are used in a single study, it is often a question of which lens is foregrounded and which is backgrounded in different parts of the study’s narrative. For example, many scholars of cross-occupational coordination utilize a doing lens at first that focuses on conflict between groups, but these same scholars also often transition in their narratives to a relating lens that emphasizes collaboration, specifying the conditions under which conflicts are resolved and at least temporary collaboration is achieved. Thus, the three lenses are not mutually exclusive, and they can even be combined in compelling ways. We now present each of the three lenses on occupations, beginning first with the becoming lens, then the doing lens, and finally the relating lens.

A Becoming Lens on Occupations

Definition

By “becoming”, we refer to the process by which an occupational community socializes its members into a particular set of shared cultural values, norms, and

worldviews (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Like any form of socialization, this process often entails many surprises and discoveries that newcomers encounter on their path to becoming legitimate members of their new community (Louis, 1980). The becoming lens encompasses the processes by which new members are inducted into established occupational communities as well as the individual-level transformations that occur among newly inducted members. Seminal works in this spirit include the study of how medical students become physicians (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961), how new recruits become full-fledged police officers (Van Maanen, 1973, 1975), and, more recently, how new hires learn to be traders, bankers or consultants (Ibarra, 1999; Michel, 2011; Zaloom, 2006). Overall, the becoming lens focuses on initiation and the lens' central problem is around "entry" into an occupation.

The becoming lens shares with traditional sociological and anthropological approaches the assumption that a person's character is heavily shaped by her or his social environment. While acknowledging that individual differences exist, this lens tends to downplay these differences in favor of the common socialization process individuals undergo when joining the collective—for instance, when individuals learn to become air traffic controllers (Vaughan, 2002) or funeral home directors (Barley, 1983). Whether studying occupations or any other collective, proponents of the becoming lens tend to focus on the dynamic evolution of individuals. Thomas and Znaniecki's (1919) introduction to their study of Polish immigrants in Chicago, also one of the major influences on the Chicago School of sociology (Bulmer, 1986, p. 3), captures this becoming trope well. As they explain when discussing their subjects' lives (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1919, p. 17):

The fundamental problems of the synthesis of human personalities are . . . problems of personal *becoming*, that the ultimate question is not what temperaments and characters there are but what are the ways in which a definite character is developed out of a definite temperament . . . The aim is to determine human types as *dynamic* types, as types of development . . . We find in any society ready models of organization with which individuals are expected to comply (emphasis in original).

The becoming lens can be classified into three main areas of scholarship: "becoming socialized", "becoming controlled", and "becoming unequal". The first lens-filter—becoming socialized—emphasizes the uniqueness of a given occupational group and how newcomers learn to belong to that group. The second lens-filter—becoming controlled—shares similarities with the first, but stresses, alongside occupational members' transformation, the organizational dynamics that accompany such transformation. Scholarship in this vein often draws inspiration from the Marxist tradition and pays particular attention to labor and management relations within organizations. Finally, the third lens-filter—becoming unequal—echoes the second category in its

emphasis on how occupational socialization results in social ordering. Unlike the second lens-filter, the becoming unequal approach tends to focus on how occupational socialization results in social inequality *across* occupations rather than within organizations.

Becoming Socialized

The substantive focus of studies in the “becoming socialized” spirit is to understand occupational members’ cognitive and behavioral transformations. The ways in which these individuals relate to their work (Hughes, 1958) and interact with other members (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 2009) to develop shared patterns of thought and action—what Pierre Bourdieu calls an acquired “specialized” habitus (2000)—prove essential to this understanding. The main assumption is that an everyday man or woman can be fashioned into an occupational member, but this fashioning often requires much effort and time. Becoming a doctor, for instance, will transform the way one thinks and acts (Konnor, 1988). As Konnor writes, some typical transformations for doctors include overcoming “the social inhibition that keeps us from intruding on another person’s space”, permitting one’s engagement in “touching and poking and pressing without embarrassment” (1988, p. 364); absorbing the “teamness” of medical training that also makes one focus emotional energy toward other team members, rather than patients (1988, p. 365); and, of course, seeing all people as patients, and the relations one develops with them as fairly desexualized (1988, p. 366). At the end of their training, physicians end up being very different people from who they were upon entry. Such transformation into an occupational member is the entire point of what it means to become socialized and is what this approach so powerfully describes.

While recent becoming socialized scholarship has expanded its scope to include the study of access to settings with less formal barriers to entry, such as sales-forces (Darr, 2006), sanitation work (Nagle, 2013), and bicycle messaging (Kidder, 2011), much of the early becoming socialized studies center on occupational settings where entry is assumed longer and more complex, such as naval officers (Elias, 1950), boxers (Weinberg & Arond, 1952), and electricians (Riemer, 1977). Notice of professions’ exclusive nature increased interest in how members gain admission and the boundaries that professionals erect between themselves and broader society. Goode’s (1957) article titled “Community within a community: The professions” nicely illustrates this point. As Goode points out, the “relations between and within the contained community and the larger society form an important, but hitherto little explored area”. (1957, p. 200). Ensuing studies of professions’ shared attributes, power, and roles are testimony to scholars’ attempts to uncover the distinct

forms of socialization and methods of cloistering themselves off that are deployed by these communities (Barber, 1963; Freidson, 1988; Moore, 1970).

In addition, becoming socialized studies have proved particularly adept at documenting and capturing a wide variety of occupational cultures (Trice, 1993), many of which are characterized by exclusivity. By positing that different occupations require distinct socializations, this approach begs for delving deeper into the intricacies of these diverse forms of socialization. Many often less prestigious and understudied occupations prove fair game for such in-depth inquiries; resulting in eclectic dives into colorful and contained occupational worlds. From “taxi-dancers” who rent their services to dance-hall patrons in Chicago (Cressey, 1932) to nightclub hostesses in Japan (Allison, 2009) and dominatrices in New York (Lindemann, 2012), no line of work proves too obscure to warrant further scrutiny. Such attention is often necessary, not only because of what it says about occupational members’ socialization, but also because of how this socialization informs broader dynamics. Becoming, for instance, a nightclub hostess in Japan can teach us as much about occupational members’ uniqueness as about Japanese salary-men’s over-involvement in their work (Allison, 2009). Hostesses learn how to express “desire” toward their patrons counter-balancing the lack of desire these men experience at home because of the overbearing nature of their workplace commitments. When long hours keep them at the office and with colleagues, they are not only absent from their homes, but become symbolically “impotent”, as Allison explains (2009, pp. 29–30) and hostesses assuage this fear. In that sense, becoming a hostess also says a lot about the incapacitating effect of mainstream corporate life in Japan.

As suggested above, the study of unique occupational cultures can go beyond just cataloguing previously undiscovered socialization processes and can bring these processes to bear on broader social issues such as morality. For example, Mars has studied a wide range of occupational cultures from a becoming perspective. His studies, ranging from the socialization of restaurant waiters to dock workers, show how individuals are socialized into “cheating” at work to affirm their social belonging (Mars, 1974; Mars & Gerald, 1982; Mars & Nicod, 1984). While cheating can be seen as an individual pursuit to advance one’s own self-interest, his studies show that cheating may advance the collective in ways that are very difficult to challenge without the risk of being excluded from their occupational group. Dock workers who break a container and then declare the goods as damaged to divide them among each other are seen as being taught about *sharing*, not cheating. Similarly, Mars’ restaurant waiters who, with the help of kitchen staff, manipulate customers’ checks to keep some served and paid dishes off the books, are able to create a hidden pot of money, later divided between kitchen and wait staff. Taking from management is not viewed as stealing but instead as reasonable compensation for the often-underpaid efforts expended. In the process, social cohesion is built.

Hence, in these occupations, cheats serve many purposes. More generally, the ways occupations socialize their members illuminates these groups' relations to broader society.

The socialization of occupational members into particular cultures may also have important organizational implications. One notable way occupational socialization can influence organizational outcomes is by restricting occupational member flexibility in decision-making. That is, as individuals undergo transformative cognitive and behavioral changes in the name of becoming part of an occupation, they may become "cognitively entrenched" as experts who hold highly stable occupational schemas that can make them inflexible and constrained in their decision-making (Dane, 2010). Such occupationally constrained decision-making can produce unexpected outcomes. For instance when bankers' professional identity is made salient, they tend to be more dishonest (Cohn, Fehr, & Maréchal, 2014). Occupational cultures can therefore harm non-members and society at large. Almandoz and Tilcsik (Forthcoming), for example, show that the professional backgrounds of strategic decision-making groups (the corporate boards or top management teams of local U.S. banks) matters greatly in predicting organizational failure (here, bank failure). They suggest that strategic decision-making groups for U.S. banks may be hampered by cognitive entrenchment, overconfidence, and limited task conflict if they are dominantly stacked with bankers. Having some professional diversity in such groups may attenuate such constraining group tendencies. Overall, then, becoming socialized into an occupational group proves consequential for a variety of outcomes.

Becoming Controlled

Occupational socialization can involve surrendering part of one's autonomy to the collective, and scholars who study dynamics leading to "becoming controlled" emphasize this loss of autonomy as much as the socialization process per se. The resulting coercive order is as central to this approach as the occupational culture's intricacies. In fact, these cultures are sometimes merely seen as vessels of corporate control (Ray, 1986). Studies in this spirit focus on a wide variety of occupations, ranging from factory workers' apprenticeship into delivering production quotas (Burawoy, 1979) and Disneyland ride operators closely regulated and monitored to maintain a smiling demeanor (Van Maanen, 1991) to luxury hotel concierges and house-keepers catering to guests' evolving needs (Sherman, 2007). While much of this scholarship looks at the lower levels of the occupational pyramid, the range of studied contexts suggests that even at the upper echelons, control is being exerted under the guise of occupational socialization. For instance, investment bankers rapidly learn to endure long office hours to please their superiors (Michel, 2011). These bankers might view themselves as different from factory

workers, but at the end of the day, studies in this lens-filter of becoming controlled suggest the key difference resides in the way workers are being controlled, not whether management controls them. Links between these lines of research and the Marxist tradition (Braverman, 1998) as well as critical management studies (Adler, Forbes, & Willmott, 2007) can often be made and underline the shared goal guiding this approach: uncovering the many mechanisms that make work coercive and workers less free. Thus, documenting novel forms of managerial control is a primary end-goal of these various inquiries.

An important insight from the becoming controlled viewpoint is that occupational members can knowingly or unknowingly “consent” to being controlled at work (Burawoy, 1979). As Burawoy notes, the factory machine operators who “make out” by manipulating their encounters with “the social and nonsocial objects that regulate their conditions of work” are de facto helping management, since they “play games” to make their production quotas (1979, p. 51). Learning to become a machine operator entails learning these games and ultimately amounts to consenting to managerial demands. Similarly, aeronautics factory craftsmen lose some of their autonomy in the process of learning, as part of their induction into their occupational culture, to produce—for their own use, with company materials, and on company time—“homers” (i.e. illegal, yet tolerated artifacts that embody their occupational identity). Supervisors can later point to these instances as managerial leniencies and ask, in exchange, for added efforts on official production (Anteby, 2008a, 2008b).

Factory workers are not the only ones who can be viewed as controlled. Engineers and consultants, for instance, can as easily get entrapped into such dynamics. By simply embracing a culture that seems on the surface attractive and fun, they may end up becoming overly committed to their work and burnt out (Kunda, 1992, p. 18; Perlow, 1999, 2012). In that sense, becoming an engineer or a consultant entails more risks for the employee’s well-being than one might initially suspect. In a similar fashion, Bunderson and Thomson (2009) show how zookeepers become easier to manage because of their attachment to their occupation. Their calling or desire to care for animals, coupled with the scarcity of openings for their skillsets in zoos and aquariums, coalesce to produce a career trajectory that usually starts with lengthy unpaid internships and goes toward minimally paid, slightly more stable jobs. As Bunderson and Thomson remark, “As a group, zookeepers are highly educated (82 percent have a college degree) but very poorly paid (average annual income of \$24,640; lowest quartile of U.S. occupations in terms of hourly wage)” (2009, p. 35). Being socialized into zookeeping is both a blessing and a curse. Because zookeepers are so attached to their occupation, and because their love of animals is key to their identity, employers can extract efforts from them in exchange for little material rewards. Studies of occupational socialization

here open up a window into control dynamics that would otherwise be overlooked.

Finally, the becoming controlled lens-filter has immensely added to our understanding of novel forms of control, particularly the emotional control that occupational members experience in organizations (Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989). While early writing on control specified its various organizational and visible manifestations [see, for instance, Edwards' (1979) typology of "direct", "technological", or "bureaucratic" controls], more recent scholarship has shifted attention to the intra-individual, less visible emotional control that gets exerted at work. The daily work of commercial flight attendants illustrates well this emotional control (Hochschild, 1983). When interacting with travelers, they engage in emotional labor to perform the role expected of them while at the same time preserving their sense of self. In doing so, the occupational demands of the job compel them to self-regulate what conventionally is believed to be a more private, less accessible self. The shaping of the self through occupational socialization is not merely a learning process, but also one that teaches members how to respond to controlling organizational and societal demands, including emotional ones (Kondo, 2009). Though not all emotional work carries negative consequences for workers' (Wharton, 1993), its extent and intensity has often raised concerns. In becoming who we "need" to be as part of an occupational group, we also might lose part of the freedom to become who we want to be.

Becoming Unequal

The last group of studies in the becoming lens, "becoming unequal", looks at how distinct forms of occupational socialization aggregate to form a landscape of inequality. Many studies aim to explain the unequal distributions of workers in different occupations, distinguished along such categorical lines as gender and ethnicity (e.g. see Fernandez & Sosa, 2005; Padavic & Reskin, 2002; Reskin, 1993). Here, the processes of socialization are almost subordinate to their outcomes, yet these implied processes strongly determine just who can "become" a member of a particular occupational group. Also, these processes help explain how occupational segregation becomes naturalized.

Segregation is often studied along gender lines; gender, understood as an ongoing interactional accomplishment (West & Zimmerman, 1987), gets produced and reproduced not only in households, but also in the workplace and in occupations. Pierce (1996), for example, examines how legal work is gendered, for litigators and for paralegals, not only at macro-levels of social structure but also at micro-levels of social interaction and identity. An ensuing social order distinguishing between "male" and "female" occupations emerges in which some occupations "come to appear, by nature, possessed of central, enduring,

and distinctive characteristics that make them suited to certain people and implausible for others” (Ashcraft, 2013, p. 7). As Steve Vallas explains,

sex segregation at work remains deeply inscribed within the occupational structure . . . Men are still historically found in male-dominated occupations such as laborer, truck driver, and manager, while large numbers of women can still be found in such heavily feminized jobs as secretaries, elementary school teachers, and nurses (2012, p. 88).

