

1-1-1982

White collar structure and class : educated labor reevaluated.

Richard Sobel
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Sobel, Richard, "White collar structure and class : educated labor reevaluated." (1982). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*.
3852.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/3852

UMASS/AMHERST



312066013594238

WHITE COLLAR STRUCTURE AND CLASS:
EDUCATED LABOR REEVALUATED

A Dissertation Presented
by
RICHARD SOBEL

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

MAY 1982

EDUCATION

(C) Richard Sobel 1982
All Rights Reserved

WHITE COLLAR STRUCTURE AND CLASS:
EDUCATED LABOR REVALUATED

A Dissertation Presented by

by

RICHARD SOBEI

Approved as to style and content by:

Harvey B. Scribner
Harvey B. Scribner, Chairperson

Heribert Gintis
Heribert Gintis, Member

William E. Connolly
William E. Connolly, Member

James D. Wright
James D. Wright, Member

Mario Fantini
Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

WCWC

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A dissertation is both the efforts of an individual and a social product. I would very much like to express my appreciation to the many people who assisted me in the course of completing this thesis. My main adviser, Herbert Gintis, has been supportive as a person and insightful as a scholar. James R. Beniger at Princeton has provided valuable methodological assistance in personal discussions and in allowing me to attend his sociology graduate methods courses. Judith S. Rowe, Associate Director of the Princeton University Computer Center, has often provided valuable information, data, and support.

My committee Chairperson, Harvey Scribner, contributed valuable ideas and encouragement. As a political theorist, William Connolly, alerted me to the limits of structural analysis and the importance of subjective concerns. James D. Wright assisted from finding early important data to the continuing process of questioning and sociological insights. J. Stuart Hunter permitted me to attend his quantitative analysis course at the Woodrow Wilson School and served as an informal "local statistician." Shirley Gilbert, Neil Polhemus, Roberta Cohen, Dennis Smith, David Bloom, Ki Kim

and Mary Lou Thompson at Princeton and Kent Smith at Northwestern also added valuable statistical and methodological assistance. Patrick Bova at the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), Juan Ruz at Princeton, and Allan McCutcheon and Bruce Stevenson at Chicago helped me with problems in obtaining and analyzing data.

During my travels, Tom Smith at NORC in Chicago ran computer analyses on the General Social Survey and provided valuable statistical information. Joseph Veroff at Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan kindly released before publication relevant data from the "Study of Modern Living" (1976) which was put on tape by David Klingel and transported by Foster Schoch of the Social Science User Services (SSUS) at Princeton. Melvin L. Kohn permitted Carrie Schoenback at NIMH to run computer analyses on the unpublished data from his 1964 occupations study. John E. Bregger, Chief, Division of Employment and Unemployment Analysis at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, provided unpublished statistics on self- and wage-employment by industry. Bob Gottlieb sent a copy of the "Port Authority Statement," after a search of Madison Historical Society and other correspondence failed to locate one.

Jane Tancig helped with translations of Mallet and Belleville (1963), provided by Javier Ruiz from Spain. Andre Maman translated from the original French where the Spanish was unclear. Rebecca Rowe translated parts of Guttman (1976) from Hebrew. Patrick Quinn, Rolf Erickson, and Jan Carew helped me to gain access to the Northwestern University Library. (The difficulty of gaining access to research libraries is a continuing source of concern for serious scholars.)

Other valuable help on substantive questions was provided by Martin Oppenheimer of Rutgers University, Marshall Pomer at University of California, Hervey Juris, Arnold Feldman and Christopher Jencks at Northwestern, and Wesley Shrum at Princeton. Melvin Tumin allowed me to attend his seminar on social stratification. Sam Bowles provided important ideas for my thesis proposal; Fritz Machlup and Peter Rossi provided encouragement in their interest in my dissertation proposal; C.W. Wheatley helped develop my analytic skills. Marvin Bressler and John Fleming, Chairs of the Sociology and English Departments at Princeton, provided important scholarly and professional models. Mike Kagay and Steve Slaby have been supportive colleagues. James Wickenden pushed me to complete my work in a timely manner, and Lyman Brainerd helped with

dissertation format.

