

EMERGING CONCEPTIONS OF
WORK, MANAGEMENT AND THE
LABOR MARKET

RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORK

Series Editor: Steven Vallas

Recent Volumes:

Volume 11: Labor Revitalization: Global Perspectives and New Initiatives

Volume 12: The Sociology of Job Training

Volume 13: Globalism/Localism at Work

Volume 14: Diversity in the Workforce

Volume 15: Entrepreneurship

Volume 16: Worker Participation: Current Research and Future Trends

Volume 17: Work Place Temporalities

Volume 18: Economic Sociology of Work

Volume 19: Work and Organizations in China after Thirty Years of Transition

Volume 20: Gender and Sexuality in the Workplace

Volume 21: Institutions and Entrepreneurship

Volume 22: Part 1: Comparing European Workers
Part A: Experiences and Inequalities
Part 2: Comparing European Workers
Part B: Policies and Institutions

Volume 23: Religion, Work, and Inequality

Volume 24: Networks, Work and Inequality

Volume 25: Adolescent Experiences and Adult Work Outcomes:
Connections and Causes

Volume 26: Work and Family in the New Economy

Volume 27: Immigration and Work

Volume 28: A Gedenkschrift to Randy Hodson: Working with Dignity

Volume 29: Research in the Sociology of Work

This page intentionally left blank

RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORK VOLUME 30

EMERGING CONCEPTIONS OF WORK, MANAGEMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET

EDITED BY

STEVEN VALLAS

Northeastern University, USA



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2017

Copyright © 2017 Emerald Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78714-460-6 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-459-0 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-934-2 (Epub)

ISSN: 0277-2833 (Series)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD	vii
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	ix
INTRODUCTION: EMERGING CONCEPTIONS OF WORK, MANAGEMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET	xi
LINKEDIN OR LINKEDOUT? HOW SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES ARE RESHAPING THE LABOR MARKET <i>Ofer Sharone</i>	1
DEALING WITH DOWNSIZING: NEW ORGANIZATIONAL CAREERS IN FINANCIAL SERVICES AFTER THE GREAT RECESSION <i>Corey Pech</i>	33
NEO-NORMATIVE CONTROL AND VALUE DISCRETION IN INTERACTIVE SERVICE WORK: A CASE STUDY <i>Sarah Jenkins and Rick Delbridge</i>	59
ENGINEERING MEDICINE: THE DEPLOYMENT OF LEAN PRODUCTION IN HEALTHCARE <i>William Attwood-Charles and Sarah Babb</i>	87
DOING MORE WITH LESS: INTENSIVE CARE AND THE LOGIC OF FLEXIBLE TEAMWORK <i>Jason Rodriquez</i>	117
RACE, RECESSION, AND SOCIAL CLOSURE IN THE LOW-WAGE LABOR MARKET: EXPERIMENTAL AND OBSERVATIONAL EVIDENCE <i>Mike Vuolo, Christopher Uggen and Sarah Lageson</i>	141

WORKFORCE DOWNSIZING AND SHAREHOLDER VALUE ORIENTATION AMONG EXECUTIVE MANAGERS AT LARGE U.S. FIRMS <i>Taekjin Shin</i>	185
ABOUT THE EDITOR	219
INDEX	221

