

In favor of a structural sociology of work

David Pichonnaz, Kevin Toffel

In **Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales** Volume 240, Issue 5, October 2021, pages 4 to 13

Translated and edited by Cadenza Academic Translations

Translator: Peter Collins; Editor: Anam Zafar; Senior editor: Mark Mellor

ISSN 0335-5322

ISBN 9782021487701

DOI 10.3917/arss.240.0004

Available online at:

<https://www.cairn-int.info/journal-actes-de-la-recherche-en-sciences-sociales-2021-5-page-4.htm>

How to cite this article:

David Pichonnaz, Kevin Toffel, «In favor of a structural sociology of work», *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 2021/5 (No 240) , p. 4-13

Electronic distribution by Cairn on behalf of Le Seuil.

© Le Seuil. All rights reserved for all countries.

Reproducing this article (including by photocopying) is only authorized in accordance with the general terms and conditions of use for the website, or with the general terms and conditions of the license held by your institution, where applicable. Any other reproduction, in full or in part, or storage in a database, in any form and by any means whatsoever is strictly prohibited without the prior written consent of the publisher, except where permitted under French law.



AT THE BOTTOM OF THE SOCIAL LADDER. Delivery personnel in France during lockdown, Spring 2020.

In favor of a structural sociology of work

The current partition of sociology into thematic areas, an inevitable result of the division of labor in any evolving discipline, has a number of epistemological consequences. The most regrettable of these is undoubtedly compartmentalization. An obstacle to the principle of analogy, which is an essential component of the scientific approach, compartmentalization impoverishes the sociological imagination as it prevents one from looking around, making comparisons, and causing surprise. Although there has been recurrent criticism about hyper-specialization of other sub-fields in the discipline, the sociologies of “work” and “professions” are to a great extent victims of this tendency, as they are frequently partitioned off and institutionalized in distinct laboratories, as well as having their own journals, literature, debates, and other “research networks” within large associations.¹ Viewed as isolated research domains, the topics of “work” and “professions” have gradually become disconnected from a more general sociology. Without questioning some of the notable achievements within these specialized sub-fields, it is regrettable that this thematic focus has resulted in a relative neglect of the social relationships structuring the social macrocosm as a whole.² These relationships affect the world of labor and determine the representations and practices of workers. This narrow focus also runs the risk of isolating elements that should be inseparable in any analysis of work practices—for example, the study of work as an activity on the one hand, and of work organizations and “professional groups” on the other.

The Chicago school tradition, which has had a considerable influence on the French sociology of professions over the last twenty years, initially drew attention to social inequalities (in particular ethno-racial inequalities) in the structure of urban

1. For a well-researched discussion of the causes and consequences of this specialization process in the United States of America, see Étienne Ollion, “De la sociologie en Amérique. Éléments pour une sociologie de la sociologie étatsunienne contemporaine,”

Sociologie 2, no. 3 (2011): 277–294. On the division of sociology into specialized subdomains in France, see Gérard Houdeville, *Le métier de sociologue en France depuis 1945. Renaissance d'une discipline* (Rennes: PUR, 2008), 83ff.

2. The social macrocosm, often viewed as contained within the boundaries of a nation state, is composed of all the fields—or social microcosms—that constitute what is generally known as “society.” See Gisèle Sapiro, “Le champ est-il national? La théorie

de différenciation sociale au prisme de l'histoire globale,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 200, no. 5 (2013): 70–85.

spaces and to class relations in the service professions.³ However, the study of “cooperative networks,” a more recent legacy of interactionism, leaves social relations on the margins in its analysis of professional “worlds.”⁴ Analyses of work and professions in this tradition have focused sociological interest on all work activities—prestigious or otherwise—as well as stimulating in-depth empirical investigations and disseminating widely-used and well-validated concepts (for example, the moral division of labor, “dirty work,” and professional segments). In contrast to approaches that focus on organizations, other authors have introduced historical and ethnographical approaches, placing practices and relations at work at the center of their research, while paying rather less attention to social relations.⁵ Lastly, the study of “professional identities,”⁶ the flagship program in the French sociology of professional groups, is based on a conception of socialization that pays little attention to the social origins of professional representations and practices.⁷