Hoe Khor and friend, and Michele Naples, transported dissertation drafts at strategic times. Caren Rosenthal Miles typed my initial proposal when I was tired of working on it. Andy Scott kept me in touch with the University of Massachusetts. Melvin Schwartz and Cynthia Green at Northwestern, Naomi Cahn, John Quadrato, Alan Sokol, Lyndon Ong, Robbie Berg, Dan Frohman, Jeff Sellers, Susan King, Art Robinson and Antony Sinascali helped with computer time. Many people at the Princeton University Computer Center have provided a variety of assistance. Robert Wuerthner and George Bryniawsky at UMASS, Rachel Rosenfeld of NORC, Myron Roomkin of Northwestern, Ralph Smith and Abe Shannon were helpful at important times. Mike Greenebaum has been a continuing source of support and encouragement as an adviser, colleague and friend (once my high school history teacher, he attended my thesis defense eighteen years later). Joan Fleming, Stan Kephart, Linda Greenebaum, Virginia Strawn, Hugo Medina, and Leslie Nathanson were supportive and interested friends. I especially thank my parents, Betty Debs and Walter Howard Sobel, for their support and encouragement of learning. To all others (including the anonymous auditor at my defense) who have helped at some point in this process, I express my thanks.

I also want to express appreciation to the various authors who in the past have explored questions covered here. C. Wright Mills' works on white collar (and power elites) provided important perspectives. Erik Olin Wright, in our discussions and my reading of his pioneering works, laid the basis for much of what I have explored. Vance Packard's work introduced me to the topic of class in American society. Stanislaw Ossowski suggested a synthesis of dichotomous and continuous conceptions of class. This study builds on the work and help of many others, and I hope it serves as the basis for the advancement of knowledge of significant social concerns.

ABSTRACT

WHITE COLLAR CLASS STRUCTURE AND CLASS:
EDUCATED LABOR REEVALUATED

May 1982

Richard Sobel, A.B., Princeton University

Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Herbert Gintis

This dissertation examines the structure and class situation of U.S. white collar labor in the 1970s and over time. In literature critique and empirical analyses, it clarifies recurring questions about class and white collar. Review of class and social stratification as income, occupation, and socioeconomic status preceed consideration of white collar as middle class (or new middle class), elite (new class), working class (new working class), an inbetween category, and divided between the working and nonworking classes. Structural class based in ownership relations establishes white collar labor as mainly working class, with a segment outside.

Based on Census data, government industry surveys, and national labor force samples, most white collar labor in the 1970s were employees and hence working class. Employing discriminant analysis to identify distinctions among occupational conditions to operationalize proletarian "workers" and relatively independent "authorized employees" ("authors"), a significant proportion of white collar labor were proletarians.

Examination of job structure transformation and proletarianization of white collar labor from 1940 to 1970s are on three levels. Simple (class) proletarianization involves movement from self-employment to wage employment. Secondary (intermediate) proletarianization involves decrease in supervisory labor. Condition proletarianization includes movement to narrowly delimited job situations. Time series of Census data and national samples from 1945 to 1977 indicate a long term trend toward wage employment, and a 1970s trend away from supervision. Structural conditions on the job have declined in some cases; in others they been upgraded.

Theories of educated labor, such as American new working class analyses, tie higher education and white collar class both historically and structurally. According to analytic principles herein, the situations of two white collar occupations in education, teachers and professors, are predominantly working class. Parallels, and in some cases, correspondences exist between levels of education and of white collar jobs. A seeming disparity appears between higher educational attainment and narrow scope of responsibilities allowed upper white collar labor.

There is strong theoretical and empirical evidence in cross-section and longitudinally for a close, and in many cases, growing relationship between white collar labor and the working class. (Methodological and analytical appendices complement the text.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction	
Basic Concerns	
Propositions of the Dissertation	
Proposition One	
Proposition Two	
Testing the Propositions	
Definitions and Terms	
Significance of the Study	
Significance of the Study for Education	
Limitations of the Study	
Organization of the Dissertation	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF CLASS AND WHITE COLLAR CLASS	25
Introduction	
Conceptions of Class	
Class as common income levels	
Class as an occupational hierarchy	
Class and the technical division of labor	
Class as common status positions	
Class and economic life chances	
Class and authority relations	
Class defined by class conflict	
Class as a subjective category	
Synthesis of class conceptions	
Structural Definitions of Class	
The Class Theories of White Collar Labor	
Middle Class	
New Middle Class	
Control in reproducing hierarchies	
Control of labor in production	
Political and ideological determinants of class	
New Class	
Working Class Theories	
Sexual division of working class labor	
New working class	

