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Every so often, a scholar attempts to provide an integration or synthesis of a particular field of study. This is University of Minnesota Professor John W. Budd’s objective in The Thought of Work. Budd begins his treatise by defining work as “purposeful human activity involving physical or mental exertion that is not undertaken solely for pleasure and that has economic or symbolic value” (p. x). Hence, employment is included in this definition of work but is not a synonym for work. Indeed, in the introduction to this book, Budd distinguishes work outside the home from work inside the home and identifies paid and unpaid activities within these two spheres. He then provides a brief historical review of work from prehistoric times to the present, emphasizing the importance of work irrespective of prevailing economic, social, and political arrangements. This importance is reflected in the wide range of academic disciplines represented in studies of work. Based on his immersion in the literatures of these disciplines, Budd organizes his book by constructing 10 conceptualizations of work and devoting a chapter to each. These conceptualizations are of work as (a) a curse, (b) freedom, (c) a commodity, (d) occupational citizenship, (e) disutility, (f) personal fulfillment, (g) a social relation, (h) caring for others, (i) identity, and (j) service.

The intellectual roots of work as a curse are Western theology and ancient Greco-Roman philosophy, which lead to a definition of work as an unquestioned burden necessary for human survival or maintenance of the social order. From this perspective, God or nature requires arduous, dirty work that is performed by the lowly and the enslaved who have no hope of upward mobility. The intellectual roots of work as freedom are Western liberal individualism and political theory, which lead to a definition of work as a way to achieve independence from nature or other humans and to express human creativity. From this perspective, the freedom to own one’s labor as a property right and the freedom to contract are key, though such freedoms rarely go
unrestricted in modern society and are subject to various legal constraints. Still, work as freedom reflects the erosion of the master–servant doctrine and the close ties between independence, work, and citizenship.

The intellectual roots of work as a commodity are capitalism, industrialization, and economics, which lead to a definition of work as an abstract quantity of productive effort that has tradable economic value. From this perspective, work has a use value and an exchange value and is necessary for creating market-based, capitalist societies. However, the commoditization of work also results in its degradation—deskilling—and in worker alienation from work. By contrast, the intellectual roots of work as occupational citizenship are Western citizenship ideals, theology, and industrial relations, which lead to a definition of work as an activity pursued by human members of a community entitled to certain rights. From this perspective, public policy and labor unions emerged to counter the commoditization of work through reducing bargaining power inequality and providing employees with voice in employment relationships. However, such balancing is threatened by deep recession and by the global decline in unionization.

The intellectual roots of work as disutility are utilitarianism and economics, which lead to a definition of work as a lousy activity tolerated to obtain goods and services that provide pleasure. From this perspective, individuals trade off unpaid leisure time for paid work time and employers use various incentive pay schemes and efficiency wages to influence this trade off. Ironically, workers use earnings from paid work time to engage in consumption during leisure time. This trade off leads to consideration of work as personal fulfillment, the intellectual roots of which are Western liberal individualism, systematic management, and psychology, which in turn lead to a definition of work as physical and psychological functioning that (ideally) satisfies individual needs. From this perspective, work can be redesigned to satisfy employees’ higher order needs and thereby provide intrinsic motivation. Whether this can be done while also satisfying employer interests in what amounts to a unitarist model of work is an issue prominently featured in contemporary human resource management research.

The intellectual roots of work as a social relationship are industrialization, sociology, and anthropology, which lead to a definition of work as human interaction embedded in social norms, institutions, and power structures. From this perspective, work is a social exchange built on trust and influenced by social relationships, groups, and networks. Social norms manifest themselves in national cultures, determining, for example, “men’s work” and “women’s work.” They also manifest themselves at the workplace, such as when workers decide to restrict their output or, alternatively, when they operate in “empowered” self-managed teams. The intellectual roots of work as caring...
for others are women’s rights and feminism, which lead to a definition of work as the physical, cognitive, and emotional effort required to attend to and maintain others. From this perspective, caring for others is importantly reflected not only in unpaid household work but also by paid work in the health care and education sectors. Such caring remains largely provided by women despite substantial efforts to explicitly value unpaid household work and to remedy employment discrimination.

The intellectual roots of work as identity are psychology, sociology, and philosophy, which lead to a definition of work as a method for understanding who you are and where you stand in the social structure. From this perspective, work strongly shapes an individual’s self-concept, self-categorization, and group membership, sometimes leading to a positive identity but perhaps more often leading to an uncertain or negative identity. The intellectual roots of work as service are in theology, Confucianism, republicanism, and humanitarianism, which lead to a definition of work as the devotion of effort to others, such as God, household, community, or country. From this perspective, work potentially satisfies needs and desires that go well beyond those of an individual worker and his or her immediate family, especially when such service is voluntary rather conscripted or mandated. Yet in a market economy, tension often arises between service and individualism.

The concluding chapter of this book is titled “Work Matters,” and Budd makes a deeply researched case for this conclusion. His 10-category organizational scheme will not necessarily sit well with all readers. His separate treatments of work as a commodity and as disutility could readily be combined, as could his separate treatments of work as personal fulfillment and identity and work as caring for others and service. Nonetheless, Budd has succeeded in showing why work should not be conceptualized from a single disciplinary or problem-centered perspective and why work should be thought of and analyzed in terms of its connections to all main aspects of life.


Reviewed by: Denise D. Bielby, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA
DOI: 10.1177/0730888412443223

In Creative Labour, Hesmondhalgh and Baker analyze the quality of workers’ experience in culture industry occupations in the United Kingdom. Relying on interviews with employees and participant-observation of work