Studies of industrial work and, more recently, research by authors who define themselves as sociologists of work (and not of “professional groups”) have all sought to include professional representations and practices within the social macrocosm by paying attention to the trajectories of workers.⁸ The manual by Christelle Avril, Marie Cartier, and Delphine Serre,⁹ for example, has helped to lay the groundwork for a dispositional sociology of work. Other authors have approached the world of work by resorting to field theory, opening up a perspective that studies the effects of surrounding fields on the structuring of professional spaces. The structural approach developed by Pierre Bourdieu¹⁰ has also proved its worth in new studies on involvement in social movements¹¹ and trade unionism, associating the study of individuals and their trajectories with the structures of the social spaces in which they are embedded.¹² Much of the analysis of service professions, intermediate professions, and intellectual professions has nevertheless paid scant attention to this theoretical matrix, notably the sociology of professional groups in France and the sociology of professions at the international level. Bourdieu, who himself

3. Marie Cartier, “Perspectives sociologiques sur le travail dans les services: les apports de Hughes, Becker et Gold,” *Le Mouvement Social* 211, no. 2 (2005): 37–49; Anne Paillet, “Valeur sociale des patient-e-s et différenciations des pratiques des médecins. Redécouvrir les enquêtes de Glaser & Strauss, Sudnow et Roth,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 236–237, no. 1–2 (2021): 20–39. For recent empirical work that places relations between professionals and clients within class and gender relations, see Muriel Darmon, *Réparer les cerveaux. Sociologie des pertes et des récupérations post-AVC* (Paris: La Découverte, 2021).

4. Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008). A notable exception is the work of Marc Perrenoud who recently proposed linking interactionist sociology of work with dispositional analysis. See Marc Perrenoud, “Pour un interactionisme dispositionnaliste dans l’étude du travail. Le cas de l’espace professionnel des musicien-ne-s ordinaires,” *SociologieS*, 2021. Accessed October 2021. doi.org/10.4000/sociologies.16646.

5. Pierre Fournier, Nicolas Hatzfeld, Cédric Lomba, and Séverin Muller, “Étudier le travail en situation,” in *Observer le travail. Histoire, ethnographie, approches combinées*, ed. Anne-Marie Arborio et al. (Paris: La Découverte, 2008), 7–21.

6. Claude Dubar, *La socialisation. Construction des identités sociales et professionnelles* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2000 [1991]).

Translator’s note: This quotation is our translation. Unless otherwise stated, all translations of foreign language material cited in this article are our own.

7. See David Pichonnaz and Kevin Toffel, eds, “Des dispositions au travail. L’origine

sociale des pratiques professionnelles,” *Émulations. Revue de sciences sociales* 25 (2018).

8. See the studies by participants in the seminar entitled “Pratiques, Travail, Organisation” (PraTO). Accessed October 2021: <https://pratoblog.wordpress.com>, in particular: Cédric Lomba, *La restructuration permanente de la condition ouvrière. De Cockerill à ArcelorMittal* (Vulaines-sur-Seine: Éditions du Croquant, 2018). On worker trajectories in other fields, see also the studies initiated by Margaret Maruani and Danièle Kergoat on social gender relations, and more recently: Nicolas Jounin, *Chantier interdit au public. Enquête parmi les travailleurs du bâtiment* (Paris: La Découverte, 2008); Isabel Boni-Le Goff, “Des expert-e-s respectables? Esthétique vestimentaire et production de la confiance,” *Travail, genre et sociétés* 41, no. 1 (2019): 67–86; Collectif

Rosa Bonheur, *La ville vue d’en bas. Travail et production de l’espace populaire* (Paris: Éditions Amsterdam, 2019).

9. Christelle Avril, Marie Cartier, and Delphine Serre, *Enquêteur sur le travail. Concepts, méthodes, récits* (Paris: La Découverte, 2010).

10. Pierre Bourdieu, “Séminaires sur le concept de champ, 1972–1975,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 200, no. 5 (2013): 4–37.