Third Position Theories	
Division Between Middle and Working Class	
Critique and Analysis	
Productive and unproductive labor: exploitation	
Political and ideological criteria for class	
Supervision as necessary coordination	
Distinction within the working-class	
Conclusions	
III. THE CLASS SITUATION OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR IN THE 1970s	128
Introduction	
Definitions and Operationalizations	
Unit of Class Analysis	
Data Sources	
Class position: census of population data	
Distinctions within the working class: government surveys	
Distinctions within the working class: national surveys	
Basic Class Divisions	
Examining class defined on a household basis	
Sexual differences in class analysis	
Distinctions within the working class: supervisors	
Distinctions Within the Central Working Class	
Toward a Definition of Working Class Conditions	
The Questions of Operationalizing Worker Development of A Metric	
Workers and the Class Structure	
Conclusions: White Collar and the Working Class	
IV. CHANGES IN THE CLASS SITUATION OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR	185
Introduction	
Review of the Literature of Proletarianization	
Simple class proletarianization	
Intermediate proletarianization	
Condition proletarianization	
Contradictory tendencies	
Empirical Evidence of Simple Class Proletarianization	
Census of population data	
Intermediate Proletarianization	
Government surveys of industry	
National sample surveys	
Time series based on the national sample surveys	

Intermediate proletarianization and national surveys	
Intermediate Proletarianization in the 1970s	
Condition Proletarianization: Comparing Studies	
Over Time	
Imputed estimates of proletarianization, 1960-70	
Gurin (1957) vs. Veroff (1976)	
Quinn (1970 vs. 1973)	
Some Tentative Conclusions	
V. WHITE COLLAR CLASS AND EDUCATION 245	
Introduction	
Student Syndicalism and the New Working Class Theory	
The Class Situation of Teachers and Professors	
White Collar Class and Education	
Higher Education and White Collar Jobs:	
Some Parallels	
Correspondence in Social Relations	
Conclusions	
VI. CONCLUSIONS: THE CLASS SITUATIONS OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR 286	
Introduction	
Conclusions on the Literature and Class	
Productive, unproductive labor and exploitation	
Secondary economic factors	
Political and functional criteria for class:	
supervision	
Supervision as necessary coordination	
Ideological factors	
White Collar Labor and the Working Class	
in the 1970s	
Working class position	
Working class condition	
Conclusions on Proletarianization	
The literature of proletarianization	
Empirical results on proletarianization	
Education and the White Collar Working Class	
Suggestions for Further Study	
Conclusions	

APPENDIXES	337
Appendix 3.1 Estimation of Class Category Sizes Based on Government Surveys of Industry	338
Appendix 3.2 Selection of Characteristics for Defining Worker	352
Appendix 3.3 Cross-sectional Data Tables	374
Appendix 4.1 Self-Employment Percentages for Doctors, Lawyers, Architects, 1940-1970	379
Appendix 4.2 Regression Equations for 1945-77 Supervisors and Employees	380
Appendix 4.3 Time Series for Total Labor Force	381
Appendix 4.4 Changes in Class Category Sizes Over Time, 1970, 1973, 1976	385

LIST OF TABLES

1. White Collar Jobs as Percentages of the Labor Force, 1910-1975	2
2. Self- and Wage-Employment Among White Collar Labor, 1940-1975	3
3. White Collar Groups in Working Class Position Percentages, 1970, 1975	138
4. Industries With High Concentrations of White Collar and Service Labor, 1970	141
5. Class Percentages for White Collar Concentrated Industries, 1970, 1975	142
6. Supervisory Percentages for White Collar Occupations, National Surveys, 1970s	144
7. (Nonsupervisory) Percentages for White Collar Occupations, National Surveys, 1970s	145
8. Class Compositions Based on Household Heads, PSID, 1977	148
9. Class Compositions Based on Individuals Aggregated, GSS, 1977	149
10. Managers vs. Supervisors in the PSID, 1976	154
11. Class Categories With Nominal Supervisors in the Expanded Central Working Class (ECWC), PSID, 1975	156
12. Wright's Percentages in Various Classes, Unweighted, 1970	158
13. Significant Dimensions for Worker Metric, SWC, 1970	173
14. Equation for Cutoff Between Authorized and General Employees	175
15. Category Percentages, and Category Proportions Within the Central Working Class, SWC, 1970 . . .	177
16. Summary Table: Working Class Categories for White Collar Levels, 1970s	180
17. White Collar Occupations in Working Class Position, Labor Force, 1940-1975	209
18. Class Category Percentages in White Collar Concentrated Industries, 1968-77	213
19. Seven National Surveys in Time Series	215
20. Class Categories for Major White Collar Occupations, Employed Males, National Surveys, 1945-77	218
21. Class Categories for Individual White Collar Occupa- tions, Employed Males, National Surveys, 1945-77	219
22. Directions of Changes for Category Percentages, Supervisors and Employees, 1945-77	221