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Michel Anteby

Boston University, USA

Steve Barley

Stanford University, USA

David Courpasson

EMLYON, France

Rick Delbridge

Cardiff University, UK

Liz Gorman

University of Virginia, USA

Alexandra Kalev

Tel Aviv University, Israel

Arne Kalleberg

University of North Carolina, USA

Erin Kelly

MIT, USA

Kate Kellogg

MIT, USA

Julie Kmec

Washington State University, USA

Anne Kovalainen

University of Turku, Finland

Steve Lopez

Ohio State University, USA

Irene Padavic

Florida State University, USA

Valeria Pulignano

*The Catholic University Leuven,
Belgium*

Gretchen Purser

Syracuse University, USA

Dee Royster

NYU, USA

Vinnie Roscigno

The Ohio State University, USA

Jeff Sallaz

University of Arizona, USA

Ofer Sharone

*University of Massachusetts
Amherst, USA*

Sheryl Skaggs

UT Dallas, USA

Vicki Smith

University of California, USA

Don Tomaskovic-Devey

*University of Massachusetts
Amherst, USA*

Catherine Turco

MIT, USA

Geert Van Hootegem
*The Catholic University Leuven,
Belgium*

Matt Vidal
Kings College London, UK

Chris Warhurst
University of Warwick, UK

Christine Williams
UT Austin, USA

George Wilson
University of Miami, USA

Adia Wingfield
Washington University, USA

Patrizia Zanoni
Hasselt University, Belgium

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

<i>William Attwood-Charles</i>	Sociology Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA
<i>Sarah Babb</i>	Sociology Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA
<i>Rick Delbridge</i>	Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
<i>Sarah Jenkins</i>	Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
<i>Sarah Lageson</i>	School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University, Center for Law and Justice, Newark, NJ, USA
<i>Corey Pech</i>	Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA
<i>Jason Rodriquez</i>	College of Liberal Arts, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, MA, USA
<i>Ofer Sharone</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA
<i>Taekjin Shin</i>	Fowler College of Business, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA
<i>Christopher Uggen</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA
<i>Mike Vuolo</i>	Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

INTRODUCTION: EMERGING CONCEPTIONS OF WORK, MANAGEMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET

In recent decades, there has been no shortage of speculation about the structural and cultural changes that have gripped work, management practices and the labor market in virtually all the advanced capitalist societies. Yet, little clarity has emerged concerning the nature of the new, post-Fordist regimes, the forces shaping them, and how distinct groups and classes are likely to fare in the new economy. The present volume is intended to fill these gaps. The chapters it contains draw on a diverse set of theoretical and methodological strategies. But what unites them is their shared concern with the changing economic landscape, its impact on the meaning of work, and way authority relations are shifting with the rise of neo-liberal capitalism. In this introduction to the volume, I will briefly sketch the intellectual context in which these chapters have emerged, and then address the distinctive ways in which each chapter advances our knowledge in this field.

From one perspective, of course, the transformation of market-based work represents nothing new; what was once called the “labor question” is, after all, as old as modern capitalism. Centuries of debate have unfolded regarding the brutalizing nature of wage labor and the destructive uses to which industrial technologies have been put. For decades following the introduction of the assembly line, a temporary solution had emerged in which workers relinquished their claim over job control, receiving in exchange varying measures of job security and rising wages. By the late 1970s, even this temporary solution – which came to be known as Fordism – had come undone, and the question arose as to the structure and meanings that work would assume in a post-Fordist period.

For a time, especially during the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars envisioned a world in which an enhanced quality of employment seemed possible or even likely for many workers. Literature in this vein foresaw a weakening of centralized, hierarchical controls over work and the emergence of a horizontal logic empowering both skilled manual and mental workers alike (see [Arthur & Rousseau, 2001](#); [Piore & Sabel, 1984](#); [Powell, 2001](#); [Saxenian, 1994](#)). Envisioned here was a logic of *flexibility*, a term that conjured work in a more creative and egalitarian form than Fordist regimes had allowed ([Florida, 2003](#); [Pink, 2001](#)).

Since that time, a different and far more dystopian set of images has governed scholarly and public discussion of work, careers, and employment relations. This shift is partly due to the growing frequency and severity of economic crises, and partly to a growing awareness (and fear) of the risks to which workers have been exposed (Beck, 1992; Hacker, 2006; Harvey, 2005). Indeed, if “words are witnesses” (Hobsbawm, 1962, p. 17), then ours is a moment best described in terms of *precarity* – a term that has appeared with growing prominence in many languages. As Bauman notes, “French theorists speak of *‘precarite’*, the Germans of *Unsicherheit* and *Risikogestellschaft*, the Italians of *incertezza* and the English of insecurity – but all of them have in mind the same aspect of the human predicament” (2000, pp. 160–161), in which workers stand more fully exposed to market volatility (see Kalleberg, 2011; Pfeffer & Baron, 1988; Pugh, 2015). This trend is perhaps most evident in the rising use of downsizing and outsourcing as managerial strategies by even highly profitable firms. It can be glimpsed in the disproportionate growth of jobs that are temporary, that offer highly uncertain or limited working hours (e.g., the British “zero hours” contract), or that apportion work on a project basis, offering contracts of limited duration. If precarious work is defined in this relatively stringent way, then the share of workers holding non-standard jobs had risen to one-sixth of the U.S. labor force in 2015 (Katz & Krueger, 2016), a 50% increase since 2005. Indeed, according to Katz and Krueger, the expansion of non-standard jobs accounted for virtually all of the job growth since 2005. The number of workers employed in such jobs is now more than twice as large as the number who belong to labor unions (Pugh, 2015).