Occupational segregation matters because wage levels and other important outcomes tend to be tightly connected to occupational affiliations. This is particularly important for the sex typing of occupations and the accompanying segregation of women into “pink-collar” lines of work (Bielby & Baron, 1986; Marini & Brinton, 1984). Members of female-dominated occupations tend to receive lower economic rewards (England, Allison, & Wu, 2007; Hartmann & Reskin, 1986; Levanon, England, & Allison, 2009; Williams, 1995). Also, the relatively low female representation in and assumed “maleness” of managerial ranks is particularly troubling since these individuals control other employees and develop cultural narratives that equate managerial competency with often stereotypically “male” traits (such as abstract reasoning and rational thinking), creating a self-reinforcing cycle of segregation (Bailyn, 1993; Kanter, 1977; Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, & Pruitt, 2001; Reid, 2015). Not only do these assumptions often disqualify women from managerial ranks, but they also play out when managers evaluate female employees differently than their male counterparts (Castilla & Benard, 2010; Crowley, 2013).

The becoming unequal lens-filter offers several explanations for occupational segregation. Some of these are demand-side explanations for segregation that account for employers’ needs, preferences, and biases. Many culturally constructed beliefs related to occupations are seen as key predictors of such segregation. Though a given organizational or work group culture can sometimes attenuate cultural biases that lead to difficulties with managing diversity (Ely & Thomas, 2001), there are prevalent cultural schemas associated with particular occupations called “ideal worker images” that define assumptions and expectations around the kinds of people who can most successfully become members of an occupation (Acker, 1990; Gorman, 2005; Reid, 2015). Turco (2010) shows, for example, that among leveraged buy-out investors, the gender-typed ideal worker image specifies aggressiveness and absolute commitment to work above all else as valued characteristics of investors. She finds that this ideal worker image disadvantages women investors, particularly those who are mothers, who are already numerically marginalized as tokens.

Similarly, in trying to explain occupational segregation by race (Bergmann, 1974), a becoming unequal lens proves quite powerful in suggesting why black men might not appear to “fit” some of the assumptions core to occupational beliefs. Managers, for example, may be less inclined to hire black men or

promote them at a slower pace on grounds that they lack “soft skills” (such as motivation and ability to interact well with customers and coworkers) based on widespread black stereotypes (Moss & Tilly, 1996). In the same spirit, consultants, lawyers, bankers, and even professors might weed out candidates based on “fit” when such a narrative simply allows them to recruit those with similar demographic and socio-economic backgrounds (Anteby, 2013, pp. 109–122; Rivera, 2012, 2015).

While the above examples suggest demand-side factors of how socialization regulates who can successfully become occupational members, the role of individuals’ own assessments of whether they can become occupational members also deserves attention. In particular, supply side studies examine individuals’ preferences, characteristics, and skills that affect their self-selection into and out of certain occupations (Kaufman, 2002). As an illustration, women’s relative lack of “professional role confidence”—or confidence in one’s ability to successfully fulfill the roles, competencies, and identity features of a given profession—seems to reduce their likelihood, compared to men, of remaining in engineering majors and careers (Cech, Rubineau, Silbey, & Seron, 2011). This lack of confidence predates potential occupational entry and offers one window into what might prevent a more equal occupational sex distribution.

Other demographic groups might also steer clear of certain occupations. In the U.S., gay men and lesbians, for example, have been shown to concentrate in occupations with distinct features, such as those providing task independence (Tilcsik, Anteby, & Knight, 2015). A becoming lens suggests they do so for stigma-management purposes, since occupations in which tasks are performed independently (from coworkers or supervisors) offer some buffering from potential workplace discrimination and harassment. Rather than joining a fire brigade (with a high-level of task interdependence), they might prefer to become a fire safety inspector (who performs her or his work independently of others). The high-representation of gay men and lesbians in occupations that allow for task independence illustrates how a subset of individuals might pair themselves with select occupations. Inequality, through this becoming unequal lens, can be understood as a consequence—intended or not—of a socialization process of individuals into worldviews based on both supply side and demand-side perceptions or predictions of who might prove better suited to what lines of work. Being viewed, by oneself or by others, as particularly suited for a line of work is a socialization process that often leads to inequalities since most occupational affiliations carry distinct sets of rewards and consequences.

Methodological Emphases

The defining methodological aspects of the becoming approach are three-fold: first, an interest in single or aggregated (rather than comparative) occupational

settings; second, its attention to both formal (if relevant) and informal training contexts, such as schools and professional training programs, but also street-corners (Duneier, 1999; Whyte, 1993) and workplace groups (Mehri, 2005); and third, its heavy reliance on participant-observation and longitudinal research designs to capture members' dynamic initiation into an occupation. The book *Boys in white* exemplifies this approach and its methodological features (Becker et al., 1961). Becker and his co-authors studied one profession: medicine. They picked the entering class of students enrolled at the University of Kansas medical school, and they engaged in "continued" and "total" participant-observation of these students both inside and outside classrooms (1961, p. 27). These choices allowed them to document how students, whom they call the "boys in white", become physicians. Tellingly, the term "nurse" is absent from the book's index and only appears 15 times in this 456-page book. This is because the authors focus almost exclusively on the studied professional group, almost to the detriment of any others, in contrast to the two other lenses that we will discuss. What this study does teach us is how students learn to adopt the values and behavior expected of them for their future profession and how their training helps shape these outcomes.

The above tradition of honing in on a professional group in its educational setting and using participant-observation to study members' socialization has many contemporary followers. Scholars have, for instance, studied the making of firefighters (Desmond, 2007) and business school professors (Anteby, 2013). Others have also relied on archives to capture the socialization of groups such as lawyers (Granfield, 1992), physicians (Dunn & Jones, 2010), and economists (Fourcade, 2006). The becoming lens's research strategy tends to be either to observe directly or reconstruct occupational newcomers' transformation process. Whether dealing with the socialization of meteorologists (Fine, 2009), magicians (Jones, 2011), fashion models (Mears, 2011), or drug dealers (Bourgois, 2003), the becoming lens immerses readers into an often mysterious initiation journey alongside members of the studied group.

Implications and Limitations

The becoming lens powerfully surfaces the nuances that characterize members' worldviews in a given occupation. It helps us understand why often similar-looking occupational groups might in fact be quite distinct. For example, the distinction between journalists and sociologists might seem to an outsider to be fairly porous. Yet the fact that sociologists go through a formal series of steps (including course requirements and the completion of a dissertation)—all of which requiring supervisory or peer sign-off—suggests a different socialization model from that of journalists. While an employer might hire either a sociologist or journalist for what appears to be similar skillsets of conducting research and writing, a lack of attention to how individuals become

occupational members might prevent organizations from fully understanding what motivates their employees. For journalists, external recognition (e.g. number of readers) might be a prized motivating factor. By contrast, for sociologists, the esteem of peers (e.g. citations by respected colleagues) might be more rewarding. Thus, a journalists and a sociologist hired into the same job might behave quite differently. Besides work motivation, understanding how employees have been socialized can influence many other organizational dynamics, including the worldviews different occupational group members bring into an organization, and the expectations they have for career paths, promotions, and pay packages.

As hinted to earlier, one major limitation of the becoming lens is its almost exclusive focus on the members of the studied occupational group. Generally, the broader external environment is analytically kept at bay from members' experiences of socialization, although studies in the labor process tradition often do account theoretically for the capitalist structure in which their studies are embedded (e.g. Burawoy, 1979). Interactions between drug dealers and law enforcement officers or fashion models and photographers, for instance, do not occupy center-stage in the becoming studies. Even the becoming unequal lens-filter refrains from fully discussing the nature of often strained, inter-occupational actions and claims. Occupational groups might be in intense competition with another (e.g. nurse practitioners versus physicians), and yet these tensions might not be captured in a becoming approach.

A second key limitation of the becoming approach is the typical temporal focus on the entry period into the occupation. Issues that are unique to more senior occupational members often go unrecognized. Anchoring the narrative on rookies or entrants into an occupation tends to facilitate readers' comprehension of these socialization journeys, and old-hands or old-timers typically only enter the narrative to help newcomers make sense of their environment. At the same time, there are newer studies that go methodologically beyond the usual becoming temporality, as they focus also on socialization but account for stages of occupational members' careers that are later than entry. Such studies examine engineers reaching stages in their career when they need to decide whether they want to become managers (Bailyn & Lynch, 1983), established musicians facing life circumstances that prevent them from practicing music anymore (Maitlis, 2009), and even senior bankers facing bodily exhaustion due to the amount of hours worked and leaving their jobs (Michel, 2011).

Third, the becoming lens tends to assume stability in the landscape of occupations. While studies using this lens do acknowledge change in individuals as they enter occupations and become transformed by the socialization process, they generally do not examine how occupational groups themselves change and how new occupations might emerge. In the next section, we examine

occupations using a doing lens, which meets the challenges of many of these limitations head-on, taking a broader, open-systems, and change-oriented perspective on occupations.

A Doing Lens on Occupations

Definition

Occupations are defined not just by how entrants become occupational members, they are also defined by what they do. Hodson and Sullivan write that an “occupation identifies the specific kind of *work* a worker does” and “more formally . . . is a cluster of job-related *activities* constituting a single economic role that is usually directed toward making a living” (2012, pp. 46–47, our emphasis). A “doing” lens focuses on how occupational members perform activities—like work tasks or practices—that have consequences for individual, occupational, and organizational outcomes (such as shifts in jurisdiction, status, power, and resource allocation). A central problem of the doing lens is to understand how occupational members engage in certain activities and compete with other occupational groups for exclusive claim to perform those activities. An assumption in this approach is that a fixed pie of tasks is being divided among various occupations; gains in task jurisdiction by one occupation come at the expense of another occupation. A study of jurisdictional battles on factory floors (Bechky, 2003a, pp. 720–721) perhaps best illustrates this assumption of competition around task domains:

The interdependence of occupations is a reality of organizational life . . . this interdependence may lead to discord, and it certainly results in negotiation and accommodation between occupational groups. Such occupational conflict has an extensive tradition of study, primarily among analysts of the professions (Abbott 1981; Freidson 1970; Larson 1977) . . . Because the task domain is the means of continued livelihood, occupations fiercely guard their core task domains from potential incursions by competitors.

The doing lens highlights several aspects of occupational life that distinguish it from the becoming lens. First, while the becoming lens emphasizes a shift in occupational members’ worldviews and understandings of themselves as individuals and as a community, the doing lens focuses on members’ activities. Of course, activities are implied in the becoming lens, but the analytical emphasis in doing studies is much more clearly on human action and less on the learning process of acquiring a worldview. A doing lens on occupations concerns itself empirically with how people act and how these actions matter.

Second, and related to the previous point, there is more emphasis in the doing lens on the agency of occupational members and groups. While the

becoming lens implies a more passive understanding of how occupational participants are socialized into particular norms and cultures, the doing lens suggests that individual members and occupational groups actively participate in the negotiation and production of work outcomes, jurisdictional boundaries, and structure. This emphasis on agency tracks with the “second wave” of the cultural turn in the social sciences (Weber & Dacin, 2011), in which actors shifted from being portrayed as “cultural dopes” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 68) blindly internalizing their socialization to more agentic and sophisticated actors skillfully utilizing cultural materials as resources for action (e.g. Swidler, 1986).

Third, many though not all studies in the doing tradition move beyond a focus on a single occupational group towards a consideration of a broader competitive ecosystem of occupational groups, whether at the macro-industry level or at the meso-workplace level. For example, Abbott (1988a) considers the ways in which professions jockey for position with one another by making jurisdictional claims over particular task areas. This shift is also readily understandable in the context of the scholarly shift in organization theory from closed- to open-systems approaches that underscore how different groups of actors pursue interests in particular institutional environments (Scott & Davis, 2007).

Next, we review the occupational literature using a doing lens. We suggest distinguishing several filters for this lens: “doing tasks”, “doing jurisdictions”, and “doing emergence”. The first lens-filter, doing tasks, focuses on how occupational members—often within a single occupation—perform tasks or practices and the individual or group implications of this performance. The second lens-filter of scholarship, doing jurisdictions, considers multiple occupational groups, and documents how they enact practices to compete with each other for exclusive, legitimized control of particular sets of tasks. The third lens-filter, doing emergence, involves considering how collectivities mobilize to enable the emergence of new occupations.

Doing Tasks

An occupation is often understood at least partially in terms of the work activities members are seen as undertaking or, as Abbott calls it, a “task area” (2005, p. 322). In this lens-filter of “doing tasks”, scholars underscore how workers perform the many distinct tasks and practices associated with a particular occupation, and how these performances have implications for individual and group outcomes, such as sense of identity, meaningful work, and dignity.

Scholars have long pointed to the wide diversity of work content in various occupations and the implications of performing these tasks. Several scholars have characterized the variations in work content across occupations in terms of attributes such as the skill level, autonomy, and intensity of work

tasks, and have emphasized the inequalities along class, gender, and racial lines that these differences introduce (Kalleberg, 2011; Osterman, 2013). Other scholars in the work design tradition have similarly acknowledged job attributes like autonomy, as well as other structural task characteristics (such as task variety and significance), but have been more focused on work outcomes like motivation (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Many of these studies, while invaluable showing variation across occupations or robust relationships between job characteristics and outcomes, present largely structural and static pictures of work content within each occupation.

Later scholarship contributed descriptive detail, dynamism, and agency to the understanding of work content, highlighting the active *doing* of tasks by occupational members and the meanings of performing these tasks. For example, workers might perform tasks not simply to complete their jobs but also to enact desired occupational identities (Anteby, 2008a, 2008b; Pratt et al., 2006). This scholarship also acknowledged that occupational members enacted practices beyond the required tasks of a job. Such practices might have been viewed by earlier scholars as extra-role behaviors, but later scholars recognized these tasks as embedded in a rich tapestry of action and meaning in the workplace that is also consequential. For example, craftsmen in factories who were not often asked to use their “golden hands” in their daily work engaged in unofficially crafting pieces for themselves or friends at work or at home to maintain their sense of worth (Anteby, 2008a, 2008b; Weber, 1989). Official, legitimized work tasks and unofficial practices together form an occupation’s activity-perimeter. The meaning of extra-role practices may also change based on worker characteristics and the meaning of what counts as “real” work (Daniels, 1987, p. 404). For example, when female engineers perform extra-role tasks such as informally nurturing others through mentoring, this work is often regarded as a natural expression of feminine “niceness” rather than an important contribution to organizational functioning and team success (Fletcher, 2001; Heilman & Chen, 2005).