23.	Directions of Changes for Categories Percentages, Supervisors and Employees, 1945-70, 1970-77 . . .	223
24.	Class Categories for Major White Collar Occupations, National Surveys, Total Labor Force, 1970-77 . . .	225
25.	Class Categories for Individual White Collar Occupa- tions, National Surveys, 1970-77	226
26.	Summary of Directions of Change, Supervisors and Employees Percentages, Total Labor Force, 1970-77	228
27.	Comparisons of Results for 1957 and 1976, Major White Collar Categories, Gurin v. Veroff, Weighted N . . .	233
28.	Comparisons of Results for 1957 and 1976, Individual White Collar Categories, Gurin v. Veroff, Weighted N	234
29.	Comparisons of Results for 1970 and 1973, Major White Collar Occupations, SWC v QES, Weighted N	237
30.	Comparisons of Results for 1970 and 1973, Individual White Collar Occupations, SWC v. QES, Weighted N	238
31.	Class Situation of College Educated White Collar Labor, Mean Years of Education Completed, 21 to 37, PSID, 1976	262
32.	Class Positions of Education Occupations, Census Data, 1970	267
33.	Class Categories for Educational Labor, PSID, 1976	268
34.	Full Class Situations of Teachers and Professor, QES, 1973	269
35.	Class Categories for Teachers and Professor, PSID (1976) vs. QES (1973)	270
36.	Full Class Situations of Teachers and Professors, QES, Male, 1973	271
37.	Full Class Situations of Teachers and Professors, QES, Female, 1973	272
38.	Educational Origins for Technicians and Professionals, Ages 21 to 37, PSID, 1976	278
39.	Educational Origins for Technicians and Professionals, Ages 21 to 27, PSID, 1976	278
40.	Comparisons of Education and Social Relations of the Jobs, Ages 21 to 37, PSID, 1976	282
41.	Comparisons of Education and Social Relations of the Jobs, Ages 21 to 27, PSID, 1976	282
42.	Summary Table, Working Class Categories for White Collar Levels, 1970s	303

43.	Sizes of Labor Forces in Different Estimates . . .	342
44.	Definitions of Supervisors/Nonsupervisors in Various Surveys	346
45.	Class Size Estimates Based on Three Government Surveys	349
46.	Industries with High Proportions of White Collar and Service Labor, 1970	351
47.	Significant Predictors from Regressions, SWC, 1970	360
48.	Questions for Significant Discriminators, Survey of Working Conditions, 1969-70	362
49.	Discriminant and Classification Coefficients, SWC, 1970	363
50.	Calculations for Cutoffs for Authors, Normals, and Workers, SWC, 1970	365
51.	Distribution Among CWC Categories from Histograms	372
52.	Class Categories Comparing Loren and Census	374
53.	Percentages of Self-Employed Doctors, Lawyers, Architects, Census, 1970	374
54.	Division by Class Position for White Collar Occupations, Census, CPS, 1970, 1975	375
55.	White Collar Occupations by Sex, CPS, 1975	376
56.	Percentages of Men and Women in Various White Collar Occupations, CPS, 1975	376
57.	Whites and Nonwhites in White Collar Occupations, CPS, 1975	377
58.	Men and Women in White Collar Occupations, by Race, CPS, 1975	377
59.	Class Positions for Technicians, Census, 1970 . . .	378
60.	Major Class Categories for Technicians, PSID, 1976	378
61.	Full Class Categories for Technical Labor, First Estimates, SWC, 1970.	378
62.	Self-Employment Percentages for Doctors, Lawyers and Architects, 1940-1970	379
63.	Regression Equations for 1945-77, Supervisors and Employees	380
64.	Regression Equations for 1970-77, Supervisors and Employees	380
65.	Summary Table, Class Time Series, 1970-77	382
66.	Summary Table, Class Time Series, 1938-76	383
67.	Changes in Class Category Sizes Over Time, 1970, 1973, Men	385
68.	Changes in Class Category Sizes Over Time, 1970, 1973, Men	386
69.	Changes in Class Category Sizes Over Time, Based on Percentages for 1970, 1973, and 1976, Men . . .	387

C H A P T E R I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

This dissertation explores questions of class structure and white collar labor. The first major concern is to identify the class situation of white collar labor in recent time. The second major concern is to identify the changes in the class situation and structure of white collar labor over time. A related concern is the relationship between educational issues and theories of white collar class.