The importance of these developments involves more than a matter of aggregate numbers, and cannot be attributed to purely subjective or irrational fears. Indeed, theorists have increasingly concluded that “precarity is not a passing or episodic condition, but a *new form of regulation* that distinguishes [our] historical time” (Butler, 2015, pp. vii–viii). In this view, “precarity has itself become a regime, a hegemonic mode of being governed, and of governing ourselves.” Put differently, economic precarity has given rise to a “*mode of domination* of a new kind” (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 83, 85, emphasis in the original). The notion here is that the “end of organized capitalism” (Lash & Urry, 1987) has now given way to a different, neo-liberal form of capitalism; and that in place of the Fordist regimes there has emerged newer and more protean regimes governed by a logic of “flexible accumulation” (see Bauman, 2000; Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Davis, 2016; Harvey, 1989). Here, the performance of labor ceases to provide the central organizing principle of the firm; indeed, as Davis shows (2016), the most prosperous firms hardly need employ large aggregates of labor at all. The result can at times impose managerial domination in a largely *negative* form, based largely on economic coercion or fear. But at other times, managerial domination assumes a more positive or *affirmative* guise, as with discourses that advise workers to embrace a “career management” ideology that construes workers

as “entrepreneurs of themselves” (Brockling, 2016; Freeman, 2014; Ho, 2009; Lane, 2011; Vallas & Cummins, 2015).

European theorists have paid particular attention to the latter forms of managerial regime. Thus, du Gay (1996) viewed work organizations as increasingly informed by what he termed “enterprise culture,” a set of practices and beliefs in which workers adopt the outlook of the “sovereign consumer” toward their own work. Alvesson and Willmott (2002) developed a theory of identity regulation, in which the ability to shape worker identity becomes a critical component of the neo-liberal firm. And Clegg and Baumeler (2010) envision contemporary firms through the lens of what Bauman called “liquid modernity” (2000). All these conceptions essentially extend the general proposition, reiterated in recent decades, that managerial power and authority have come to rest in its control over the discourses, norms, and identities that arise within the workplace itself (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005; Kunda, 1992).

These claims have provoked much discussion, debate, and empirical research. Yet the literature that has emerged is as yet marked by a number of absences and ambiguities. First, owing to the abstract level at which much of the discussion has been pitched, we have little clear understanding of precisely how neo-liberal employment regimes operate. How are the new forms of subjectivity and identity established or policed? How do the new regimes “work” to elicit consent on the part of employees? And what is the role of technology in shaping the identity norms to which employees are expected to comply?

Second, the question arises as to how disparate groups and categories of employees are affected by the new precarity. Here, it is important to acknowledge the ways in which racial, gender, and class privilege have all differentially positioned workers in the labor market. Rather than assume that precarity represents a “collective mentality” that is “common to the whole epoch” (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 83, 85), research on job and labor market insecurity cannot afford to accept a single, overarching narrative, least of all at a time when primordial affiliations based on race and gender seem so powerful, often prompting workers to assume a defensive and even reactionary stance (Atkinson, 2007; Wacquant, 2009).