Scholars in the organizational behavior literature have examined how occupational members enact practices that reframe, calibrate, or otherwise moderate the effect of task content on worker outcomes like positive identity, meaningfulness of work, and career outcomes. For instance, work content for a particular occupation may be stigmatized because the tasks are seen as morally, socially, or physically tainted, as in “dirty work” occupations (Hughes, 1962). In dirty work occupations, members may muster up justifications that change the meaning of “dirt” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999) or counter the taint with practices such as mobilizing occupational ideologies, social buffering, confronting client or public perceptions of the occupation, and enacting defensive tactics like role-distancing and gallows humor (Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark, & Fugate, 2007).

Some occupations, similarly, require the performance of “necessary evils” as a crucial part of the work, which are “work-related tasks in which an individual must, as part of his or her job, perform an act that causes emotional or physical harm to another human being in the service of achieving some perceived greater good or purpose” (Molinsky & Margolis, 2005, p. 245). Margolis and Molinsky studied a variety of occupational members who perform necessary evils, including managers who conduct lay-offs, doctors performing painful spinal taps, police officers evicting tenants, and addiction counselors delivering “tough love” to clients by scolding them (2008). They identified different response styles that occupational members adopted to cope with their performance of necessary evils, including becoming psychologically engaged and making personalized responses. This included an example of a manager who, after laying off an employee who had no place to live as a result of being unemployed, catered to the employee by making special arrangements for them to be placed in temporary housing (Margolis & Molinsky, 2008). More generally, workers in all sorts of occupations can “craft” their jobs by changing the cognitive, relational, and task boundaries of their work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Indeed, many occupational members job-craft to pursue unanswered callings even without leaving their line of work by privileging certain tasks over others or expanding their jobs by adding tasks to align with their callings (Berg, Grant, & Johnson, 2010).

Sociologists have also examined practices that occupational members enact to alter how their work tasks are perceived by themselves and others, with implications for workers’ outcomes like their senses of dignity and identity. Hodson (2001), for example, writes how, in the face of being assigned tasks by managers that overwork occupational members and impinge on their autonomy, workers attempt to maintain their sense of dignity at work by using various strategies such as resisting via covert uncooperativeness (see also Morrill, Zald, & Rao, 2003). Occupational members might also espouse rhetorics that influence the way they justify and view their tasks. Rhetorics are themselves also action in the sense that they are not just reflective of cognition; they are also performative (Barley, 1983; Nelsen & Barley, 1997). That is, rhetoric, language, and other symbolic expressions have “a performative role in that its use pragmatically affects actors in their thoughts and behaviors” (Cornelissen, Durand, Fiss, Lammers, & Vaara, 2015, p. 13). Fine (1996) suggests that cooks mobilize various rhetorics while performing different tasks to enact a range of occupational identities. As Fine writes, “many occupations incorporate diverse tasks” and “each task or set of tasks conveys self-images and implications for identity” (1996, p. 112). For example, a chef said,

We have to have basic cooking talents. We have to have creative cooking talents. You have to be a personnel director as far as hiring and firing

people . . . You almost have to be a psychologist . . . to be able to deal with problems [of the cooking staff], (Fine, 1996, p. 95).

He variously espouses a rhetoric of art regarding his creative cooking tasks to play up his identity as culinary artist, but also mobilizing a rhetoric of management regarding his hiring, firing, and people management tasks to assert an identity of being an effective restaurant supervisor.

Scholars have also considered how the various practices that occupational members perform have implications for their career outcomes. For example, O'Mahony and Bechky (2006) study contract workers entering the external labor market, and they posit that contract workers are especially challenged by a career progression paradox. In this paradox, workers attempt to build new skills by seeking jobs in new task areas, but employers prefer workers with prior relevant experience. O'Mahony and Bechky suggest contract workers enact the practices of "stretchwork", which is "work that largely fits with an individual's previous work experience but introduces a small novel element that extends his or her skills in a new direction", to shape employers' perceptions of their work and progress in their careers (2006, p. 919).

Finally, while many existing studies have generally regarded an occupation as a mostly coherent, relatively homogeneous set of tasks and practices, an emerging set of studies, like Fine's (1996) above, consider within-occupation heterogeneity in tasks and how the performance of these heterogeneous tasks can matter for work outcomes. One important inequality-generating mechanism might be task segregation—the disproportionate allocation of a worker group to particular tasks: for example, female security screeners at the Transportation Security Administration spend more time conducting pat-downs than do men, and because pat-downs are particularly physically, emotionally, and relationally straining, female screeners have poorer job quality outcomes such as perceived work intensity and emotional exhaustion than male screeners (Chan & Anteby, 2015). Thus, even within a given occupation, the allocation of tasks cannot always be assumed to be homogenous across workers, and more generally the tasks that occupational members perform may have divergent implications for different groups of members.

In sum, this lens-filter of doing tasks points to the kinds of task content and practices that occupational members perform and the ways they are consequential for individual and group outcomes. The next filter of scholarship in the doing lens considers how the boundaries of task content between different occupational groups may shift as a result of various actions that occupational members undertake and why such shifts matter.

Doing Jurisdictions

If a single occupation is understood partially in terms of what tasks members perform, two related questions arise from this statement. First, how might

these tasks *change*? While a becoming lens mostly assumes that occupations are relatively stable and static enough to be characterized by a particular culture and set of primary tasks, the doing lens—by the nature of its focus on action—allows for a more nuanced understanding of how occupations change. For example, physicians’ tasks are substantially different today from the tasks they performed decades earlier. A doing lens can capture such a shift in action, while a becoming lens would only pick up on the shift when it is already stabilized and ingrained into an occupation such that new members are socialized into the new occupational reality.

Second, how do *multiple* occupations intersect with each other? The doing lens suggests a focus not only on intra-occupational action, but also on inter-occupational action. Many of the tasks nurses perform today were previously performed by physicians, resulting from physicians relinquishing certain tasks to nurses or from nurses making claims to physicians’ tasks. In this lens-filter of “doing jurisdictions”, scholars emphasize how occupational groups make claims—often against other occupations—to negotiate and change jurisdictional boundaries around the content of their work in an effort to enhance their groups’ prestige, influence, and compensation.

The study of occupations was deeply influenced by Abbott’s (1988a) book, *The system of professions*, which argued that prior theories of “professionalization”, which emphasized a sequence of patterned stages of the development of a professional group, were incomplete. He proposed an alternative theorization: that professions existed in a system where they actively compete with one another by making jurisdictional claims. Abbott’s theory suggests that professions are defined not simply by the signs, symbols, and other trappings of communal identity, but by the group’s jurisdictional claims to and control of certain tasks (1988a). “Jurisdiction”, Abbott asserts, “is the link between a profession and its work” (1988a, p. 20). Such claims determine, for example, who can legally cut you with a scalpel or diagnose your mental state; physician groups, for example, make jurisdictional claims in their negotiation of medical board licensing and certification (Horowitz, 2012). Professions are subsets of occupations, and occupational communities, likewise, can define themselves by means of jurisdictional struggles with competing groups over the tasks to which they lay claim. Whether asserting their right to fact-check journalists’ articles (Cohen & Staw, 1998) or to repair photocopiers (Orr, 1996), various occupations deploy many elaborate efforts and ingenuity to assert their expertise over certain, unique tasks.

These macro-level jurisdictional contests enacted by occupational groups may be precipitated by and have effects for sweeping organizational and societal shifts. Broad cultural and institutional changes produce new opportunities for occupations to increase their status and power, and in so doing, these groups shape the very course of history. Such a possibility is documented vividly by the way in which the human resources profession shaped the

meaning and implementation of equal opportunity legislation by pushing personnel programs, offices, and job positions and claiming these bureaucratic changes would allow the enforcement of equality and justice in organizations (Dobbin, 2009; Dobbin & Kelly, 2007; Edelman, Abraham, & Erlanger, 1992; Kelly & Dobbin, 1998). The legal profession, meanwhile, could not offer the kinds of bureaucratic solutions that personnel managers pushed, instead “balk[ing] at the idea of peddling remedies that the courts had not approved” (Dobbin, 2009, p. 5). Through interaction and contestation with U.S. courts and legal experts, personnel managers defined and redefined what equal opportunity meant in practice, shaping not only the jurisdictions and identity of the personnel management profession itself, but the wider legal and cultural landscape of U.S. law, society, and workplaces. Thus, this scholarship highlights how the actions and practices of occupations that jostle for jurisdiction can be deeply consequential for critical societal issues.

While Abbott (1988a) focused on inter-occupational contests over task boundaries at a field-level, in the realm of legal and social institutions, later work focused on inter-occupational coordination and boundary contestation at more micro-levels, such as in social interactions and practices. For example, in the trade of human cadavers, clinical anatomists in hospitals sought to distinguish themselves from entrepreneurs running independent ventures who also secured cadavers for research and education (Anteby, 2010). While both groups initially engaged in what could be construed as similar task domains (i.e. securing cadavers), the anatomists rapidly adopted specific and distinct practices they proclaimed were the more “honorable” way to procure specimens (2010, p. 627), such as getting direct consent from body donors (rather than just from families) and refusing to dissect cadavers prior to use. These micro-level distinctions or ways in which members “inhabited” their occupations (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006), allowed them to draw a boundary between themselves and entrepreneurs. Similarly, Timmermans (2002) examined the everyday activities of medical examiners as they fought with organ procurement groups for jurisdiction over corpses, with medical examiners seeking to determine cause of death and procurement groups seeking to acquire organs for tissue transplantation.

A notable branch of scholarship examines micro-level jurisdictional contests in particular workplaces. Bechky (2003a) argues that considering occupational boundary contests in the context of an organization is critical because workplace interactions “make real” the jurisdictional claims of occupational members. Indeed, there has been a robust and growing literature on inter-occupational contestation. For example, Kellogg, Orlikowski, and Yates (2006) examine coordination between four different occupational groups at an online marketing solutions firm: Project Management, Client Services, Creative, and Technology. They found that cross-occupational attempts to coordinate work on client projects were recurrently stymied by various

conflicts. These included conflicts over jurisdictional control, as well as identity and accountability across the four occupational communities. More specifically, members of the Creative group often rejected requests from the Client Services group to make edits to PowerPoint slides, which they saw as jurisdictional transgressions. One of the Creative members memorably said to a Client Services member, “Please don’t design the slides. Let the Art Director [referring to himself] do that” (2006, p. 35). This example demonstrates how boundary work (Lamont & Molnár, 2002) operates on the ground by articulating not only who should do what, but also what should not be done by whom. The prerogative of occupational groups is partly to “do what others don’t” (Anteby, 2013, pp. 89–108) and imposing that prohibition on others is crucial to a group’s continued standing and success inside and across organizations.

Other studies illuminate how technology may also play a role in how occupational jurisdictions change. For instance, Zetka (2001) examines the introduction of gastrointestinal endoscopic technology into the medical field. General surgeons were at first indifferent to the new scope technology because it was framed as consistent with cultural prescriptions that guide the division of labor between surgeons and gastroenterologists. That is, the endoscope was initially defined as a diagnostic tool, where diagnosis was seen as the jurisdiction of gastroenterologists. However, gastroenterologists began to use the scope to not just diagnose but also to treat pathologies (by using probes and snares with the scopes), sparking a jurisdictional conflict between gastroenterologists and general surgeons. Nelson and Irwin (2014), in their historical study of librarians, also found that the introduction and evolution of a new technology—in this case Internet search tools—prompted librarians to redefine their occupational domain of expertise from “masters of search” to “masters of interpretation” and later to “connectors of people and information”.

More recent scholarship considers jurisdictional contests not only between different occupations, but also between occupations and organizations as well as occupations and lay people. For example, Galperin (2012), in his study of U.S. retail clinics (e.g. in drug stores), found that disputes over occupational jurisdiction also occur between occupational groups and large corporations. He documents how retail “minute clinics” successfully captured jurisdiction over basic primary care services, upsetting the previously negotiated settlement for this scope of work by physicians and nurses. Recent work by Huising (2014) also looks beyond cross-occupational jurisdictional turf wars to explore the relations between safety professionals and managers inside the organization. She finds managers use “censure episodes” to steal jurisdiction over tasks away from the safety professionals they employed by mobilizing an organizational network to re-label the practices of some of these professionals as problematic. Scholars have also explored how institutional pressure from social movements driven by lay people can challenge occupational practices and jurisdictions. For example, the longstanding practices and identities associated

with “iron man” surgeons who work 100-plus hour weeks and operate on little sleep were challenged by patient rights activists resulting in new laws limiting surgeons’ work hours to improve employee and patient safety (Kellogg, 2009, 2011a, 2011b).

Additionally, recent scholarship utilizing the doing jurisdictions lens has problematized the notion that occupational closure is actively sought by occupational members. Most studies assume occupations initiate or embrace professionalization projects that institute educational requirements, certifications, and restricted training procedures to achieve monopoly benefits for their members. Ranganathan (2013), however, suggests conditions in which professionalization projects might be resisted by members of the occupation getting professionalized. She presents a case where an international association’s attempts to professionalize plumbing was resisted by plumbers in an eastern state of Orissa in India. These plumbers had achieved an alternative form of occupational closure based on shared ethnicity that was undermined by the professionalization process that allowed international entrants into the plumbing occupation. Ranganathan underscores the importance of accounting for the differences in identity between the professionalizers (in this case, internationally trained plumbers) and the professionalized (locally trained plumbers from Orissa).

Overall, the doing jurisdiction lens-filter demonstrates how occupational groups’ active division of task labor—in the form of jurisdictional claims—has consequences for occupational groups’ relative standing and growth or decline. These jurisdictional battles also matter, importantly, for organizational outcomes. That is, the jurisdictional contests of occupational members are consequential in explaining a broad range of dynamics across and within organizations.

Doing Emergence

While a becoming lens mostly assumes a stable landscape of occupations (focusing on the socialization of members into given, existing occupations) the doing lens, as described above, considers change amongst occupations. In this lens-filter of “doing emergence”, scholars examine how practices and actions enable the emergence of occupational groups. In other words, this lens-filter considers how groups of individuals start doing what other groups do not do or start doing differently what others already do. These small shifts can open up possibilities for the emergence of new occupations.