In reviewing white collar and class, the thesis looks at theories which attempt to define the present class situation of white collar labor and explain change in white collar class structure over time. The study also examines available statistical data clarifying the main questions. In sum, the thesis brings to bear theoretical and empirical insights on the questions of the current class situation of white collar labor and its changes over time.

In addition, the study explores related and subsidiary concerns. Among them are important issues connected to education. For instance, to a significant extent, white collar labor is college-educated. In particular, some American formulations of the "new working class" theories

referred to white collar work as "educated labor." The background for this designation is examined and explained.

Basic Concerns

Over the last century, two seemingly contradictory trends have been observed concerning white collar labor--professional, managerial, clerical and sales work. Most evident is the growth both in the number and percentage of jobs which are in the white collar sector. Since 1910, white collar jobs have grown from about one-fifth to about one-half of the occupational structure (Reich, 1972:178).

TABLE 1

WHITE COLLAR JOBS AS PERCENTAGES OF THE LABOR FORCE,
1910-1975

1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1975
21.3%	24.9	29.4	31.1	36.5	42.3	48.3	49.8

SOURCES: Reich (1972), Census of Population (1970), Current Population Survey (CPS) (1975).

1. This thesis uses structural definitions of class and subclass based on objective dimension such as ownership, supervision, and conditions of work. The theoretical conception of structurally defined class is the unifying theme throughout. Moreover, the structural data used in defining class and clarifying trends present in themselves a description of the organization of white collar work and how it has changed. Hence, the trends in white collar labor may be examined in both class and structural terms.

Equally important have been the changes in the position of white collar labor over time and in the organization of the labor process within white collar work. While "white collar" still connotes a job with independence and shades of professional status, increasingly it means a job in technical, office or sales work under the control of others.

White collar jobs are increasingly in wage-labor status, that is, paid by wages or salaries. Since 1910, self-employment--which is significantly concentrated in white collar levels--has dropped from 25% of all jobs to less than 10% (Reich, 1972:175). In the same period, wage employment has grown from 70% to 90% of all jobs. Since 1940 the proportions in white collar work who are wage paid has grown from less than 80% to more than 90%.

TABLE 2

SELF- AND WAGE-EMPLOYMENT AMONG WHITE COLLAR LABOR,
1940-1975

	1940	1950	1960	1970	1975
Self-Employed	(20%)	15.6	10.6	9.9	8.2
Wage-Employed	79.2	81.5	85.5	89.5	90.9

SOURCES: Reich (1972), Census (1970), CPS (1975). Self-employment for 1940 is an estimate based on wage employment.

The realities of white collar work, particularly at the lower levels of clerical and sales jobs are clearly

4

different today from the images of professional work with financial and workplace autonomy. Despite the aura of the word "white collar", many jobs in these sectors have become like work in the blue collar sectors in a number of ways: wage-labor status, loss of independence in decision-making, hierarchical control of work, fragmented labor process, and higher unemployment rates. According to Wright (1977:27), about one third of white collar jobs are under working class conditions today.

The transformation of white collar labor to working class conditions has occurred at differential rates among the different occupational levels of the sector. At the lower level of white collar work--clerical and sales jobs--the process is clearest and farthest along: virtually all such jobs are wage-paid, and many are under hierarchic control, and with a fragmented and routinized labor process. As Braverman (1974:354,371) has indicated, work in large stores and offices is increasingly similar to that of blue collar jobs on the assembly-line in factories. In fact, Braverman (1974:393) shows that pay and status of lower white collar jobs has declined below that of blue-collar manufacturing jobs. Wright (1977:27) estimates that about two-thirds of lower white collar positions have been proletarianized, that is, are in working class conditions.

At the middle levels of white collar work, there has

been a growth of technicians and paraprofessionals who lack the independence, training, status and career mobility traditionally associated with white collar work. They, like clerks and salespeople, typically work for wages and have little part in making work-related decisions. They are part of what Aronowitz (1971) calls the "proletarianization of technicians."

Even at the upper white collar levels of professional work, changes in white collar situation are being felt, though they are subtle and are far from "proletarianization." As self-employment among them declines, professionals such as doctors and lawyers are increasingly paid by salaries (Edwards, 1972:180; Freeman, 1976:124; Census, 1970, PC2-7A:43). Their independence of decision-making is declining and their status as salaried employees increasing. Wright finds (1977:27) that one in six professionals are in working class conditions.