11. Frédérique Matonti and Franck Poupeau, eds, “Le capital militant (1). Engagements improbables, apprentissages et techniques de lutte,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 155, no. 5 (2004); Lilian Mathieu, “L’espace des mouvements sociaux,” *Politix* 77, no. 1 (2007): 131–151.

12. Baptiste Giraud, Karel Yon, and Sophie Bérout, *Sociologie politique du syndicalisme* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2018).

approached work from the angle of a sociology of salaried employment and of labor markets, avoided the study of work practices.¹³ His reticence over a non-reflective use of “occupational taxonomies” and the risks of nominalism that it entails led him to distance himself from an analysis of occupations.¹⁴ That said, the numerous studies by Bourdieu that view occupation as an indicator of social position, as well as countless other research studies, confirm the place of occupations as inevitable explanatory variables and, conversely, demonstrate the impact of class position on industrial relations, for example in Marxist sociology. We can say, with Will Atkinson,¹⁵ that occupations largely “irrigate” sociological surveys as a distinctive marker of the position that individuals occupy in the social macrocosm, in particular in the use of “socio-professional categories.” If professions are a recurrent indicator of social position, then social position should be systematically incorporated into analyses of work practices, whatever the status of the professions studied.

Linking work and professions

The intention of this issue is to continue and strengthen the dialogue between the sociologies of work, professions and professional groups, and a more general sociology.¹⁶ This requires the object of sociological study to be reconstructed, with work, professions, and the social macrocosm being integrated into a system of relations; the object of study should not be a number of dissociable “levels of analysis” that can be divided up into thematic specializations. Studying paid work involves studying a set of practices, or even gestures, while reflecting on professions and professional groups (the organizations that structure these practices),¹⁷ and considering the social relations of which they are the product. The most pertinent studies,¹⁸ including those in this issue, combine a focus on the mental structures behind workers’ practices and representations, on the systems of relations between the (individual and collective) agents concerned, and on the structuring of professional spaces (the latter being variably organized places of struggles). Just as the distinction between occupations and professions is sociologically irrelevant, the separation of the study of work from that of professions appears to be a form of scholarly distinction¹⁹ that is generated by the compartmentalization of these areas. To counter this tendency to thematic segregation, we advocate a study of work and professions that is based on an integrated theoretical matrix that includes work representations and practices within the social macro-

13. This is highlighted by Maxime Quijoux in *Bourdieu et le travail* (Rennes: PUR, 2015), and specifically referred to in Pierre Bourdieu, *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* (Paris: Raisons d’agir, 2021 [1963]).

14. Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, *Invitation à la sociologie réflexive* (Paris: Seuil, 2014). The contemporary sociology of professions, frequently focused on the issues of professionalization and professionalism (with, in particular, the intention to distinguish “professions” and “semi-

professions” from “occupations”) is often bound up with “folk uses” of these concepts, particularly in the English-speaking world.

15. Will Atkinson, *Bourdieu and After: A Guide to Relational Phenomenology* (Oxford and New York: Routledge, 2020).

16. Muriel Darmon, David Pichonnaz and Kevin Toffel, “La socialisation secondaire ne s’exerce pas sur une page blanche mais sur une page déjà écrite et déjà froissée par les expériences antérieures.” Interview with Muriel Darmon, *Émulations. Revue de*

sciences sociales 25 (2018): 115–121.

17. See Arborio et al, ed. *Observer le travail*.

18. The work studied here is salaried work. However, some recent developments in the sociology of work have shown the value of including other forms of employment in the analysis. For an overview of these contributions, see: José-Angel Calderón, Lise Demailly, and Séverin Muller, eds, *Aux marges du travail*, (Toulouse: Octarès éditions, 2016). Studies of unsalaried or even unpaid

work have also paid particular attention to social relations, especially gender relations, and to the trajectories of workers.