How do new occupations emerge? One possibility is that an occupation “hives off” tasks (Hughes, 1958) such that a new occupation is created to take on the tasks that were hived off by the existing occupation. Physicians and nurses, for example, may hive-off more menial tasks, leading to the creation of new occupations such as various types of medical technicians, as

Nelsen and Barley (1997) note. A second possibility is that collectives act to form occupations as technology changes. When a new technology is created and adopted widely enough to require support, an occupational group may arise to meet the needs of users of this new technology. The historical rise of the profession of naval officers in the United Kingdom is in part a testimony to the increased centrality of a then-new technology to the British crown; the need to control large ships was a technological necessity for an empire in expansion (Elias, 1950, 2007). A third possibility is that actors mobilize to legitimize “non-work” activities as “work”, by seeking recognition and remuneration for these activities. The studies in the doing jurisdictions lens-filter above presume there are already legitimized work tasks that fully formed occupations fight over to claim the right to perform. However, there are a variety of activities like housekeeping or volunteering (Daniels, 1988; Rollins, 1987) that involve the expenditure of effort to produce a “socially valued good or service” (Vallas, 2012, p. 3) but that have not historically been recognized as “real work” or a distinct occupation. Actors can nonetheless mobilize to try legitimizing such activities. This might happen through the commodification of these activities, endowing them with exchange value, and producing them for profit; in the process, this creates a new work category and associated occupational group (Nelsen & Barley, 1997).

In this third possibility, one group’s emergence into a paid occupation is framed as coming at the expense of some other group. For example, Nelsen and Barley (1997) compare paid emergency medical technicians (EMTs) with unpaid EMTs, examining how they employ rhetoric and practices to fight for whether EMT work should be paid work or remain a volunteer-based effort. Nelsen and Barley consider paid EMTs a “fledgling occupation”—by which they mean an occupation that has only recently emerged and has few institutional resources, in stark contrast to highly institutionalized professions. The authors find that paid EMTs mobilize claims that they were “seasoned rather than simply trained, being decisive rather than indecisive, being in control rather than out of control, and being a public servant rather than a ‘trauma junkie’” to distinguish themselves from volunteer EMTs and to legitimize themselves as an occupational group who performs commodifiable, remunerable work (1997, p. 631).

A number of other scholars have examined collectives that have successfully mobilized in legitimating a set of activities as remunerable work, producing new occupational groups in the process. For example, caretaking of children and the elderly (Hochschild, 2011, 2012) and the handling of typical household chores (Sherman, 2010) have become commercialized into distinctive occupational groups—respectively, nannies and caregivers as well as personal concierges. There have also been attempts to commoditize local handicraft production (Wherry, 2008), surrogacy (Almeling, 2007) and community support for new mothers (Turco, 2012). Thus, the doing emergence lens-

filter shows that the emergence of new occupational groups does not occur passively; rather, occupations emerge through collective action by laying claim to a previously unrecognized or unclaimed set of tasks.

Methodological Emphases

There are a number of methodological emphases of the doing lens. First, because these studies examine activities and practices performed by occupational members, authors of these studies look for such action in observable behaviors, task performances, or claims-making—whether in the form of participant-observational data (e.g. Bechky, 2003b), or in the form of filings of occupational complaints that represent jurisdictional battles in archives (e.g. Abbott, 1988a). In addition, some newer studies have taken advantage of the recent and novel cataloging of “work activities” in the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) database, which enables a doing lens on occupations. In this U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics comprehensive database of survey-based occupational ratings, each work activity rating describes the “general type of job behaviors” associated with a given occupation. Though other parts of O*NET are more enabling of a becoming lens on occupations (e.g. by asking what certifications, if any, are needed), many sections offer a way to think about occupations as partly constituted by tasks and practices (namely, a doing lens on occupations). These sections ask, for instance, whether workers need to “enter, transcribe, record, store, or maintain information” and/or use their “hands and arms in handling, installing, positioning, and moving materials, and manipulating things” (National Center for O*NET Development, 2014). Such an approach has allowed several scholars to start digging deeper into the activities constitutive of occupations (e.g. Liu & Grusky, 2013 and Tilcsik, Anteby, & Knight, 2015). This might help scholars to understand the rise or fall of occupations characterized by particular tasks since some scholars have argued that some broad sets of activities can be automated and that entire occupations will likely decline (Levy & Murnane, 2012).

Second, these studies generally examine settings where there is interaction between multiple occupational groups and usually adopt a comparative (inter-group) design. For example, Abbott (1988a) considers public and legal contexts where occupational groups make claims against one another, while Bechky (2003a) examines workplace and organizational contexts where different occupational groups come into contact. This last study is paradigmatic of such a doing approach—Bechky compares the knowledge, authority, and legitimacy claims of engineers, technicians, and assemblers in a workplace setting and how they compete over the use of given workplace artifacts. Likewise, Nelsen and Barley (1997) compare paid and unpaid EMTs, examining their differing ways of mobilizing identities, rhetorics, strategies, and practices.

Third, unlike the becoming lens, which tends to focus on the early days of individuals' entry into an occupation, studies adopting a doing lens tend to consider typical days of individuals already socialized into an occupation. That is, the observation window of data collection for studies utilizing a doing lens may be somewhat atemporal. For instance, Kellogg, Orlikowski, and Yates do not examine the early days of socializing newcomers into occupational communities (like the creative design group and technology group), but rather, they study the "everyday" practices of these communities (2006, p. 26).

Implications and Limitations

A doing lens on occupations helps sensitize scholars to occupational efforts that shape important outcomes at individual, group, and organizational levels. For example, a doing lens may help explain how the jurisdictional claims-making of different occupational groups may influence group status shifts or impede cross-occupational collaboration in organizations (e.g. Bechky, 2003a, 2003b). Also, such a lens may help explain outcomes of organizational change initiatives; introducing new technology in an organization, for instance, may produce challenges as it alters practices and claims-making of different occupational groups (e.g. Barley, 1986; Beane & Orlikowski, 2015). Open questions remain by applying a doing lens to understand why and how occupational members take on or yield new tasks, or how they support new organizational initiatives and technologies.

There are a number of limitations of this lens, however. While the doing lens does account for more of an open-systems view of occupations by examining how different occupational groups interact and compete with one another, it generally does not account for groups related to, but distinct from other occupations, such as clients. For example, while the inter-occupational coordination literature considers workplace conflicts between occupational groups, with some exceptions, it generally lacks a focus on how occupations relate to clients or other groups. Understanding how occupations define and redefine their work and identities amidst challenges not just from other occupational groups, but also from managers and lay people (e.g. patients using the Internet to self-diagnose), is critical for a more complete view of occupations. Work using a "relating lens" addresses some of these limitations by considering occupational interactions beyond those with other occupations.

A second limitation is that the doing lens tends to emphasize conflictual or adversarial interactions, rather than cooperative interactions. This emphasis on contestation is characterized by jurisdictional battles and contests between occupations, rooted in assumptions that professional groups are primarily "political bodies whose purpose is to define, organize, secure and advance the interests of their (most vocal and influential) members" (Willmott, 1986,

p. 556) and that advancement occurs mainly through competition rather than collaboration. Thus, the doing lens often misses out on considering how occupations construct more collaborative relations with other occupations as well as with a larger ecosystem of non-occupational groups—a perspective that we argue is more fully adopted in the relating lens described next.

A Relating Lens on Occupations

Definition

We suggest a third and final dynamic that defines occupations: relating. Occupational members are defined not just by who they are and what they do, but by the collaborative relations they build with other groups. The central question of this lens is explaining the generative nature of occupational relations with other occupational and non-occupational groups. While scholars in the doing lens have mostly examined conflictual occupational relations, scholars in the “relating” lens have instead looked at collaborative relations and emphasized more “positive” human connections (cf. Cameron & Dutton, 2003). A relating lens focuses attention on understanding when and how occupational groups collaborate with other groups to perform interdependent work or collectively expand their social influence. As this is a fairly newer perspective on occupations, research is comparatively scant, but we suggest it can have powerful implications.

While early work focused on identifying mechanisms that enable cross-occupational collaboration (e.g. Bechky, 2003b), more recent work considers collaborative relations between occupations and a complex web of stakeholders to achieve shared or complementary goals. For example, a relating study of physicians would be situated in the context of insurance companies, their employing organization, nurses, patients and patient family members. In contrast to the becoming and doing lenses, the relating lens looks beyond intra- and inter-occupational competitive dynamics to examine the potentially generative relations between occupations and an entire ecosystem of stakeholders including clients, lay persons, organizations, and technology, in addition to other occupational groups. This lens builds on past empirical forays into the interactive nature of occupations—for example, how interactions between building janitors and tenants (Gold, 1952) or cabdrivers and their clients (Davis, 1959) contribute to occupational members’ self-views—yet makes these relations central to the occupational pursuit.

In the past few decades, the social sciences have taken a relational turn. Rather than study socially bounded categories such as “physicians”, “patients”, and “hospitals” in relative isolation, a relating lens shifts the analysis to the “dynamic, unfolding relations” between such groups (Emirbayer, 1997, p. 281; Somers, 1994). From the explosion of quantitative social network

analyses in our management journals to calls for “relational ethnography” (Desmond, 2014), the field has embraced the importance of these webs of relations across methodologies and literatures (e.g. Grant & Parker, 2009). Rather than study one bounded entity, such as an occupation or even an occupational group in relation to another occupation, an occupation’s entire field of relations is taken into account. Desmond (2014, p. 553) explains the logic behind this approach:

The field biologist knows that, say, large animal abundance cannot be explained by reference only to the large animals themselves; rather, the entire ecology of the savanna—the relations between large and small animals, between predator and prey, the availability and geography of insects, grassland, and water—must be taken into account (Pringle et al. 2010). In the same way, the relational ethnographer holds that, say, the political strategies of Brazilian socialists cannot be explained by reference only to interactions between socialists; rather, the structural conditions to which the socialists are oriented—the architecture and internal dynamics of the political field—must be reconstructed.

However, the study of occupations in organizations has only begun to capitalize on the benefits of adopting a more relational approach. In doing so, the field has begun to address Abbott’s (1993, pp. 204–205) largely unmet call to analyze occupations in relation to the broader system of relations they are embedded within by working across multiple levels of analysis. In the sections below, we highlight current scholarship that has begun to utilize this approach by considering the different ways occupations relate with those in their broader field.

We examine occupational scholarship using a relating perspective through the three lens-filters of “relating as collaborating”, “relating as coproducing”, and “relating as brokering”. In the first lens-filter—relating as collaborating—we consider work that identifies mechanisms enabling collaboration across and within occupations, in contrast to the doing lens which primarily examines conflict and competition. We next use a relating as coproducing lens-filter to feature research situating occupations in relation to a complex web of other entities in their broader fields. These studies examine how occupations align and interact with multiple other parties to collectively coproduce expertise and extend the reach of their societal influence. Lastly, the third lens-filter, relating as brokering, examines the rise of intermediary occupational groups that play an essential role in maintaining the functioning of these complex webs of relations by connecting, buffering, and mediating across people and tasks to benefit the entire ecosystem they are embedded within. We conclude by identifying the methodological emphases as well as opportunities to move the field forward by employing the relating lens to the study of occupations.

Relating as Collaborating

The first lens-filter in the relating approach focuses attention on scholarly work that adopts a “relating as collaborating” perspective on intra- and inter-occupational relations. While the doing lens highlights jurisdictional battles between occupational groups, a relating lens specifies mechanisms that allow occupational groups to overcome their differences and collaborate to perform interdependent work. Sometimes scholars utilize both the doing jurisdictional lens-filter with the relating as collaborating lens-filter as a way of structuring their account: presenting a jurisdictional battle between occupational groups before elucidating it by showing how occupational groups overcome this conflict via collaboration. Such scholars find that cross-occupational collaboration can be successful when organizations provide certain tools (see for a review Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). For example, rules and routines can improve collaboration by bringing occupational members together and specifying respective responsibility for tasks (e.g. Feldman, 2000; Feldman & Pentland, 2003). Team scaffolds or structural design features of teams can also facilitate coordination across professional groups (Valentine & Edmondson, 2015). Moreover, boundary objects, such as representational tools like engineering drawings and prototypes, can support the translation of meanings and the negotiation of status across occupational boundaries (e.g. Bechky, 2003a; Carlile, 2002; Levina & Vaaste, 2004; Star & Griesemer, 1989). As an illustration, Carlile (2002) found that members of different occupational groups—in this case marketers, production technicians, and engineers—can collaborate despite differences in occupational beliefs, expertise, and status by using boundary objects, such as shared assembly drawings. Finally, common spaces as Bechky (2003b) demonstrates, or trading zones as Kellogg, Orlikowski, and Yates (2006) show, can help promote communication and liking among different occupational members.

While early work emphasized the need to identify mechanisms to overcome what were considered inherently conflictual cross-occupational relations, more recent work challenges this assumption. For example, DiBenigno and Kellogg (2014), in their study of nurses and patient care technicians (PCTs), found that cross-occupational collaboration was successful in work environments characterized by cross-cutting demographics (where occupational membership was uncorrelated with demographic group membership in terms of race, age, and nationality) which loosened the occupational status and identity order so that nurses and PCTs could collaborate by drawing upon alternative forms of expertise, status, emotion rules, and meanings from shared non-work identities. By expanding their focus to include the role of non-work identities and the source of connection they can provide (e.g. “working mothers” or “Haitian immigrants”) (cf. Ramarajan & Reid, 2013) in cross-occupational

collaboration, DiBenigno and Kellogg showed that effective collaboration can occur despite occupational differences.

In a similar vein, a relating as collaborating view challenges an adversarial conception of interactions among ostensibly competing capitalists in the same occupation. For example, Uzzi (1997) discovered through observation and social network analyses that New York City apparel shop owners, rather than compete with one another, developed strong-tie friendship relations and collectively helped one another's businesses succeed. Zuckerman and Sgourev (2006) similarly found that car dealership owners and home construction company owners each formed informal peer networks where they regularly shared confidential details on their firm performance, and learned from and motivated one another to succeed, rather than compete and undermine one another as classic economic theories may have predicted. Likewise, Indian immigrants from Gujarat who owned hotels have been shown to thrive in part due to the proximity to other Gujarati-owned hotels. This is most likely because these owners refer customers to each other when they can no longer provide rooms due to capacity constraints (Kalnins & Chung, 2006).

In sum, the relating as collaborating lens-filter on occupational scholarship highlights mechanisms and processes through which intra- and inter-occupational collaboration can occur. In the next section, we feature research in the relating as coproducing lens-filter that broadens the scope of collaboration to consider an occupation's generative relations with an entire ecosystem in their wider fields.

Relating as Coproducing

A "relating as coproducing" lens-filter focuses attention on how occupations relate not just with fellow occupational members or other occupational groups, but with an entire field of stakeholders with which they are mutually interdependent. Instead of viewing jurisdiction as a fixed pie, with one occupation gaining at another's expense, as described in the doing lens, this lens sensitizes us to situations in which the pie can expand through collaborative action among occupational and non-occupational groups. Here, occupational expertise is viewed as less defined by internalized occupational knowledge or the tasks performed, and more defined by the ability to yoke together local complementarities into a functioning network of expertise (Eyal, 2013; Huising, 2015; Huising & Silbey, 2011). For instance, mental health professionals' expertise relies in part on their ability to enroll patients' parents into the diagnosis of certain illnesses like autism. Similarly, craftsmen's expertise rests in part on the willingness of less skilled factory workers to request and accept the craft pieces they illegally create (Anteby, 2008a, 2008b). And it is lawyers' relational expertise, such as their understanding of a judge's tolerance

for longwinded explanations, that affects the outcomes of civil trials and hearings as much as or sometimes more than their substantive legal expertise (Sandefur, 2015).