In the middle of the last century, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1977:222) wrote that "society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great ... classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat." As industry develops, the proletariat grows, and as a result of this development, "the lower strata of the middle class--small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired

o

tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants--all sink gradually into the proletariat." Hence, "the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the populations." This includes "entire section of the ruling classes" which are either "precipitated into the proletariat" or are at least threatened with such conditions by the advance of industry.

The sharp decline in self-employment and the increase in white collar jobs in working class conditions appears to be part of the fulfillment of these prophesies. There may be a time when only a small percentage of people at the top of the class structure will not be in working class position. The progress of this transformation can be roughly gauged by the increase in the percentage of white collar employees in working class situations.

Propositions of the Dissertation

Two central propositions regarding class and white collar work are explored in this dissertation. Each is examined through theoretical and empirical analysis. The two propositions are:

Proposition One.

The first proposition holds that a large proportion of white collar labor is presently in the working class. In

other words, to a great extent, people in white collar jobs are wage earners and do not own or control the productive machinery. Much white collar labor is also in particular working class conditions in that control of the labor process is hierarchic regarding what and how work is done.²

Proposition Two.

The second proposition concerns the class situation of white collar workers over time. It states that white collar work appears to have come into working class conditions at differential rates up the job hierarchy over the last 35 years. A review of the theories of the new working class, new middle class, white collar proletariat and educated labor provide qualitative support for this proposition. Statistical data on occupation by class illuminates questions of class situation at various white collar levels.

While not formally a third proposition, concern for the connections between class, white collar labor and education are also explored in the thesis. As white collar labor is increasingly educated at some level of the stratified system of higher education, the link is clear. Also, since early theory of white collar class dealt significantly with issues

2. Many such workers are also exploited in that they produce more value or labor than they are paid for. Exploitation, however, is not a necessary part of the definition of working class used in this study.

of university education, there is an historical link between education and white collar class.

Testing the Propositions

In order to test the above propositions, two main approaches are followed. The first is a review of the relevant theories of class, and in particular, white collar class. Following the theoretical review, an examination is made of data which bear on the question of the present class situation of white collar labor. Various authors have located white workers in different classes, mainly the middle class or working class. The chapter reviews these theories for their current significance on the class situation of white collar labor.

The second approach is a statistical analysis of relevant data. The data are drawn from the Census of Population, government surveys of industry, and national sample surveys which include variables for examining class and occupation around 1970. While later data exists, 1970 is chosen as the benchmark year because several surveys exist for that year.

Proposition Two, regarding changes in white collar class, is also explored through a review of the literature and through data analysis. The literature review covers theories and the process of proletarianization. The change

in the class situation of labor is examined through data from the Census and various surveys conducted from 1940 to 1977.

Definitions and Terms

In order to clarify the class situation of white collar labor, this dissertation applies analytical terms like class and proletarianization to essentially general phenomena like white collar work and the middle class. Because this involves a mixture of somewhat unfamiliar terms and typically undefined designations, an attempt is made here to clarify what each terms means in general. Initial definitions are given here as guides; they become more precise as they are discussed later in this work. Other terms not defined here are explained when they are encountered in the study e.g. Chapter Two).

Class is defined here as an economic category of common relative positions in the hierarch system of relationships to ownership and control of the the machinery, resources and processes of production, known as the means of production. It designates essentially economic and structural situations in terms of common relations to ownership of productive resources. The concern here is largely with two major classes, the owning, capitalist class and the nonowning, working class. A subsidiary class is the middle class.

The capitalist class, or bourgeoisie, owns and controls the means and processes of production. The working class, or proletariat, works for others and is paid by wages or salaries. Workers are members of the working class under particularly limiting conditions such as hierarchical control over what is made, how it is made, and its use. Workers are employees under working class conditions. Essentially, workers under such conditions are alienated in that they lack meaningful control of the process of their work. Many workers are exploited in that they produce a surplus of value or labor for which they are not compensated.

The basic frame of reference used in this thesis is a simple class structure suggested by Freedman (1975), Becker (1974), and Loren (1977). This system distinguishes capitalists, independent producers, and members of the working class based on economic categories and structural positions. As Freedman (1975) and Becker (1974) propose, all persons in wage labor positions are included in the working class (or working classes). Political, ideological, and functional considerations do not determine class position; they do influence the class fraction or section of the working class (Freedman, 1975:43) in which a particular employee is located. The study refers to employees under wage labor as in working-class position, with the various

strata of the working class distinguished as different fractions of that class.