Third, and related to the above, is the matter of agency, or the ways in which workers themselves can act to modify, negotiate, or resist managerial authority (Courpasson & Vallas, 2016; Hodson, 1995, 2001). The question of resistance has been well developed in the field of organization studies, where a rich tradition of theory and research has developed (see Vallas, 2016). Yet the connection between precarity and worker agency has not been well explored. Occasional eruptions of worker mobilization, as in the Euro May Day movements during the early years of this century, prompted a number of claims regarding the self-styled “precarariat” (Standing, 2011), whose validity remains open to doubt. Our may not be a time in which a “new dangerous class” has emerged, but rather on in which an old class struggles desperately to restore its previous economic position.

In varying ways and using diverse approaches, each of the contributions to the current volume has sought to address such absences and ambiguities as these. Sharone's analysis, for example, scrutinizes a previously unexamined feature of the labor market: its growing reliance of digital platforms such as LinkedIn, which harbor structural constraints and normative presuppositions that impose on job seekers an array of subtle yet powerful pressures and dilemmas (Marwick & boyd, 2010; van Dijck, 2013). Having a "complete" profile on this site virtually requires the posting of a photograph, with obvious implications for labor market stratification. The very structure of LinkedIn rules out the impression management tactics (such as the tailoring of resumes to fit particular audiences) on which job seekers have long relied. Social networking sites expand the visibility of job seekers' skills, but they do so by subjecting workers to the watchful gaze of potential employers. Implied here are subtle institutional forces that shape workers' orientations toward work, the labor market, and the self, thus contributing to the workings of the new managerial regimes.

The chapters by Pech and by Jenkins and Delbridge also inquire into the exercise of managerial authority. Using the case of mid-level workers in the financial industry, Pech asks what happens when workers face the clear and present danger of downsizing (Ho, 2009). Do workers exhibit pattern of continuing loyalty to their employers, even in the absence of firm reciprocity? Or do they withdraw their affiliation and adopt a more self-interested orientation? Pech's findings support the former point of view. The effect of job and labor market uncertainty seems to incline workers to narrow their job horizons, redoubling their willingness to identify with their current employer. Here is a good example of the tenacity of what Pugh (2015) has called the "one-way honor code."

The chapter by Jenkins and Delbridge runs parallel to that by Pech. Here workers exhibit a similar form of loyalty or allegiance to the firm, in spite of the unrewarding nature of the job as measured by wages. In this case, involving workers in an upscale call center, the reason is not rooted in the pursuit of career opportunities (as in the chapter by Pech). Instead, the efficacy of management's regime lies in its willingness to allow workers the capacity to exercise "value discretion" – that is, the ability to rule on the firm's behalf. Here we encounter a regime that bears more than a passing resemblance to what popular writers have termed "liberation management," and what Fleming and Sturdy (2009) have called "neo-normative control." Here, firms achieve control over employees by enabling them to "just be themselves" – thus lending managerial authority an informal and even "natural" quality to which no one could reasonably object. A subtle form of colonization occurs here, Jenkins and Delbridge conclude, in which workers embody the interests of the firm, now on their own account.

The chapters by Attwood-Charles and Babb and by Rodriguez both address a terrain that stands in particular need of attention – the provision of medical care – given the health care industry's growing embrace of privatization, profit

imperatives, cost controls, and new managerial constructs (e.g., “lean production” and “team” systems). Indeed, the adoption of the latter practices by the health care industry attests to the pervasive presence that neo-liberal logic has achieved across broad swaths of the economy. Notably, both these chapters speak to the capacity of medical practitioners to subvert normative practices they find to be alien to their own professional orientations. In the case of the Attwood-Charles and Babb chapter, doctors easily marginalized the lean regimes their employers had proposed, but in highly variable ways. In one site, doctors invoked their professional autonomy, refusing lean medicine by defining it as too profit-oriented, and thus as foreign to their professional norms. In a second site, however, lean medicine failed to gain traction for very different reasons: largely because it seemed at odds with the efficiency- and profit-generating needs that administrators sought to address. These findings provide a healthy reminder of the limits of managerial regimes, and of the nuanced patterns of contention that arise within work organizations, even in the face of economic restructuring and organizational consolidation (Kellogg, 2011). Parallel processes unfold in Rodriquez’s account. Here, management introduced a new, team-based regime with great promise, only to see this effort crash and burn. The reason did not stem from the resistance of either professionals or administrators; indeed, “team” discourse seemed wholly acceptable to both groups. Instead, the failure of the new regime stemmed from the contradictions implied within the new regime itself – its promise of enhanced quality, cooperation, and autonomy on the one hand, versus its imposition of a regime of austerity and rationalized cost-cutting on the other hand.