19. See Louis Pinto, ed., *La construction d’objet en sociologie. Actualité d’une démarche* (Bellecombe en Bauges: Éditions du Croquant, 2021). And on the need to reconstruct certain objects of study, see, for example, Gérard Mauger, “La délinquance: nouvel essai de construction d’objet,” in *La construction d’objet en sociologie*, 177–194.

cosm. And that is because individuals are never only workers but always social agents. The relational approach on which field theory is based enables one to grasp the structures underpinning relations between professions and the surrounding fields, on the one hand, and the relations among agents within professional spaces, on the other. This approach makes it necessary to take account of the manner in which social dispositions are incorporated and activated at work, and to place at the center of the analysis the struggles to define the borders between occupations.

Structural analysis of work is based on two closely interrelated lines of research. The first sets out to understand the positions of workers and to map out their spaces of belonging by focusing on the struggles, strategies, and resources at play in these spaces as well as the relationships between professional spaces and their surrounding fields. The second involves accounting for the effects of successive socializations on careers and on work representations and practices by studying the sociogenesis of dispositions in the sphere of work and their links with other dispositions. This approach to work is based on a theory of practice whose analytic approach focuses on the interdependence of social structures and mental structures. The value of a structural sociology of work and professions lies in connecting these two lines of research, making it possible to grasp, for example, variation in the effects of professional socialization according to the fraction of the space considered, or the way in which the resources accumulated outside work are an indicator of social position and play a part in intra-professional struggles. It seems essential to link study of the effects of positions and socializations with study of the structures and dynamics of professional spaces. Much of the research available tends to focus on only one of the two aspects at any one time.

Professional spaces and systems of relations

The sociology of professions, particularly in English-language studies, tends to limit structural analysis to interprofessional relations²⁰ and to the impact of the state on professions, generally conceptualized as the entity that guarantees a monopoly of activities and the closure of professional groups.²¹ However, if the state is able to reinforce the autonomy of professional spaces (for example, by guaranteeing a monopoly), it is also able to impose its own logic on the resources that are valued and can be mobilized there as well as their conversion rates. Here, the greatest heuristic gains can be achieved by analyzing the position occupied by the professional space when seen within the field of power.²² This position can be apprehended by looking

20. Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). Abbott's model is fertile in that it puts work—work activity—at the center of the analysis of professional dynamics (not distinguishing between work and professions) and in the fact that it takes into account inter-professional competition. If the model proves

to be heuristic for understanding the way in which problems are defined by groups claiming to possess expert knowledge, it limits its analysis to certain (high status) professions, focuses on the cultural resources mobilized, and, above all, is of little help in understanding differentiation and structuring within professions (which they owe to the effects of the surrounding fields and the impact that the

fields have on interprofessional relations as well as on work itself). See Stanislas Morel, "Au(x) coeur(s) des professions. Penser le rapport des professions à l'hétéronomie avec Abbott et Bourdieu," in *Andrew Abbott et l'héritage de l'école de Chicago*, ed. Didier Demazière and Morgan Jouvenet (Paris: Éd. de l'EHESS, 2016), 315–334.

21. Mike Saks, "Analyzing the Professions:

The Case for the Neo-Weberian Approach," *Comparative Sociology* 9, no. 6 (2010): 887–915.

22. See Pierre Bourdieu, "Champ du pouvoir et division du travail de domination. Texte manuscrit inédit ayant servi de support de cours au Collège de France, 1985–1986," *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 190, no. 5 (2011): 126–139.

at the possession and mobilization of types of capital specific to this field, even if their effectiveness may be limited to certain fractions of the space in question. The classic works on the processes of professionalization²³ or on “professional power”²⁴ can therefore be seen as a partial exploration of the structure of the field of power and the mobilization of its resources within professional spaces.²⁵ More generally, accounting for the relations between professional spaces and the surrounding fields²⁶ results in an exploration of the question of their autonomy in a more complex way than within the sociology of the professions, by studying variation in terms of fractions or poles, as has been shown in studies on journalism,²⁷ art,²⁸ and the police.²⁹ Accounting for the relations between professional spaces and the surrounding fields invites us to rethink the concept of professional autonomy in the light of the phenomenon of refraction or, conversely, of submission to external logics. This perspective makes it possible to embrace both the impact of external forces on the professions and the internal structuring of professional spaces, by reconstructing their sociogeneses,³⁰ and by establishing the variable capacity of these fields to impose their logic on the different fractions of professional spaces or, conversely, for individuals to accumulate resources in their professional spaces that are profitable in other fields. This analytical approach can be applied to all professional spaces, including those that are furthest from the field of power, such as nursing³¹ or even prostitution.³² Moreover—and contrary to a sociology of professions that limits the concept of autonomy to a capacity for self-organization³³ in an internalist perspective,³⁴ without taking into account the internal heterogeneity of professional spaces—this perspective makes it possible to bring to light the struggles over professional boundaries and to grasp the multiple forces that are exerted on them from outside.