A relating as coproducing view highlights how an occupation's expertise and societal influence can expand through the process of "generosity" or "coproduction" with clients, lay persons, other occupational groups and institutions. This perspective tellingly calls for a "sociology of expertise" rather than a sociology of occupations (Eyal, 2013). Proponents of this view seek to decenter occupations as the singular unit of analysis and shift our focus to the network of relations connected to occupations that collectively contribute to building and sustaining their influence (Collins, 1990; Eyal, 2013; Eyal & Buchholz, 2010). Scholars using this lens-filter examine entire fields reliant on occupational labor to understand how a variety of actors across a field collectively coproduce what can on the surface appear to be a simple intra-occupational task. For example, consider price setting in the reinsurance market. Jarzabkowski, Bednarek, and Spee (2015) conducted a global ethnography of finance professionals in multiple firms in the reinsurance industry responding to the same crises, including floods, earthquakes, terrorism, and other natural or man-made disasters. By studying financial professionals in relation to a complex constellation of other entities—including financial institutions, multiple reinsurance firms, industry associations, and media outlets, they were able to understand how these financial professionals collectively constructed prices (their distinct "expertise") by relating to non-occupational members. Lawrence (2004) likewise studied the emergence of environmental auditing by studying the entire field of relations that accountants were embedded within and the ways in which they claimed their expertise.

A relating as coproducing lens-filter also provides an opportunity to reexamine assumptions regarding how occupational groups relate to their clients. Rather than view control over clients as a given, these scholars examine how occupations modify client behavior or enroll clients in collectively achieving shared objectives. Heimer and Staffen (1995), for example, show how neonatal intensive care unit nurses re-socialize challenging or "inappropriate" parents by educating them rather than marginalizing them to aide in their occupational goal of taking care of sick newborns. Similarly, while much literature on occupations assumes automatic client compliance with occupational authority, particularly towards high-status professionals, more recent work that takes a relating as coproducing approach problematizes this assumption. Huising (2015) uses a comparative ethnographic approach to explore how occupational authority is coproduced by both occupational members (in this case health physicists and biosafety officers) and their clients (in this case scientific laboratory personnel). She finds that successful client compliance with their safety recommendations occurs when these professionals performed "scut work" generally associated with non-professional work. By engaging more closely

with their clients through scut work, these professionals were able to elicit relational authority (i.e. voluntary compliance from their clients). In contrast, those professionals who maintained their professional purity and distance from their clients by not performing such low-status work were unsuccessful. This study demonstrates the important role of building relations with clients to expand an occupation's influence and reach within an organization. It also demonstrates how occupational expertise alone may be insufficient for eliciting client deference to occupational recommendations and suggests instead that such expertise is an ongoing relational accomplishment.

Other research employing a relating as coproducing lens-filter examines how low-status and low-power occupations, such as those in the service sector, can realize shared interests by forming mutually beneficial alliances. For example, Lopez (2010) highlights what he calls the "service triangle", which describes the relationship between service workers (e.g. waiters, retail clerks), their clients, and their organizational managers. Leidner (1993, 1996) develops an "interest-alliance framework" to describe when service occupational members form collaborative relations with their clients or organizational managers to advance their collective interests. For instance, service workers may form coalitions with sympathetic customers to organize for improved working conditions (Rhee & Zabin, 2009).

A final important piece of the relating as coproducing view of occupations involves the place of technology in this perspective (Orlikowski & Scott, 2008). Occupations are increasingly constituted by and mutually dependent upon their relation with technology to perform their work. Rather than view technology as a backdrop or tool of occupational members in performing their work, recent actor-network theory inspired views of technology highlight its agentic properties as human stand-ins, inscribed with the assumptions, politics, and values of their creators (Berg, 1997; Beunza & Stark, 2004; Callon, 1987; De Laet & Mol, 2000; Hinds, Roberts, & Jones, 2004; Latour, 1992; Pickering, 1993; Stubbs, Wettergreen, & Hinds, 2007). For example, Beunza and Stark (2004), in their study of Wall Street traders engaged in arbitrage, treated the robots these traders worked with as important actors who enabled trader "recognition" or a way of seeing the world that would be unattainable to humans alone. Robots were kept separate from one another to avoid influencing one another's calculations and engaged in automatic trades and actions, constituting important relational architecture that enables the work of traders. Other work in this tradition takes a relating as coproducing approach by studying the adoption of new technologies and identifying a mix of human and technological relations, often involving occupational members, that collectively interact to co-construct the trajectory of a particular technology or practice (e.g. Pinch & Bijker, 1984), and by extension, the occupational group's trajectory.

To summarize, the relating as coproducing lens-filter draws attention to how collaborative relations between occupations and those in their broader

field—be they clients, technology, organizations, or other occupations—can coproduce expertise, authority, and other outcomes. We next consider how connections between these webs of relations are maintained by highlighting the work of intermediary occupational groups using a relating as brokering lens-filter.

Relating as Brokering

The final filter for the relating lens considers “relating as brokering”. A relating as brokering perspective accounts for the rise of new occupational groups that act as intermediaries connecting networks of people and systems to help organizations accomplish increasingly interdependent work (e.g. Heaphy, 2013; Kellogg, 2014). In contrast to prior understandings of how new occupational groups emerge by competing for exclusive control over a set of tasks, typically at the expense of another group, as described in the doing lens (e.g. Nelsen & Barley, 1997), the relating as brokering view of occupational emergence describes a less competitive process. This perspective suggests new occupations may emerge to fill critical gaps in complex networks of relations by connecting, buffering, and mediating across multiple organizational and occupational boundaries (Appelbaum & Batt, 2014; Barley, 1996; Barley & Bechky, 1994; Hoffer Gittell, 2002; Lingo & O’Mahony, 2010; Obstfeld, 2005). Instead of competing with other groups for control over tasks, they share and coordinate them. Rather than erect boundaries, they bridge across them. Rather than concern themselves only with their own occupational group’s advancement, they connect people and tasks to benefit the entire network, and in the process they often help implement change and reform, coproduce innovative products and services, or get their and other’s work done.

Organizations may rely on these intermediary occupational groups to manage increasingly complex divisions of labor within and across organizations. As an illustration, Lingo and O’Mahony (2010) examined how country music producers used “nexus work” to synthesize and integrate the contributions of multiple occupational groups (e.g. performers, sound engineers, songwriters, etc.) to collectively coproduce a hit song. In a similar vein, Kellogg (2014) highlights how reforms that rely on cross-occupational collaboration may require the services of low-status “brokerage” occupations to succeed by buffering high-status occupational groups from directly interacting with one another rather than by linking them. In another example, Heaphy’s (2013) comparative ethnographic study of patient advocates highlights their critical role as “pressure specialists” in maintaining the institutionalized roles of various actors (e.g. patients, doctors, family members) by repairing breaches in these roles. In these last two cases, the intermediary occupational groups had weak occupational identities and neither group was collectively organized in terms of belonging to a formal occupational association. Interestingly, in

contrast to dominant assumptions about the desire of occupational groups to achieve closure by organizing to protect and expand their jurisdiction (e.g. Abbott, 1988b), patient advocates claim to purposefully avoid professionalizing (unlike how other powerful occupational groups like nurses and physicians have done) to ensure they remain focused on their patients (Heaphy, 2008). These occupational intermediaries may therefore share features with other occupational groups who often work in the shadows, behind the scenes, and who generally minimize public credit for their work in service of their clients (such as ghostwriters, chiefs of staff, and sherpas).

A relating as brokering view suggests these occupational intermediary groups may develop unique capacities from their network position to act as “sociological citizens” who “see their work and themselves as links in a complex web of interactions and processes rather than as a cabin of limited interests and demarcated responsibilities” (Canales, 2011; Silbey, Huisig, & Coslovsky, 2009, p. 203). For example, Huisig and Silbey (2011), in their study of Environmental Health and Safety coordinators, found that closing the policy-practice gap to improve safety within university laboratories required “relational regulation” in which these coordinators collectively developed relationships and gathered information to take pragmatic action to achieve compliance. A relating as brokering perspective also aligns with recent work on the “paradox of embedded agency” which finds that under some conditions, occupational members can develop high levels of self-consciousness to imagine alternatives and behave differently to bring about institutional change (Battilana & D’Aunno, 2009; Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; D’Aunno, Succi, & Alexander, 2000; Dorado, 2005; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004). For example, Reay, Golden-Biddle, and Germann (2006) find that nurse practitioners’ embeddedness in their healthcare system—rather than being an impediment to their ability to affect change—allowed them to know when to seize and create opportunities for changing organizational practices given their intimate knowledge of the web of other relations they were embedded within.

Methodological Emphases

The methodological approaches that best define occupational studies of relating are two-fold: first, the use of network and relational modes of analysis, often involving multi-site ethnography, relational ethnography or social network analyses; and second, an interest in an occupation’s full relational network that goes beyond its links to other occupational groups. Rather than study one group in isolation, a relational methodological approach shifts the analytical focus to study an occupation’s many relations in their broader field. Creative methodological strategies may be needed to realize the promise of applying a relating lens to the study of occupations. For instance, future studies might entail teams of scholars to observe multiple sides of the relations between a

given occupation and its various constituents. Desmond (2014) likewise discusses strategies for ensuring that both sides of mutually dependent relations are taken into account, such as first winning the trust of the lower-status party in multi-party imbalanced contexts. This heightened burden of mapping an occupation's entire relational network might require scholars to adopt increasingly comprehensive, multi-site designs and larger teams of researchers to fulfill the relational lens' hopes and aspirations.

Implications and Limitations

As suggested above, a major impediment to employing a relating approach to the study of occupations in organizations is primarily methodological. Studying a complex web of relations can be more complicated than studying a single occupation or two. For instance, negotiating access alone may be fraught with challenges, especially in regards to building relations with both sides of a contentious relationship (e.g. landlords and tenants). Another limitation of a relating view is that by expanding one's focus to include an occupation's broader network of relations, breadth may be achieved at the expense of depth (e.g. while the existence of ties may be clear, the contents of the ties might prove harder to decipher). In addition, as with all network analysis, there is always the concern that observed effects may be driven by unobserved relations outside of one's field of study, however broad.

Despite the methodological ambition needed to attempt a relational study of occupations, there is a great need for more studies of occupations employing a relational approach. Important questions remain: How do occupational members actually coordinate with a network of relations to collectively expand their scope of expertise? Can "brokerage" occupations endure over extended periods of time as low-status, with weak occupational identities, often working in the shadows in the service of other occupations rather than for themselves? In addition, do occupational members generally develop collaborative and conflicting relations with others or can an occupational group thrive on collaborative relations alone? Also, which relations (e.g. with other occupations, clients, lay persons, organizational members) do occupations use to define not just who they are, but also who they are not? These and other questions that emerge from adopting a relating lens on occupations may provide fruitful ground for future research.

A Historical Perspective on the Lenses

We produced our typology of lenses by following an inductive approach. In our experiences of reading the occupational literature and through the process of writing this article, we iterated between our readings and our emerging typology to induce, refine, and reshape these categories. Through this process, the

three lenses of becoming, doing, and relating emerged as salient to us, along with the various filters within each lens. In creating this typology, we noticed a pattern in the historical emergence of these scholarly perspectives. Here, we consider some of these trends and situate the three lenses and their filters in historical perspective.

The temporal ordering of the three lenses of becoming, doing, and relating roughly associates with the historical development of the scholarly field of occupations. That is, while these lenses have been applied across time periods, a look at some of the key archetypical studies for each lens is illuminating. *Boys in white* by Becker and his colleagues, an archetype of the becoming lens, was published in 1961. Abbott's book *The systems of professions* crystallized the doing lens and was published in 1988. For the relating lens, Eyal's *American Journal of Sociology* article titled "For a sociology of expertise" and showcasing the lens's applicability to medical expertise went to print in 2013. Indeed, many key archetypical studies in the becoming lens were published approximately in the general time span of the early 1900s until about the 1980s, those in the doing lens were published during the 1980s to the early twenty-first century, and those in the relating lens were primarily published during the early twenty-first century to the present.

Several illustrative trends reflect the general shift from the becoming to doing to relating lenses. One trend is the expansion of scope of analysis and theorization from intra-occupational studies to wide-ranging field-level examinations. Early becoming studies were characterized by a relatively limited intra-occupational scope. Research on socialization focused on the intra-occupational consideration of neophytes entering an occupation and internalizing group values. Studies of how workers become controlled expanded the scope somewhat to include the organizational context that enabled control of occupational members. Studies in the doing lens typically widened the scope further to account not only for organizational contexts and institutional contexts but also the inter-occupational context—examining often contested interactions between occupational groups. Finally, scholarship adopting a relating lens expands the scope of inquiry even further by considering not just the inter-occupational level but also how an occupation fits into a wider ecosystem of actors that include occupations, but also clients and even technology.

A second trend is the changing conceptualization of actors from somewhat passive to generally more active. Studies adopting a becoming lens mostly portrayed actors as relatively passive, either by internalizing occupational values and norms, being subjected to mechanisms of control, or being structurally or culturally induced into positions of disadvantage. Studies adopting a doing lens, however, began to conceive of occupational actors as agentially enacting tasks, as well as taking collective action to expand their occupation's jurisdictional claims. Studies taking a relating perspective continue this active perspective by exploring how occupations engage with a broader network of

stakeholders to co-construct their expertise with clients, laypersons, and other occupations.

We argue that each lens provides a unique and valuable perspective on the role of occupations in management and organizational studies, but also possibly in the broader social sciences. Though each lens can be dated by its emergence, each is *not* dated in its analytical power. By presenting and comparing these lenses, summarized in [Table 1](#), our hope is to better equip scholars with analytical tools to deepen and enrich their occupational inquiries.

Implications for Advancing Management and Organizational Theory

We believe that, besides advancing the literature on occupations, a renewed focus on occupations and professions through these analytical lenses can reinvigorate management and organizational theory (see [Table 1](#)). To illustrate the benefit of incorporating occupations into mainstream management and organizational literatures, we next explore how several broad areas of contemporary inquiry—namely, theories on institutions, identity, organizational diversity, and inequality—might advance by taking occupations into greater account and benefit from experimenting with alternate lenses than the ones often used in these respective literatures. These examples of literatures are not meant to be exhaustive but rather are meant to stimulate lines of further inquiry into these and other domains.