As noted, we have as yet only a meager understanding of the ways in which ascribed statuses shape the unfolding of labor market uncertainty in the current period. For this reason, the chapter by Vuolo, Uggen, and Lageson, which explores the relation between recession and racial hierarchies, is especially welcome. The question Vuolo and his colleagues have posed whether the labor market privileges that whites enjoy tend to expand during periods of substantial downturn (as social closure theory might suggest); or alternatively, whether racial hierarchies within the labor market exhibit the qualities that Tilly (1998) once called “durable inequality.” Both scenarios seem plausible. It is conceivable that hiring managers would respond to a recessionary economy by exhibiting a preference for white labor, even within low-wage jobs, especially if doing so would advance the firm’s prestige. The alternative possibility is that racial hierarchies are so deeply institutionalized as to persist as part of the “natural” order of things, with racial disparities in the labor market remaining as a constant over time. As Vuolo et al. report, the “durable” outcome seems to obtain, suggesting that racial disparities and status hierarchies are powerfully institutionalized within the low-wage labor market. Perhaps most strikingly, the job rewards that black workers receive even during flush times remain less generous than those which their white counterparts receive during recessionary times (see Pager, 2003). The Vuolo, Uggen, and Lageson chapter stands as a strong

example of the need to sort out the workings of the categorical inequalities that are brought forward into the neo-liberal economy.

The final chapter in this volume, that by Shin, investigates the link between what has become the *lingua franca* of contemporary corporate life – the view of the firm as a platform for the enrichment of shareholders – and the rolling out of downsizing campaigns as a result layoffs. Carefully studying CEO reports, Shin finds evidence of a close connection between their content – that is, their embrace of the “shareholder value” discourse – and correlative shifts in employment levels (the use of downsizing as a weapon against alleged inefficiencies within the firm). These findings provide a cautionary note against neo-institutionalist accounts that encourage us to view corporate announcements as discursive performances that uncoupled from the internal operations of the firm. Discourse, Shin finds, has real consequences; it seems closely bound up with managerial practices that operate to the disadvantages of millions of employees.

Much remains unknown about the nature of the economic era into which we have been so blindly propelled. Some scholars, such as Beck (2000) speak of a looming crisis of the “work society,” suggesting that the modernization process has begun to erode its own sources of stability. Certainly, the onset of precarity has disrupted longstanding assumptions and orientations regarding the meaning of work and the employment relation itself. Needed are studies such as those collected here, the better to map out the ways in which work organizations and labor market institutions have evolved – and to explore the space in which alternative arrangements might conceivably emerge.