Internal divisions and social relations

The concept traditionally used to account for the internal heterogeneity of professions is that of “segments.” Popularized by Rue Bucher and Anselm Strauss,³⁵ the concept was elaborated further by Florent Champy, whose idea of “agonistic segmentation”³⁶ sought to draw attention to intra-professional struggles by showing

23. Eliot Freidson, *Professionalism: The Third Logic* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001).

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

25. See the studies that attest to the impact of the field of power on professional positions and practices: Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo academicus* (Paris: Minuit, 1984); Paul Bourdieu, *Science de la science et réflexivité* (Paris: Raisons d'agir, 2001); Frédéric Lebaron, *La croyance économique. Les économistes entre science et politique*, (Paris: Seuil, 2000).

26. Lebaron, *La croyance économique*; Patrice Pinell, “Champ médical et processus

de spécialisation,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 156–157, no. 1–2 (2005): 4–36.

27. Olivier Baisnée and Jérémie Nollet, “Journalism as a Field,” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication* (2019). Accessed October 2021. doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.906.

28. Marie Buscatto, “De la vocation artistique au travail musical. Tensions, compromis et ambivalences chez les musiciens de jazz,” *Sociologie de l'Art* 5, no. 3 (2004): 35–56; Pierre Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire* (Paris: Seuil, 1992); Marc Perrenoud, *Les musicos. Enquête sur des musiciens ordinaires* (Paris: La Découverte, 2007).

29. Laurent Bonelli, Élodie Lemaire, and Laurence Proteau, eds, “Frontières policières,” *Sociétés contemporaines* 122, no. 2 (2021).

30. Patrice Pinell, “La genèse du champ médical: le cas de la France (1795–1870),” *Revue française de sociologie* 50, no. 2 (2009): 315–349.

31. Philippe Longchamp, Kevin Toffel, Felix Bühlmann, and Amal Tawfik, “L'espace professionnel infirmier: une analyse à partir du cas de la Suisse romande,” *Revue française de sociologie* 59, no. 2 (2018): 219–258; Kevin Toffel, “Les enjeux symboliques d'un diplôme académique. Reconfiguration des rapports sociaux et nouvelles tensions au sein de la profession infirmière,” *Revue*

suisse de sociologie 46, no. 1 (2020): 73–95.

32. Lilian Mathieu, “L'espace de la prostitution. Éléments empiriques et perspectives en sociologie de la déviance,” *Sociétés contemporaines* 38, no. 2 (2000): 99–116.

33. Freidson, *Professionalism*.

34. Gisèle Sapiro, “Repenser le concept d'autonomie pour la sociologie des biens symboliques,” *Biens Symboliques* 4 (2019). Accessed October 2021. doi.org/10.4000/bssg.327.