Institutional Theory and Occupations

Institutional theory has become an important stream of research in organizational theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Dobbin, 1994; Scott, 2014), yet its analysis of occupations has so far been largely limited to a becoming or doing lens, and often confined to a single lens within given institutional sub-fields of research (see e.g. Muzio, Brock, & Suddaby, 2013). In early neo-institutional theory, occupations were viewed largely through the lens of becoming, as the socializing force of professions was seen as a key source of normative isomorphic pressure on organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Still today, this becoming trope prevails in many sub-fields of institutional studies as illustrated in the burgeoning literature on hybrid organizations. For example, institutional scholars studying hybrid identities compare loan officers with “social work” backgrounds (e.g. social workers, teachers, and ex-nuns and priests) to those with “banking” backgrounds (e.g. economics, auditing, and finance) to document and conceptually account for institutional hybridity (Battilana & Dorado, 2010). The specific socialization of individuals (i.e. socialized as bankers or not) is thought to be critical to the success or failure of micro-finance organizations (e.g. Canales, 2013). A doing lens might offer an alternative way to distinguish members’ profiles. For instance,

Table 1 Summary of Three Lenses on Occupations

	Becoming	Doing	Relating
Definition	The ways in which occupational members are socialized into the cultural values, norms, and worldviews of their occupational community	The ways in which occupational members perform occupational tasks or practices and enact claims about their scope of expertise	The ways in which occupational members build collaborative relations with others, including intra-, inter-, and extra-occupational relations
Theoretical foci	Becoming socialized Becoming controlled Becoming unequal	Doing tasks Doing jurisdictions Doing emergence	Relating as collaborating Relating as coproducing Relating as brokering
Approximate era of archetypal works	Early 1900s–1980s	1980s–2000s	2000s–current
Exemplar work	<i>Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School</i> (Becker et al., 1961)	<i>The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor</i> (Abbott, 1988a)	<i>For a Sociology of Expertise: The Social Origins of the Autism Epidemic</i> (Eyal, 2013)
Key concepts	Socialization Occupational culture Control	Tasks and practices Jurisdictions Conflict	Coproduction Occupational fields Collaboration
Assumptions about actors	Little agency	Agentic and competitive	Agentic and collaborative
Key empirical focus	Worldviews of occupational members (especially newcomers)	Actions of occupational members Cross-occupational conflict	Relations between an occupation and its broader field Cross-occupational collaboration

a former banker and a former social worker might engage in similar tasks to close a loan (e.g. requiring collateral for a loan); in that regard, a doing lens would suggest re-categorizing loan officers based on what they do, not where they come from. Such a lens would therefore offer a different view on what explains organizational outcomes in hybrid organizations as well as what constitutes hybridity in the first place. That is, “hybrid” organizations might be more homogenous than they appear if all members adopt the same practices. Thus, by bringing an occupational doing lens to the study of hybrid organizations, future research can bridge levels of analysis and link micro-interactions to broader field-level changes (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Hirsch & Lounsbury, 1997).

Other institutional sub-fields have taken more of a doing approach on occupations and professions. For example, a growing literature on institutional logics has long been concerned with professions and occupations (e.g. Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Thornton (2004) notes that the professions constitute an institutional sector of society—along with markets, corporations, states, families, and religions—and professions have their own logics. Professional logics are instances of institutional logics or “organizing principles” (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 248) that constitute “the socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804).

Much scholarship in this tradition might be considered as viewing professions from a doing lens, as they examined how professional logics were contested over time—such as when the editorial logic lost out to a market logic in the publishing industry (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) or when accountants and lawyers contested the legitimacy of the assumptions underlying particular logics by utilizing rhetorical strategies of legitimacy (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). While these studies have shown the way change can occur in institutions as a result of contestation, the institutional logics literature may well benefit from a more relating lens. A relating lens might reveal not only competitive dynamics but also collaborative dynamics between professions in how they enact their professional logics. For example, by adopting a relating lens on institutional logic use in practice, McPherson and Sauder (2013) discovered that occupational members sometimes draw on multiple institutional logics rather than rigidly adhere to the “home” logic or set of values and beliefs of only their occupational group to influence sentencing decisions in a drug court. Experimenting with new lenses can therefore yield new insights for the institutional literature.

Identity and Occupations

Our framework on occupations may also be useful for identity scholars. While extant management and organizational literature on identity has engaged at length with organizational identity and social identity dynamics, as well as their interaction (e.g. Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996; George & Chattopadhyay, 2005; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Hogg & Terry, 2014; Scott & Lane, 2000), less attention has been paid to their interaction with *occupational* identities (for exceptions see Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006 and Kellogg, 2011a). Over the past 50 years, many occupational members, even those in high prestige professions such as medicine and law, no longer operate as sole practitioners engaging directly with their clientele in private practices, but are instead employed by larger organizations (Briscoe, 2007; Gorman & Sandefur, 2011; Noordegraaf, 2011). In addition, there is a growing number of contract workers who may specialize in an occupation (e.g. like information technology or engineering) but may work for a variety of organizational clients (e.g. Ashford et al., 2007). These trends have important implications for our understanding of how occupational identification may complement or conflict with one's organizational identification. A relating lens, for example, could further explore these intersections and answer recent calls to adopt an "intra-personal network" approach to the study of multiple identities and the complex ways in which these constellations of identities—be they occupational, organizational, or other—interact and intersect (Ramarajan, 2014).

Our framework could also move the study of identity forward in other ways. For instance, a doing lens on identity could focus attention on the ways in which toy designers express their identities through the production of their designs (Elsbach, 2009). Yet a relating lens on these same dynamics could analyze how designers' identities might be constructed in relation to their clients. Thus, variations in client types might predict expressions of identity. Similarly, while the identity of various occupational groups is typically examined by studying socialization processes, such as the "making" of a police officer (e.g. Van Maanen, 1975), adopting a relating lens would shift our understanding of police officers' identities towards a focus on how officers interact with other groups—such as types of citizens and alleged perpetrators (Van Maanen, 1978). It might be that police officers' identities vary in predictable ways depending on their patterns of interactions across types of interactants. Thus, the relating lens might alert scholars to how an occupational identity is constituted not just by the occupation itself but by its relations to other occupations, clients, organizational actors, and other non-occupational members (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007).

Organizational Diversity and Occupations

A vast literature on organizational diversity has identified the ways in which demographic differences—such as race, gender, nationality, and class differences—affect individual and organizational performance outcomes (e.g. Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Phillips, Mannix, Neale, & Gruenfeld, 2004; Rivera, 2015; Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). However, this literature has largely excluded the intersection of demographic differences and occupational differences, aside from research demonstrating widespread occupational segregation in which women and minorities are concentrated in lower pay and lower prestige occupations (e.g. Anker, 1998; Bean & Bell-Rose, 1999; Catanzarite, 2000; Charles & Grusky, 2004; DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007; McCall, 2001; Reskin, 1999; Tomaskovic-Devey, 1993). For example, diversity scholarship on faultlines rarely empirically examines occupational faultlines (e.g. Lau & Murnighan, 1998), despite organizational contexts where occupational distinctions may be an even stronger axis of difference than demographic distinctions. For instance, the distinction between engineers and marketers may be a more salient faultline than race or gender in certain organizations in which substantial power or status lies with either engineers or marketers. A relating lens on diversity scholarship in organizations would answer calls to look not only at differences in race, gender, and class, but also occupational or functional distinctions and their effects and interactions with these other differences (e.g. Harrison et al., 2002; Randel & Jaussi, 2003).

By taking occupations seriously, the literature on organizational diversity could advance in promising new directions (e.g. Almandoz & Tilcsik, forthcoming; Chattopadhyay, Finn, & Ashkanasy, 2010). For example, a becoming lens on occupations and diversity would compel greater attention to who can “become” an occupational member, given longstanding occupational segregation by race, gender, age, and nationality (Ashcraft, 2013; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). In particular, such an approach might point to occupational dynamics capable of reshaping members' broader identities, like in the case of offshore oil platform workers' learning to “undo” their (masculine) gender identity to create a safer work environment (Ely & Meyerson, 2010). A doing lens on diversity and occupations would sensitize scholars to the ways in which conflict in organizations is enacted not just from the basis of demographic differences, but also from occupational ones. As an illustration, recent work finds that consolidated workgroup demographics within organizations—where occupational membership is correlated with particular demographic characteristics—can exacerbate difficulties in the cross-occupational collaboration essential for achieving good outcomes in organizations (DiBenedigno & Kellogg, 2014). Moreover, a relating lens on diversity and occupations

would open new avenues for research on the dynamics of organizational growth or decline based on the degree of homophilous or cross-cutting demographic characteristics across occupations and other related groups in organizations. An organization's success might depend as much on its membership diversity across occupations as on the demographic diversity within the organization.

Inequality and Occupations

Finally, our framework also may have implications for the workplace inequality literature. The scholarship on workplace and organizational inequality is extensive (see DiTomaso et al., 2007; Stainback, Tomaskovic-Devey, & Skaggs, 2010) and has long examined the role that occupational segregation plays in the perpetuation of inequality (see Reskin, 1993; Reskin, McBrier, & Kmec, 1999). However, this literature has mostly taken a becoming lens on inequality, examining how different groups of people self-select or are sorted into particular jobs. That is, the inequality literature has considered how perceived misalignments between an individual's skillset and an occupation's needs may lead to supply side aspirations or demand-side discrimination that exacerbates occupational segregation (e.g. Ashcraft, 2013). For example, gendered cultural assumptions may lead to views that men are a better "fit" for the school superintendent job than women (Williams, 1992).

On the other hand, a doing lens that examines the actual tasks performed by different occupational groups might produce a different view of inequality that accounts for the micro-level performance of activities and practices. More specifically, a doing lens could be deployed to examine how, despite being in the same occupation and holding the same job title, a particular worker group may disproportionately perform particular tasks, leading to inequalities within a job in a given organization (Chan & Anteby, 2015). As an illustration, minority faculty members might be over-assigned to diversity committee work relative to their majority peers, and because such committee work is relatively less rewarded than research tasks, minority faculty members may be disadvantaged. In addition, a relating lens on occupations and inequality might draw attention to the way in which one's occupational network and position within one's broader field can limit mobility within and across organizations. Considering the intersectional interrelations between peoples' different categorical affiliations has important implications for inequality (Vallas & Cummins, 2014), and occupational affiliation has been an under-examined categorization that could contribute to widespread workplace inequality in unexamined ways.

Conclusion

Overall, by introducing a novel framework to understand occupations and professions, we aim to encourage scholars to build upon their approaches—such as

those found in the institutional, identity, organizational diversity, and inequality literatures—with new lenses that question scholarly assumptions around what occupations and professions entail and thereby suggest alternative accounts. We believe that by viewing occupations and professions through the lenses of becoming, doing, and relating we can provide a comprehensive framework to organize the current literature and spark new scholarship on open questions that remain within each lens. In doing so, we also hope to continue “bringing back” occupations and professions into management and organizational studies.

Finally, if we take a relational view on the nature of scholarly expertise, then our hope for building and enriching the field might center on collaborations across domains—be it management studies, organizational behavior and theory, strategy, or the study of work and occupations and beyond—to expand the reach of our collective academic expertise. Our research trajectories, whether we acknowledge it or not, may be more inter-twined than we realize. After all, we scholars not only encounter and study occupations in our research, but we are also part of one. Perhaps, then, we might also turn our lenses on ourselves.

Acknowledgements

We thank Elizabeth George and Sim Sitkin for their helpful editorial guidance. We are also very grateful to Ruthanne Huising, Kate Kellogg, András Tilcsik, and John Van Maanen for their reactions to drafts of this article as well as to Caitlin Anderson for initial assistance in locating references.

Note

1. There are multiple perspectives on what professions entail. A structural approach to professions, exemplified by the work of Greenwood (1957) and Goode (1957), “points to a series of static characteristics possessed by the professions and lacking in the non-professions” (Ritzer, 1975, p. 630). A process approach, represented by scholars like Caplow (1954) and Wilensky (1964), focuses on a series of historical stages through which an occupation must pass through en route to becoming a profession. A power perspective, illustrated by Freidson (1970), suggests that professions are occupations that have achieved a monopoly over their work tasks. In this view, a profession achieves such monopoly by developing a “market project” (Larson, 1979) to carve-out a “shelter”, “a social closure”, or “sinecure” for its members (Freidson, 1988, p. 59), thereby “convincing the state and the lay public that they need, and deserve, such a right” to monopoly (Ritzer, 1975, p. 630). An ecological perspective, pioneered by Abbott (1988a), suggests that professions exist in a system in which various professions contend for jurisdiction over tasks. Notably, however, Abbott (1988a, p. 315) writes, “I have used the word

‘profession’ very loosely, and have largely ignored the issue of when groups can legitimately be said to have coalesced into professions”.