Steven Vallas
Editor

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39, 619–644.
- Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. (2001). *The Boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atkinson, W. (2007). Beck, individualization, and the death of class: A critique. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 58, (3), 349–366.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. (2000). *The brave new world of work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2005). *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Brockling, U. (2016). *The entrepreneurial self: Fabricating a new type of subject*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Butler, J. (2015). Foreword. In *Isabell Lorey, state of insecurity: Government of the precarious* (pp. vii–xi). London: Verso.
- Clegg, S., & Baumeler, C. (2010). From iron cages to liquid modernity in organizational analysis. *Organization Studies, 31*(12), 1713–1733.
- Courpasson, D., & Vallas, S. P. (2016). Resistance studies: A critical introduction. In D. Courpasson & S. P. Vallas (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of resistance studies*. London: Sage.
- Davis, G. F. (2016). *The vanishing corporation: Navigating the hazards of a new economy*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and identity at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fleming, P., & Sturdy, A. (2009). “Just be yourself!”: Towards neo-normative control in organisations? *Employee Relations, 31*(6), 569–583.
- Florida, R. L. (2003). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Freeman, C. (2014). *Entrepreneurial selves: Neoliberal respectability and the making of a Caribbean middle class*. Durham, NC: Duke.
- Hacker, J. (2006). *The great risk shift*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neo-liberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ho, K. Z. (2009). *Liquidated: An ethnography of wall street*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1962). *The age of revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Hodson, R. (1995). Worker resistance: An underdeveloped concept in the sociology of work. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 16*, 32.
- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalleberg, A. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s–2000s*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2016). *The rise and nature of alternative work arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015*. Retrieved from http://krueger.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/akrueger/files/katz_krueger_cws_-_march_29_20165.pdf
- Kellogg, K. (2011). *Challenging operations: Institutional reform and resistance in medical work*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lane, C. (2011). *A company of one: Insecurity, independence, and the new world of white collar unemployment*. Ithaca, NY: ILR/Cornell.
- Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1987). *The end of organized capitalism*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Marwick, A. E., & boyd, D. (2010). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media and Society, 12*(1), 114–133.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*, 39.
- Pfeffer, J., & Baron, J. (1988). Taking the workers back out: Recent trends in the structuring of employment. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 10*, 46.
- Pink, D. (2001). *Free agent nation: How America's new independent workers are transforming the way we live*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Piore, M. J., & Sabel, C. F. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Powell, W. W. (2001). The capitalist firm in the twenty-first century: Emerging patterns in western enterprise. In P. DiMaggio (Ed.), *The twenty-first century firm* (pp. 33–68). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pugh, A. (2015). *The tumbleweed society*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Saxenian, A. L. (1994). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

- Tilly, C. (1998). *Durable inequality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Vallas, S. P. (2016). Working class heroes or working stiffs? Domination and resistance within business organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 28, 101–126.
- Vallas, S. P., & Cummins, E. R. (2015). Personal branding and identity norms in the popular business press: Enterprise culture in an age of precarity. *Organization Studies*, 36(3), 293–319.
- Van dijck, J. (2013). ‘You have one identity’: Performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(2), 199–215.
- Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor*. Durham, NC: Duke.

LINKEDIN OR LINKEDOUT? HOW SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES ARE RESHAPING THE LABOR MARKET

Ofer Sharone

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of online social networking sites (“SNS”) such as LinkedIn and Facebook has created new forms of online labor market intermediation that are reconfiguring the hiring process in profound ways; yet, little is understood about the implications of these new technologies for job seekers navigating the labor market, or more broadly, for the careers and lives of workers. The existing literature has focused on digital inequality – workers’ unequal access to or skilled use of digital technologies – but has left unanswered critical questions about the emerging and broad effects of SNS as a labor market intermediary. Drawing on in-depth interviews with unemployed workers this paper describes job seekers’ experiences using SNS to look for work. The findings suggest that SNS intermediation of the labor market has two kinds of effects. First, as an intermediary for hiring, SNS produces labor market winners and losers involving filtering processes that often have little to do with evaluations of merit. Second, SNS filtering processes exert new pressures on all workers, whether winners or losers as perceived through this new filter, to manage their careers, and to some extent their private lives, in particular ways that fit the logic of the SNS-mediated labor market.

Keywords: Labor market; social networking; human resources; Internet; digital technologies

Over a decade ago leading scholars of the American labor market began observing that the “Internet is bringing radical change to corporate recruiting” (Cappelli, 2001, p. 139), and predicted that a “spectacular rise” in online labor market intermediation “will change the way employer-employee matches are made” (Autor, 2001, p. 25). While academic research in this area remains sparse, the existing data suggest, as these scholars foresaw, that the use of the Internet for recruiting has rapidly risen. Since 2006 a majority of new hires have been “sourced” from the Internet (Cober & Brown, 2006), but little is known about the implications of this transformation for workers.