35. Rue Bucher and Anselm Strauss, “Professions in Process,” *American Journal of Sociology* 66, no. 4 (1961): 325–334.

36. Florent Champy, *La sociologie des professions* (Paris: PUF, 2009).

the way in which professionals' views of their profession are linked to their worldviews and political perceptions.³⁷ His reflection on the politicization of work, which needs to be pursued, and studies focusing on the dispositional analysis of work highlight the importance of connecting the study of workers with the study of their social positions, and of extending the study of social relationships at work from interactions between professionals and “clients” to those among professionals.³⁸ By connecting fields and habitus, structural analysis makes it possible to reveal the fractures and tensions within professional spaces, while identifying the resources that are at the origin of work practices and competition between individuals, resources that are dependent on individuals' trajectories. Use of the concept of capital,³⁹ for example, to identify types of resources and their specific arrangements within professional spaces makes it possible to determine what is important in each space, by seeking, as Durkheim, to understand why “The soldier seeks military glory, the priest moral authority, the statesman power, the industrialist wealth, the scientist professional fame.”⁴⁰ Nevertheless, internal divisions must also be taken into account: the types of capital coveted by workers are likely to vary according to the fractions of the professional space, since the same task may, for example, be perceived as enviable by some and as “dirty work” by others.⁴¹ These internal divisions, although they may be related to specific issues and resources, are frequently pegged to social relationships outside professional spaces, whether they be related to class, gender, or ethnicity—structural elements that are excluded by the sociologies of work and the professions when they are too inward-looking. Since professional positions often depend on resources accumulated *outside* professional spaces, in particular cultural capital, bringing them to light is an effective way of reintroducing social relationships into the analysis of work.

Effect of non-work socializations

We have mentioned elsewhere the fact that work is a space in which imported dispositions⁴² can be activated in a process that has been described by Julie Pagis and Maxime Quijoux as “dispositional circulation.”⁴³ The links between primary and secondary socialization are becoming better known, even if there is still some residual debate about the capacity of the former to influence the latter. It seems reasonable to believe that the strength of professional socialization, particularly in relation to previous socializations, is a question to be settled empirically, and that it is likely to vary according to the professional spaces considered and the non-work trajectories of individuals.⁴⁴

37. Florent Champy, “L’engagement des professionnels comme conséquence de tensions consubstantielles à leur pratique: l’architecture moderne entre les deux guerres,” *Sociétés contemporaines* 73, no. 1 (2009): 97–119.

38. This second point has been made recently with regard to the health professions. See Maud Gelly, Audrey Mariette, and Laure Pitti, “Santé critique. Inégalités

sociales et rapports de domination dans le champ de la santé,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 236–237 (2021): 4–19.

39. For a heuristic use of the concept of capital in studies on work, see Longchamp et al., “L’espace professionnel infirmier”; Baisnée and Nollet, “Journalism as a Field.”

40. Émile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. W.D. Halls (New York: Free

Press, 1997): 209.

41. Anne-Marie Arborio has demonstrated how “dirty work” is delegated in hospitals in her work *Un personnel invisible. Les aides-soignantes à l’hôpital* (Paris: Economica, 2002).

42. David Pichonnaz and Kevin Toffel, “Pour une analyse dispositionnelle des pratiques professionnelles,” *Émulations. Revue de sciences sociales* 25 (2018): 7–21.

43. Julie Pagis and Maxime Quijoux, “From Roots to Biographical Consequences of Work. Occupational Socialization between Work and Non-Work,” *Terrains & travaux* 34, no. 1 (2019): 5–18.

44. Sylvain Laurens and Delphine Serre, “Des agents de l’État interchangeables ? L’ajustement dispositionnel des agents au cœur de l’action publique,” *Politix* 115, no. 3 (2016): 155–177.

**IN A WORD, LET US AFFORD ALL THE LATITUDE
REQUIRED FOR GROUPS OF SPECIALISTS
WITHIN OUR FIELD TO CULTIVATE THEIR
PARTICULAR INTERESTS; BUT FOR THE SAFE
ANCHORAGE OF EACH OF THE SPECIALTIES
LET US AT THE SAME TIME MAGNIFY THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS,
THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, THE CONGRESS
OF CONGRESSES IN WHICH WE PRESERVE
THE HABIT OF SURVEYING ALL THE SPECIAL
PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY IN THE PERSPECTIVE
OF THE LARGEST OUTLOOK WHICH OUR COMBINED
VISION COMMANDS.**

Albion Small, co-founder of the American Sociological
Association at the congress of the Association, 1921.
Cited in Jerold Starr, "Specialization and the Development
of Sociology: Differentiation or Fragmentation?",
"Qualitative Sociology 6, no. 1 (1983): 68.