The term middle class is a category which generally signifies place in the social structure between the capitalist class and the working class. This term is clarified later in the study. The new middle class is a category used in some cases to refer to most white collar employees on salary and in others to include supervisory, technical and professional labor whose function is described as maintaining or reproducing the capitalist class system. The new working class includes technicians, professionals, paraprofessionals, and some research workers and skilled labor who have important technical functions in production but do not make decisions and are paid by wages and salaries. The petty bourgeoisie is a category which includes both self-employed people who do not employ workers (petty producers or independents) and small employers.

The term "middle class" has taken on different meanings at different points in time. Originally "middle class" meant the same as the French term, "bourgeoisie," the capitalist class. The middle class at first was the class between what was then the ruling class, the aristocracy, and the working class (cf. Bell, 1973). As class in this thesis has a structural and economic definition in relationship to production, the only class which can now be validly referred

to as "middle" is composed of "petty producers" (Loren, 1977:10) or independents (Centers, 1945:50). These are independent producers who employ no labor. The petty bourgeoisie (often synonymous with the middle class) includes both petty producers (independents who employ no labor) and small employers. In other words, the petty bourgeoisie are the small owners, both petty producer ("middle class") and small members of the capitalist class. The "new middle class," typically described as consisting of professionals, managers and supervisors, is part of the working class. The major part of this "new middle class," in fact, is divided among different fractions of the working class.

White collar jobs are defined by the Census (1970, PC(2)7A:11) as professional, managerial, clerical and sales. (Some service jobs are closely allied to white collar work.) White collar work is typically involved in the production of services, not goods. Educated labor designates people who have gone to college at some level; this term was at one time used as a definition of the new working class. Higher education refers to a stratified system of education which involves a hierarchy running up from community colleges to elite universities.

Significance of the Study

Over the last hundred years in general, and the last two decades in particular, a number of theories of the class situation of white collar labor have been advocated. While Wright (1976), for example, has reviewed a good part of this area, this study is the first attempt to review and synthesize the particular literature, evaluate it and bring to bear statistical evidence over time on its validity and flaws. In reviewing changes in white collar labor and the working class, particularly in light of the recurrence of various new working class and new middle class theories, this study helps develop a more systematic understanding of the present class structure. In presenting statistical data, the study evaluates theoretical predictions in light of empirical evidence.

Some of the tentative conclusions here have major significance for understanding social structure, work, education and social change. Contrary to the accepted wisdom that there is high status among the entire white collar sector, it appears that a great part of white collar labor is, in fact, part of a growing working class. Most lower white collar employees have more in common with blue collar workers, in terms of wage-payment, lack of control, segmented labor, and pay levels than has previously been

recognized. This proportion appears to be increasing. It appears, too, that the promises supposedly flowing from college education and from the American Dream--that white collar work spells success--are to be seriously questioned.

This study attempts to go beyond the works of Mallet (1963), who developed the theory of the new working class among a limited group, and of Wright (1976) whose work, both analytical and empirical, has brought many issues into focus. It attempts to clarify the composition of the working class, particularly among white collar labor, which is typically thought to be outside the working class by changing, both conceptually and empirically, the relationships seen between white collar and the working class.

Significance of the Study for Education

This dissertation on white collar work and changing class structure has particular relevance for the study of education. First, the concentration is on occupations e.g. professionals, which are traditionally associated with higher education. College, of course, is thought to lead to such jobs. Conversely, college has almost become a requirement to get many such jobs.

Second, the transformation of segments of the white collar working class are closely allied with the

transformation of higher education into a stratified system running from community colleges to elite universities. In particular, the growth of the community college sector, which trains technical (and some clerical) labor, has taken a central position in the stratified system of education.

Third, the dissertation has grown out of an interest in the development of the theory of the new working class and the early applications of the theory to analyzing and organizing student activism in the U.S. The new working class theory was applied in the mid 1960s as a theoretical basis for organizing student action at a number of universities. Davidson (1967) and Calvert (1967, 1971) are particularly important in this regard for their attempts at developing a theory for activism and trying to apply it in action. Moreover, in its early formulations in America, the theory of the new working class used the definition of "educated labor" to signify the new working class (Davidson, 1967; Gintis, 1970; Oppenheimer, 1972; Denitch, 1970). Attempts were also made (cf. Gintis, 1970; Denitch, 1970) to use parts of the theory of the new working class to explain the causes for the student activism of previous years. University educated labor and university developed research were also connected to the theory of the new working class.