The use of the Internet for hiring has come in two great waves. The first wave was marked by the rise of online job boards, such as [Monster.com](#), where employers post ads and job seekers post resumes. This first wave replaced local newspaper ads with a globally accessible database of jobs listings and resumes that is continuously updated. A second wave of technological change – the explosive growth of online social networking sites (“SNS”) – has created new forms of online labor market intermediation that are currently reconfiguring the hiring process in even more profound ways that have no pre-digital equivalents. SNS are online platforms on which users create profiles, connect (or “friend”) other users, and make themselves visible and searchable to network contacts and potential employers. A report by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), the largest association for human resource professionals in the United States, revealed that among a random sample of its 250,000 member companies the use of SNS for recruiting increased from 34% in 2008 to 56% in 2011 to 77% in 2013 (SHRM, 2013). By 2015 another industry survey found that 92% of recruiters used social media as part of their candidate search (Jobvite, 2015). SNS provide recruiters who pay a fee the ability to search their entire database of profiles, review potential candidates’ work histories, pictures, and contacts, and send a personal message to any potential candidate of interest. SNS are being used to recruit for a wide range of jobs, from executives to hourly employees, with the highest rates of usage for hiring of “non-managerial salaried employees” (SHRM, 2013). One study suggests that even in cases where job applicants initiate contact using traditional resumes, and in which no links to social media are provided, up to a third of U.S. firms nonetheless search SNS for information about the applicant (Acquisti & Fong, 2013). Despite these trends, little is understood about the implications of SNS for job seekers navigating the labor market, or more broadly, for the careers and lives of working professionals. This paper is the first to my knowledge to use interview data with job seekers to explore the implications of the rise of SNS for workers.

The literature on digital technologies and labor markets has to date largely focused on the issue of digital inequality: job seekers’ unequal access to digital technologies and various barriers to the effective use of these digital technologies (DiMaggio, Hargittai, Celeste, & Shaer, 2004). The literature’s focus on digital inequality implicitly takes for granted the career benefits of using SNS and is concerned about workers who do not have access to these benefits.

While barriers to the use of SNS technology are undoubtedly important, this focus has left unanswered critical questions about the broader effects of SNS as an emerging labor market intermediary for all workers.

A dominant narrative has emerged among policy-makers and career professionals that SNS *empower* job seekers, and correspondingly the central issue of policy concern has been the ability of job seekers to access and effectively use SNS. This perspective is a subset of the more general concern over a growing *digital divide* or digital inequality in which technological change is largely perceived as beneficial to all who are able to use it; a perspective which may overlook how new technologies may have unanticipated consequences for generating new forms of inequalities or for reproducing existing inequalities.

This paper breaks new ground by pointing to a range of previously overlooked tensions and dilemmas that exist for the growing numbers of job seekers who have full access and capacity to use SNS. Drawing on in-depth interviews with unemployed job seekers using SNS to look for work, and participant observations at workshops to train job seekers to use SNS, this study finds that while job seekers perceive certain benefits to using SNS, the use of SNS also raises a range of difficulties and potential obstacles. At core, SNS increase the exposure of job seekers, and this exposure is double-edged. The same visibility that makes it easier for job seekers to expand their networks and for employers to find and recruit them, also makes it possible for employers to classify, compare, and screen out entire categories of job seekers on the basis of job seekers' pictures or political activities. Moreover, for reasons that will be described in this paper, SNS mediation of the labor market may disadvantage workers who wish to simultaneously pursue different kinds of jobs, or whose work histories are not optimally presented in a reverse chronological order. Reflecting this double-edge, the job seekers I interviewed share deep ambivalences and anxieties about the effects of using SNS. In various ways these anxieties all point to a perceived loss of control over one's narrative and image, and to concerns about the implications of such lost control for one's ability to find work. Job seekers' experiences suggest that SNS intermediation of the labor market has two kinds of effects. First, as a filtering mechanism for hiring, SNS may generate labor market winners and losers on the basis of information that has little to do with merit. Second, these filtering mechanisms may exert new disciplinary pressures on all workers (Foucault, 1977), whether winners or losers, to manage their careers and private lives in ways that fit the logic of the SNS-mediated labor market.

JOB SEARCH AND DIGITAL INTERMEDIARIES

Since scholars first observed that digital technologies are changing the nature of hiring (Autor, 2001; Cappelli, 2001) most studies of this change have focused