Avoiding the trap of thematic compartmentalization, a number of studies substantiate the impact of non-work socializations on professional dispositions. Family background, gender, and social trajectory are instances of socialization whose effects on work have been proven;⁴⁵ family socialization, for example, affects the way social workers judge the educational practices of the parents they support,⁴⁶ and those working at a supermarket checkout defend different practices, depending on whether they occupy the position following an upward trajectory that has been interrupted or, on the contrary, whether they are working there temporarily in order to finance further education.⁴⁷ A structural sociology of work also invites us to take into account the symbolic dimension of the social, by studying not only the “ignorance of the objective truth of work as exploitation,”⁴⁸ but also the recognition expected by individuals of their professional position, within and outside their professional space, which determines their investment in work, their variable adherence to the rules of the profession, and their relations with their “clients.” Social trajectories influence work because they shape worldviews and workers’ relationships to politics, for example, by influencing the way merit is perceived, which then contributes to shaping the moral value attributed to “clients,” especially in service occupations. Work can nevertheless have transformative effects and impact other spheres of life, well beyond the accumulation of economic capital, resulting in what is generally identified as “professional deformation.” Study of the links between the effects of work and non-work socializations, initiated in the works cited, needs to be deepened and systematized, in particular to clarify the variable strength of socializations depending on professional spaces—i.e., the different ways in which work may, or may not, transform individuals.

Against the harmful effects of compartmentalization, a return to a general sociology involved in a structural analysis of work sheds light on what is played out *within* professional spaces as well as on what, *around them*, helps determine their structure, the issues at stake, and the struggles over the value of the symbolic goods circulating. The articles in this issue are proof of the value of this approach. Lilian Mathieu’s analysis of the role played by the political and activist socializations of individuals retraining to enter the teaching profession takes into account the mobilization of resources in activist experience and the way in which this capital can determine the position occupied within the teaching profession. Identification of the resources at stake in professions and the nature of their differential yields make it possible to avoid standardizing the value of different capitals. This is shown by Anne-Marie

45. There are many studies of this nature. See, for example: Christelle Avril, *Les aides à domicile. Un autre monde populaire* (Paris: La Dispute, 2014); Emmanuelle Zolesio, “La chirurgie et sa matrice de socialisation professionnelle,” *Sociologie* 3, no. 4 (2012): 377–394; Anne Paillet and Delphine Serre, “Les rouages du genre. La différenciation

des pratiques de travail chez les juges des enfants,” *Sociologie du travail* 56, no. 3 (2014): 342–364; David Pichonnaz, “La force des dispositions. Mobilités sociales, genre et devenirs policiers,” *Champ pénal/ Penal field* 22 (2021). Accessed October 2021. doi.org/10.4000/champ-penal.12960; Julien Bertrand, *La fabrique*

des footballeurs (Paris: La Dispute, 2012); Vincent Dubois, *La vie au guichet. Relation administrative et traitement de la misère* (Paris: Economica, 2010 [1999]); Alexis Spire, *Accueillir ou reconduire. Enquête sur les guichets de l’immigration* (Paris: Raisons d’agir, 2008).

46. Delphine Serre, *Les coulisses de l’État*

social. Enquête sur les signalements d’enfant en danger (Paris: Raisons d’agir, 2009).

47. Marlène Benquet, *Encaisser! Enquête en immersion dans la grande distribution* (Paris: La Découverte, 2013).

48. Pierre Bourdieu, “La double vérité du travail,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 114 (1996): 89–90.

Arborio in her analysis of the way in which school-type classification criteria remain prevalent in an exam system that is supposed to evaluate professional know-how. In an analysis of Frederick W. Taylor's social trajectory, Nicolas Jounin endeavors to grasp the bourgeois dispositions and elective affinities that the father of the "scientific organization of work" entertained with employers and shows the mistrust and contempt he displayed toward workers. Finally, Olivia Chambard and H  l  ne Stevens shed light on the conflicts between "socio-educational" and "economic" approaches in a new professional space, that of university-level "entrepreneurship" courses, demonstrating the different types of capital accumulated by individuals in other fields. These articles all reaffirm the value of placing the analysis of professions and work within a general sociology.

Translated and edited by
Cadenza Academic Translations

Translator: Peter Collins

Editor: Anam Zafar

Senior editor: Mark Mellor