ORCID

Michel Anteby  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2629-2529>

References

- Abbott, A. (1988a). *The system of professions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, A. (1988b). Transcending general linear reality. *Sociological Theory*, 6(2), 169–186.
- Abbott, A. (1993). The sociology of work and occupations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19, 187–209.
- Abbott, A. (2005). Sociology of work and occupations. In N. J. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *Handbook of economic sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 307–330). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139–158.
- Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2007). Critical management studies. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 119–179.
- Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 13–17.
- Allison, A. (2009). *Nightwork: Sexuality, pleasure, and corporate masculinity in a Tokyo hostess club*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Almandoz, J. (2012). Arriving at the starting line: The impact of community and financial logics on new banking ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1381–1406.
- Almandoz, J. (2014). Founding teams as carriers of competing logics when institutional forces predict banks’ risk exposure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(3), 442–473.
- Almandoz, J., & Tilcsik, A. (forthcoming). When experts become liabilities: Domain experts on boards and organizational failure. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Almeling, R. (2007). Selling genes, selling gender: Egg agencies, sperm banks, and the medical market in genetic material. *American Sociological Review*, 72(3), 319–340.
- Anker, R. (1998). *Gender and jobs: Sex segregation of occupations in the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anteby, M. (2008a). *Moral gray zones: Side productions, identity, and regulation in an aeronautic plant*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Anteby, M. (2008b). Identity incentives as an engaging form of control: Revisiting leniencies in an aeronautic plant. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 202–220.
- Anteby, M. (2010). Markets, morals, and practices of trade: Jurisdictional disputes in the U.S. Commerce in cadavers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 606–638.
- Anteby, M. (2013). *Manufacturing morals: The values of silence in business school education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Appelbaum, E., & Batt, R. (2014). *Private equity at work: When wall street manages main street*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2013). The glass slipper: "Incorporating" occupational identity in management studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(1), 6–31.
- Ashford, S. J., George, E., & Blatt, R. (2007). Old assumptions, new work: The opportunities and challenges of research on nonstandard employment. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 65–117.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 413–434.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., Clark, M. A., & Fugate, M. (2007). Normalizing dirty work: Managerial tactics for countering occupational taint. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 149–174.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men, and time in the new corporate world*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bailyn, L., & Lynch, J. T. (1983). Engineering as a life-long career: Its meaning, its satisfactions, its difficulties. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4(4), 263–283.
- Barber, B. (1963). Some problems in the sociology of the professions. *Daedalus*, 92(4), 669–688.
- Barley, S. R. (1983). Semiotics and the study of occupational and organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), 393–413.
- Barley, S. R. (1986). Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of ct scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 78–108.
- Barley, S. R. (1996). Technicians in the workplace: Ethnographic evidence for bringing work into organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), 404–441.
- Barley, S. R., & Bechky, B. A. (1994). In the backrooms of science: The work of technicians in science labs. *Work and Occupations*, 21(1), 85–126.
- Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (2001). Bringing work back in. *Organization Science*, 12(1), 76–95.
- Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (2004). *Gurus, hired guns, and warm bodies: Itinerant experts in a knowledge economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Battilana, J., & D'Aunno, T. (2009). Institutional work and the paradox of embedded agency. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 31–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419–1440.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). 2 how actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 65–107.
- Baum, J. A., & McGahan, A. M. (2013). The reorganization of legitimate violence: The contested terrain of the private military and security industry during the post-cold war era. *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 33, 3–37.
- Bean, F. D., & Bell-Rose, S. (1999). *Immigration and opportunity: Race, ethnicity, and employment in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Beane, M., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2015). What difference does a robot make? The material enactment of distributed coordination. *Organization Science*, published online October 7, 2015, doi:10.1287/orsc.2015.1004
- Bechky, B. A. (2003a). Object lessons: Workplace artifacts as representations of occupational jurisdiction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(3), 720–752.
- Bechky, B. A. (2003b). Sharing meaning across communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 312–330.
- Bechky, B. A. (2011). Making organizational theory work: Institutions, occupations, and negotiated orders. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1157–1167.
- Becker, H. S., & Carper, J. W. (1956). The development of identification with an occupation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 289–298.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). *Boys in white*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Berg, J. M., Grant, A. M., & Johnson, V. (2010). When callings are calling: Crafting work and leisure in pursuit of unanswered occupational callings. *Organization Science*, 21(5), 973–994.
- Berg, M. (1997). Of forms, containers, and the electronic medical record: Some tools for a sociology of the formal. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 22(4), 403–433.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. 1966. New York: Anchor.
- Bergmann, B. R. (1974). Occupational segregation, wages and profits when employers discriminate by race or sex. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 1(2), 103–110.
- Beunza, D., & Stark, D. (2004). Tools of the trade: The socio-technology of arbitrage in a Wall Street trading room. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 13(2), 369–400.
- Bidwell, M., & Briscoe, F. (2010). The dynamics of interorganizational careers. *Organization Science*, 21(5), 1034–1053.
- Bidwell, M., Briscoe, F., Fernandez-Mateo, I., & Sterling, A. (2013). The employment relationship and inequality: How and why changes in employment practices are reshaping rewards in organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 61–121.
- Bielby, W. T., & Baron, J. N. (1986). Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(4), 759–799.
- Boczkowski, P. J. (2010). *News at work: Imitation in an age of information abundance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourgois, P. I. (2003). *In search of respect: Selling crack in el barrio*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Braverman, H. (1998). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. New York: NYU Press.
- Briscoe, F. (2007). From iron cage to iron shield? How bureaucracy enables temporal flexibility for professional service workers. *Organization Science*, 18(2), 297–314.
- Bulmer, M. (1986). *The Chicago school of sociology: Institutionalization, diversity, and the rise of sociological research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(1), 32–57.
- Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). *Occupational outlook handbook*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). *Number of jobs held, labor market activity, and earnings growth among the youngest baby boomers: Results from a longitudinal survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/nlsoy.pdf>
- Callon, M. (1987). Society in the making: The study of technology as a tool for sociological analysis. In W. E. Bijker, T. P. Hughes, & T. J. Pinch (Eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology* (pp. 83–103). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cameron, K., & Dutton, J. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Canales, R. (2011). Rule bending, sociological citizenship, and organizational contestation in microfinance. *Regulation & Governance*, 5(1), 90–117.
- Canales, R. (2013). Weaving straw into gold: Managing organizational tensions between standardization and flexibility in microfinance. *Organization Science*, 25(1), 1–28.
- Caplow, T. (1954). *The sociology of work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cappelli, P. (2001). The decline of internal labor markets. In I. E. Berg & A. L. Kalleberg (Eds.), *Sourcebook of labor markets: Evolving structures and processes*. (pp. 207–245). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Carlile, P. R. (2002). A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. *Organization Science*, 13(4), 442–455.
- Carnevale, A. P., Rose, S. J., & Cheah, B. (2011). *The college payoff: Education, occupations, lifetime earnings*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.
- Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(4), 543–576.
- Catanzarite, L. (2000). Brown-collar jobs: Occupational segregation and earnings of recent-immigrant Latinos. *Sociological Perspectives*, 43(1), 45–75.
- Cech, E., Rubineau, B., Silbey, S. S., & Seron, C. (2011). Professional role confidence and gendered persistence in engineering. *American Sociological Review*, 76(5), 641–666.
- Chan, C. K., & Anteby, M. (2015). Task segregation as a mechanism for within-job inequality: Women and men of the Transportation Security Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, published online October 9, 2015, doi:10.1177/0001839215611447.
- Charles, M., & Grusky, D. B. (2004). *Occupational ghettos: The worldwide segregation of women and men*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(4), 749–780.
- Chattopadhyay, P., Finn, C., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2010). Affective responses to professional dissimilarity: A matter of status. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(4), 808–826.
- Cohen, L. E. (2013). Assembling jobs: A model of how tasks are bundled into and across jobs. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 432–454.

- Cohen, L. E., & Staw, B. M. (1998). 'Fun's over. Fact checkers are here': A case study of institutionalized dissent in the magazine publishing industry. *Advances in Qualitative Organizational Research*, 1, 100–135.
- Cohn, A., Fehr, E., & Maréchal, M. A. (2014). Business culture and dishonesty in the banking industry. *Nature*. doi:10.1038/nature13977
- Collins, H. M. (1990). *Artificial experts: Social knowledge and intelligent machines*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. (2015). Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 10–27.
- Cressey, P. G. (1932). *The taxi-dance hall: A sociological study in commercialized recreation and city life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Crowley, M. (2013). Gender, the labor process and dignity at work. *Social Forces*, 91(4), 1209–1238.
- Dane, E. (2010). Reconsidering the trade-off between expertise and flexibility: A cognitive entrenchment perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 579–603.
- Daniels, A. K. (1987). Invisible work. *Social Problems*, 34(5), 403–415.
- Daniels, A. K. (1988). *Invisible careers: Women civic leaders from the volunteer world*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Darr, A. (2006). *Selling technology: The changing shape of sales in an information economy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- D'Aunno, T., Succi, M., & Alexander, J. A. (2000). The role of institutional and market forces in divergent organizational change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(4), 679–703.
- Davis, F. (1959). The cabdriver and his fare: Facets of a fleeting relationship. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65(2), 158–165.
- De Laet, M., & Mol, A. (2000). The Zimbabwe bush pump mechanics of a fluid technology. *Social Studies of Science*, 30(2), 225–263.
- Desmond, M. (2007). *On the fireline: Living and dying with wildland firefighters*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Desmond, M. (2014). Relational ethnography. *Theory and Society*, 43(5), 547–579.
- DiBenigno, J., & Kellogg, K. C. (2014). Beyond occupational differences the importance of cross-cutting demographics and dyadic toolkits for collaboration in a U.S. hospital. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(3), 375–408.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (Eds.). (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiTomaso, N., Post, C., & Parks-Yancy, R. (2007). Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 473–501.
- Dobbin, F. (1994). *Forging industrial policy: The United States, Britain, and France in the railway age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobbin, F. (2009). *Inventing equal opportunity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. L. (2007). How to stop harassment: Professional construction of legal compliance in organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(4), 1203–1243.
- Dorado, S. (2005). Institutional entrepreneurship, partaking, and convening. *Organization Studies*, 26(3), 385–414.
- Duneier, M. (1999). *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 114–149.
- Durkheim, E. (1984/1933). *The division of labor in society* (W. D. Halls, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Edelman, L. B., Abraham, S. E., & Erlanger, H. S. (1992). Professional construction of law: The inflated threat of wrongful discharge. *Law and Society Review*, 24(1), 47–83.
- Edwards, R. C. (1979). *Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the twentieth century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Elias, N. (1950). Studies in the genesis of the naval profession. *British Journal of Sociology*, 1(4), 291–309.
- Elias, N. (2007). *The genesis of the naval profession*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Elsbach, K. D. (2009). Identity affirmation through ‘signature style’: A study of toy car designers. *Human Relations*, 62(7), 1041–1072.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members’ responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the business week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), 442–476.
- Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2010). An organizational approach to undoing gender: The unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 3–34.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229–273.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a relational sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 281–317.
- England, P., Allison, P., & Wu, Y. (2007). Does bad pay cause occupations to feminize, does feminization reduce pay, and how can we tell with longitudinal data? *Social science research*, 36(3), 1237–1256.
- Etzioni, A. (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers*. New York: Free Press.
- Eyal, G. (2013). For a sociology of expertise: The social origins of the autism epidemic. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4), 863–907.
- Eyal, G., & Buchholz, L. (2010). From the sociology of intellectuals to the sociology of interventions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 117–137.
- Feldman, M. S. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization Science*, 11(6), 611–629.
- Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(1), 94–94.
- Fernandez, R. M., & Sosa, M. L. (2005). Gendering the job: Networks and recruitment at a call center. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(3), 859–904.

- Fine, G. A. (1996). Justifying work: Occupational rhetorics as resources in restaurant kitchens. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 90–115.
- Fine, G. A. (2009). *Authors of the storm: Meteorologists and the culture of prediction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fletcher, J. K. (2001). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power and relational practice at work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fourcade, M. (2006). The construction of a global profession: The transnationalization of economics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(1), 145–194.
- Fourcade, M. (2009). *Economists and societies: Discipline and profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1890s to 1990s*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Freidson, E. (1988). *Professional powers: A study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 212–266). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedson, E. (1970). *Profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Galperin, R. (2012). *Organization-bound professionalism: Essays on contemporary expert work* (Doctoral dissertation). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- George, E., & Chattopadhyay, P. (2005). One foot in each camp: The dual identification of contract workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 68–99.
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 63–81.
- Gold, R. (1952). Janitors versus tenants: A status-income dilemma. *American Journal of Sociology*, 57(5), 486–493.
- Goode, W. J. (1957). Community within a community: The professions. *American Sociological Review*, 22(2), 194–200.
- Gorman, E. H. (2005). Gender stereotypes, same-gender preferences, and organizational variation in the hiring of women: Evidence from law firms. *American Sociological Review*, 70(4), 702–728.
- Gorman, E. H., & Sandefur, R. L. (2011). “Golden age,” quiescence, and revival how the sociology of professions became the study of knowledge-based work. *Work and Occupations*, 38(3), 275–302.
- Government Accountability Office. (2015). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics, earnings, and benefits*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/669766.pdf>
- Granfield, R. (1992). *Making elite lawyers: Visions of law at Harvard and beyond*. New York: Routledge.
- Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 317–375.
- Grant, A. M., Berg, J. M., & Cable, D. M. (2014). Job titles as identity badges: How self-reflective titles can reduce emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4), 1201–1225.
- Gray, B. A., & Kish-Gephart, J. J. (2013). Encountering social class differences at work: How “class work” perpetuates inequality. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4), 670–699.

- Greenwood, E. (1957). Attributes of a profession. *Social work*, 2(3), 45–55.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1022–1054.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58–80.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(3), 259–286.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Hall, R. H. (1983). Theoretical trends in the sociology of occupations. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 24(1), 5–23.
- Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner's patterns of industrial bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, 35(2), 213–236.
- Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5), 1029–1045.
- Hartmann, H. I., & Reskin, B. F. (1986). *Women's work, men's work: Sex segregation on the job*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Heaphy, E. D. (2008). *Two views of agency in patient advocates' problem-handling work: Storytelling and rule use* (Doctoral dissertation). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Heaphy, E. D. (2013). Repairing breaches with rules: Maintaining institutions in the face of everyday disruptions. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1291–1315.
- Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 431–441.
- Heimer, C. A., & Staffen, L. R. (1995). Interdependence and reintegrative social control: Labeling and reforming “inappropriate” parents in neonatal intensive care units. *American Sociological Review*, 60(5), 635–654.
- Hinds, P. J., Roberts, T. L., & Jones, H. (2004). Whose job is it anyway? A study of human-robot interaction in a collaborative task. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 19(1), 151–181.
- Hirsch, P. M., & Lounsbury, M. (1997). Ending the family quarrel: Toward a reconciliation of “old” and “new” institutionalisms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4), 406–418.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2011). Emotional life on the market frontier. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37(1), 21–33.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The outsourced self: Intimate life in market times*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodson, R., & Sullivan, T. A. (2012). *The social organization of work*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Hoffer Gittel, J. (2002). Coordinating mechanisms in care provider groups: Relational coordination as a mediator and input uncertainty as a moderator of performance effects. *Management Science*, 48(11), 1408–1426.

- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2014). *Social identity processes in organizational contexts*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Horowitz, R. (2012). *In the public interest: Medical licensing and the disciplinary process*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Hughes, E. C. (1962). Good people and dirty work. *Social Problems*, 10(1), 3–11.
- Huising, R. (2014). The erosion of expert control through censure episodes. *Organization Science*, 25(6), 1633–1661.
- Huising, R. (2015). To hive or to hold? Producing relational authority through scut work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(2), 263–299.
- Huising, R., & Silbey, S. S. (2011). Governing the gap: Forging safe science through relational regulation. *Regulation & Governance*, 5(1), 14–42.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 764–791.
- Jarzabkowski, P., Bednarek, R., & Spee, P. (2015). *Making a market for acts of god: The practice of risk trading in the global reinsurance industry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, G. M. (2011). *Trade of the tricks: Inside the magician's craft*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s–2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kalnins, A., & Chung, W. (2006). Social capital, geography, and survival: Gujarati immigrant entrepreneurs in the U.S. lodging industry. *Management Science*, 52(2), 233–247.
- Kambourov, G., & Manovskii, I. (2009). Occupational specificity of human capital. *International Economic Review*, 50(1), 63–115.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kaufman, R. L. (2002). Assessing alternative perspectives on race and sex employment segregation. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 547–572.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2009). Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in surgery. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(3), 657–711.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2011a). *Challenging operations: Medical reform and resistance in surgery*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2011b). Hot lights and cold steel: Cultural and political toolkits for practice change in surgery. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 482–502.
- Kellogg, K. C. (2014). Brokerage professions and implementing reform in an age of experts. *American Sociological Review*, 79(5), 912–941.
- Kellogg, K. C., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2006). Life in the trading zone: Structuring coordination across boundaries in postbureaucratic organizations. *Organization Science*, 17(1), 22–44.
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management employer response to antidiscrimination law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(7), 960–984.
- Kidder, J. L. (2011). *Urban flow: Bike messengers and the city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kleiner, M. M., & Krueger, A. B. (2010). The prevalence and effects of occupational licensing. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(4), 676–687.

- Kondo, D. K. (2009). *Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Konnor, M. (1988). *Becoming a doctor: A journey of initiation in medical school*. New York: Penguin.
- Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2006). Where is the “me” among the “we”? Identity work and the search for optimal balance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 1031–1057.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 167–195.
- Larson, M. S. (1979). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Latour, B. (1992). Where are the missing masses? The sociology of a few mundane artifacts. In W. E. Bijker, & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology/building society: Studies in sociotechnical change* (pp. 225–258). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lau, D. C., & Murnighan, J. K. (1998). Demographic diversity and faultlines: The compositional dynamics of organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 325–340.
- Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Rituals and resistance: Membership dynamics in professional fields. *Human Relations*, 57(2), 115–143.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J. J., & Allen, N. J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799–811.
- Leidner, R. (1993). Constituency, accountability, and deliberation: Reshaping democracy in the national women’s studies association. *NWSA journal*, 5(1), 4–27.
- Leidner, R. (1996). Rethinking questions of control: Lessons from McDonald’s. In C. L. Macdonald & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Working in the service society* (pp. 29–49). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Levanon, A., England, P., & Allison, P. (2009). Occupational feminization and pay: Assessing causal dynamics using 1950–2000 U.S. census data. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 865–891.
- Levina, N., & Vaaste, E. (2004). The emergence of boundary spanning competence in practice: Implications for information systems’ implementation use. *MIS Quarterly*, 29, 335–363.
- Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2012). *The new division of labor: How computers are creating the next job market*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lindemann, D. J. (2012). *Dominatrix: Gender, eroticism, and control in the dungeon*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lingo, E. L., & O’Mahony, S. (2010). Nexus work: Brokerage on creative projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 47–81.
- Liu, Y., & Grusky, D. B. (2013). The payoff to skill in the third industrial revolution. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(5), 1330–1374.
- Lopez, S. H. (2010). Workers, managers, and customers: Triangles of power in work communities. *Work and Occupations*, 37(3), 251–271.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 226–251.

- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: Hiv/aids treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 657–679.
- Maitlis, S. (2009). Who am i now? Sensemaking and identity in posttraumatic growth. In L. M. Roberts & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring positive identities and organizations: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 47–76). New York: Routledge.
- Margolis, J. D., & Molinsky, A. (2008). Navigating the bind of necessary evils: Psychological engagement and the production of interpersonally sensitive behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(5), 847–872.
- Marini, M. M., & Brinton, M. C. (1984). Sex typing in occupational socialization. In B. F. Reskin (Ed.), *Sex segregation in the workplace: Trends, explanations, remedies* (pp. 192–232). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Mars, G. (1974). Dock pilferage: A case study in occupational theft. In P. Rock, & M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Deviance and social control* (pp. 209–228). London: Tavistock Institute.
- Mars, G., & Gerald, M. (1982). *Cheats at work: An anthropology of workplace crime*. London: Unwin Paperbacks.
- Mars, G., & Nicod, M. (1984). *The world of waiters*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- McCall, L. (2001). *Complex inequality: Gender, class, and race in the new economy*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2), 165–196.
- Mead, G. H. (2009). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist* (Vol. 1). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mears, A. (2011). *Pricing beauty: The making of a fashion model*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Mehri, D. (2005). *Notes from Toyota-land: An American engineer in Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Michel, A. (2011). Transcending socialization: A nine-year ethnography of the body's role in organizational control and knowledge workers' transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(3), 325–368.
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 402–433.
- Molinsky, A., & Margolis, J. (2005). Necessary evils and interpersonal sensitivity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 245–268.
- Moore, W. E. (1970). *The professions: Roles and rules*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Morrill, C., Zald, M. N., & Rao, H. (2003). Covert political conflict in organizations: Challenges from below. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29(1), 391–415.
- Moss, P., & Tilly, C. (1996). “Soft” skills and race: An investigation of black men's employment problems. *Work and Occupations*, 23(3), 252–276.
- Muzio, D., Brock, D. M., & Suddaby, R. (2013). Professions and institutional change: Towards an institutionalist sociology of the professions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(5), 699–721.
- Nagle, R. (2013). *Picking up: On the streets and behind the trucks with the sanitation workers of New York city*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- National Center for O*NET Development. (2014). *About o*net*. Retrieved from <http://www.onetcenter.org/overview.html>
- Nelsen, B. J., & Barley, S. R. (1997). For love or money? Commodification and the construction of an occupational mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(4), 619–653.
- Nelson, A. J., & Irwin, J. (2014). 'Defining what we do—all over again': Occupational identity, technological change, and the librarian/internet-search relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3), 892–928.
- Noordegraaf, M. (2011). Risky business: How professionals and professional fields (must) deal with organizational issues. *Organization Studies*, 32(10), 1349–1371.
- Obstfeld, D. (2005). Social networks, the tertius iungens orientation, and involvement in innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 100–130.
- Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. (2009). Coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 463–502.
- Okhuysen, G. A., Lepak, D., Ashcraft, K. L., Labianca, G. J., Smith, V., & Steensma, H. K. (2013). Theories of work and working today. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4), 491–502.
- O'Mahony, S., & Bechky, B. A. (2006). Stretchwork: Managing the career progression paradox in external labor markets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 918–941.
- O'Mahony, S., & Ferraro, F. (2007). The emergence of governance in an open source community. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1079–1106.
- Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 433–474.
- Orr, J. E. (1996). *Talking about machines: An ethnography of a modern job*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Osterman, P. (2013). Introduction to the special issue on job quality: What does it mean and how might we think about it. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 66, 739–752.
- Padavic, I., & Reskin, B. F. (2002). *Women and men at work* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Perlow, L. A. (1999). The time famine: Toward a sociology of work time. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1), 57–57.
- Perlow, L. A. (2012). *Sleeping with your smartphone: How to break the 24/7 habit and change the way you work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Phillips, K. W., Mannix, E. A., Neale, M. A., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2004). Diverse groups and information sharing: The effects of congruent ties. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(4), 497–510.
- Pickering, A. (1993). The mangle of practice: Agency and emergence in the sociology of science. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(3), 559–589.
- Pierce, J. L. (1996). *Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pinch, T. J., & Bijker, W. E. (1984). The social construction of facts and artefacts: Or how the sociology of science and the sociology of technology might benefit each other. *Social Studies of Science*, 14(3), 399–441.
- Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. (2006). Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of

- identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 235–262.
- Ramarajan, L. (2014). Past, present and future research on multiple identities: Toward an intrapersonal network approach. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 589–659.
- Ramarajan, L., & Reid, E. (2013). Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating nonwork identities at work. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4), 621–644.
- Randel, A. E., & Jaussi, K. S. (2003). Functional background identity, diversity, and individual performance in cross-functional teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 763–774.
- Ranganathan, A. (2013). Professionalization and market closure: The case of plumbing in India. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 66(4), 902–932.
- Rapoport, R., Bailyn, L., Fletcher, J., & Pruitt, B. (2001). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Ray, C. A. (1986). Corporate culture: The last frontier of control? *Journal of Management Studies*, 23(3), 287–297.
- Reay, T., Golden-Biddle, K., & Germann, K. (2006). Legitimizing a new role: Small wins and microprocesses of change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 977–998.
- Reid, E. (2015). Embracing, passing, revealing, and the ideal worker image: How people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organization Science*, 26(4), 997–1017.
- Reskin, B. F. (1993). Sex segregation in the workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19, 241–270.
- Reskin, B. F. (1999). Occupational segregation by race and ethnicity among women workers. In I. Brown (Ed.), *Latinas and African American women at work: Race, gender, and economic inequality* (pp. 183–206). New York: Russell Sage.
- Reskin, B. F., McBrier, D. B., & Kmec, J. A. (1999). The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25(1), 335–361.
- Rhee, N., & Zabin, C. (2009). Aggregating dispersed workers: Union organizing in the “care” industries. *Geoforum*, 40(6), 969–979.
- Riemer, J. W. (1977). Becoming a journeyman electrician some implicit indicators in the apprenticeship process. *Work and Occupations*, 4(1), 87–98.
- Ritzer, G. (1975). Professionalization, bureaucratization and rationalization: The views of max weber. *Social Forces*, 53(4), 627–634.
- Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 999–1022.
- Rivera, L. A. (2015). Go with your gut: Emotion and evaluation in job interviews. *American Journal of Sociology*, 120(5), 1339–1389.
- Rollins, J. (1987). *Between women: Domesticity and their employers*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Rose, S. J. (1995). *Declining job security and the professionalization of opportunity*. Washington, DC: National Commission for Employment Policy Washington, DC.
- Rossmann, G. (2012). *Climbing the charts: What radio airplay tells us about the diffusion of innovation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sainsaulieu, R. (1988). *L'identité au travail: Les effets culturels de l'organisation*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

- Sandefur, R. L. (2015). Elements of professional expertise understanding relational and substantive expertise through lawyers' impact. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5), 909–933.
- Scott, S. G., & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 43–62.
- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sherman, R. (2007). *Class acts: Service and inequality in luxury hotels*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sherman, R. (2010). "Time is our commodity": Gender and the struggle for occupational legitimacy among personal concierges. *Work and Occupations*, 37(1), 81–114.
- Silbey, S. S., Huising, R., & Coslovsky, S. V. (2009). The "sociological citizen": Relational interdependence in law and organizations. *L'Annee Sociologique*, 59(1), 201–229.
- Sluss, D. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2007). Relational identity and identification: Defining ourselves through work relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 9–32.
- Somers, M. R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23(5), 605–649.
- Stainback, K., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., & Skaggs, S. (2010). Organizational approaches to inequality: Inertia, relative power, and environments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36(1), 225–247.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's museum of vertebrate zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420.
- Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Townsend, S. S. (2007). Choice as an act of meaning: The case of social class. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 814–830.
- Stubbs, K., Wettergreen, D., & Hinds, P. H. (2007). Autonomy and common ground in human-robot interaction: A field study. *Intelligent Systems, IEEE*, 22(2), 42–50.
- Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 35–67.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 273–273.
- Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1919). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America: Monograph of an immigrant group* (Vol. 3). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (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., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Tilcsik, A. (2010). From ritual to reality: Demography, ideology, and decoupling in a post-communist government agency. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1474–1498.
- Tilcsik, A., Anteby, M., & Knight, C. R. (2015). Concealable stigma and occupational segregation: Toward a theory of gay and lesbian occupations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(2), 446–481.
- Timmermans, S. (2002). The cause of death vs. the gift of life: Boundary maintenance and the politics of expertise in death investigation. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 24(5), 550–574.
- Tolbert, P. S. (1996). Occupations, organizations, and boundaryless careers. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era* (pp. 331–349). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (1993). The gender and race composition of jobs and the male/female, white/black pay gaps. *Social Forces*, 72(1), 45–76.
- Trice, H. M. (1993). *Occupational subcultures in the workplace*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Turco, C. J. (2010). Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review*, 75(6), 894–913.
- Turco, C. J. (2012). Difficult decoupling: Employee resistance to the commercialization of personal settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(2), 380–419.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1), 35–67.
- Valentine, M. A., & Edmondson, A. C. (2015). Team scaffolds: How mesolevel structures enable role-based coordination in temporary groups. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 405–422.
- Vallas, S. (2012). *Work: A critique*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Vallas, S., & Cummins, E. (2014). Relational models of organizational inequalities emerging approaches and conceptual dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(2), 228–255.
- Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization*, 32(4), 407–418.
- Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20(2), 207–228.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). The asshole. In P. K. Manning & J. Van Maanen (Eds.), *Policing: A view from the street* (pp. 221–237). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.
- Van Maanen, J. (1991). The smile factory. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 58–76). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, J., & Barley, S. R. (1984). Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations. *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 6, 287–365.
- Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). “Real feelings”: Emotional expression and organizational culture. *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 11, 43–103.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209–264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Vaughan, D. (2002). Signals and interpretive work: The role of culture in a theory of practical action. In K. A. Cerulo (Ed.), *Culture in mind: Toward a sociology of culture and cognition* (pp. 28–54). New York: Routledge.
- Weber, F. (1989). *Le travail à-côté: Étude d'ethnographie ouvrière*. Paris: Institut national de la recherche agronomique.
- Weber, K., & Dacin, M. T. (2011). The cultural construction of organizational life: Introduction to the special issue. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 287–298.
- Weber, M. (Ed.). (1968). *Economy and society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weeden, K. A. (2002). Why do some occupations pay more than others? Social closure and earnings inequality in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(1), 55–101.
- Weinberg, S. K., & Arond, H. (1952). The occupational culture of the boxer. *American Journal of Sociology*, 57(5), 460–469.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
- Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, 20(2), 205–232.
- Wherry, F. F. (2008). *Global markets and local crafts: Thailand and Costa Rica compared*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whyte, W. F. (1993). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum* (4th ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 137–158.
- Williams, C. L. (1992). The glass escalator: Hidden advantages for men in the 'female' professions. *Social Problems*, 39(3), 253–267.
- Williams, C. L. (1995). *Still a man's world: Men who do "women's work"* (Vol. 1). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 20, 77–140.
- Willmott, H. (1986). Organising the profession: A theoretical and historical examination of the development of the major accountancy bodies in the UK. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 11(6), 555–580.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179–201.
- Zaloom, C. (2006). *Out of the pits: Traders and technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Zetka, J. R. (2001). Occupational divisions of labor and their technology politics: The case of surgical scopes and gastrointestinal medicine. *Social Forces*, 79(4), 1495–1520.
- Zuckerman, E. W., & Sgourev, S. V. (2006). Peer capitalism: Parallel relationships in the U.S. Economy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(5), 1327–1366.