No longer is the fact of receiving, or requiring, a

higher education considered a central factor in analyzing white collar labor. Hence, the "educated labor" definition has been dropped, as the concentration on class has come forward. While the educational dimensions of white collar labor are important ones, there is a deeper level on which white collar labor must be examined in order to touch its real foundations: the level of class. In order to understand the white collar world, one must look behind the the educational credentials incidentally needed for such work and discover the structure of hierarchy and the changes in position and situation which affect the work performed. This thesis, therefore, concentrates on the deeper dimensions of class situation regarding white collar, including educated, labor.

The myth that white collar jobs, many of which require college training, are synonomous with success is still pervasive. That higher education, especially at the lower levels, need not lead to a successful career is becoming increasingly clear over time. What is yet to be widely recognized is that white collar jobs are increasingly similar to blue collar jobs in terms of their wage-paid position, how they are structured, limited input in decision-making and higher unemployment rates. These points dispell some of the aura around higher education and white collar status. If one looks at white collar labor from the

point of view of connection with the prestige of college, one seems to see class distinctions between white and blue collar work. But, if one looks at similar work situations, one sees common positions instead. The first view leads to false distinctions; the second suggests underlying ties.

It seems that even college education leads increasingly to working class jobs, for white collar work today tends to be working class. There is a vast common class position for most people in both white and blue collar jobs. While a system of higher education trains these varied people of the same class, it is not the "dependent variable" of education, but the "independent" variable of class (Stinchcombe in Wright, 1976:1) which is determining.

Limitations of the Study

This study concentrates on defining, explaining and analyzing the class situation of white collar labor. In particular, it focuses on the extent to which white collar work is in the working class. Involved here are detailed reviews of the new working class and new middle class theories as well as a statistical exploration of changes over time in white collar class at various levels.

In the course of such a study, numerous subsidiary issues are encountered but not discussed in detail. In particular, these include various theories and analyses of

the changing class position and education of white collar labor which are tangentially related to the main topics.

For example, the concept of the "new class" ("la nouvelle classe dirigente") developed by Djilas (1958) regarding the socialist countries, and echoed by Parkins (1971) and others cannot be fully reviewed here. So, too, concerns for the growth of a technocratic stratum (Galbraith, 1967; Halberstam, 1972) or the so-called "managerial revolution" (Burnham, 1941) are not emphasized, nor is there a discussion in depth of the issues of ownership vs. control in corporations. Nor will the debate on the class position of high level managers be discussed in any details as the emphasis here is on the class questions of the broader groups of white collar employees. The theories of the "affluent workers" (Goldthorpe and Lockwood, 1969) and of the "embourgeoisement" of blue collar workers are also outside the main purview of this study as it focuses on white collar employees. Precursors to the new working class theory, such as ideas of "youth as a class" (Rowntree, 1968) or "revolutionary youth" (Gintis, 1970) are also not discussed in detail.

Also neglected are the areas suggested by O'Connor (1973) and Aptheker (1972) in their analyses of the integration of state and higher education into the productive processes. The question of whether state and

research workers have strategic positions in automated economies will also be left to later scholarship. Nor shall the question of why the new working class theory arose in France, a nation rocked by revolutionary unrest of students and workers in 1968 be explored. Nor is the theory of the intellectuals reviewed here.

Omitted from consideration in this study, too, are questions of political action related to class theories of white collar labor. Similarly, the theories of student organizing based on the new working class theories are only touched upon. Issues of class struggle, and the intriguing notion of "the long march through the existing institutions" of society (Dutschke, 1967) are mentioned only in passing. Related theories of radicials in the professions or professional insurgency are not pursued. These topics are mentioned briefly in the body of thesis and in the suggestions for further study to alert the reader to their importance.

Certain authors insist that classes can only be defined within class struggle. While an important concern, it is another topic of action not discussed in this work. This study contributes to the foundation of a theory of class action without fully entering into the analysis of that realm by clarifying class concepts and their relationship to actors in the modern political economy. Similar to the

analysis of the basics of atomic structure, there are benefits in exploring the structural norms of both atoms and classes, as well as the more agitated states and locations of each. While models may not fully mirror subtle realities, they may assist the understanding of a complex phenomenon. Thus in the pursuit of a structural understanding, issues of practice, of class struggle, of strategic agents, of unionization, and of activism are identified but discussed only in passing. In sum, this study deals essentially with what is called "class-in-itself" (Marx in Bendix and Lipset, 1966:9) as opposed to "class-for-itself" which is identified with issues of class action and consciousness.

Finally, there is the limitations from the difficulty of finding data on class in the United States. Most data gathering in the U.S. does not analyze phenomena in categories such as ownership, supervisory status, hierarchy, decision-making, structure of employment and other features which can reveal distinctions of class or class fraction. The Census of Population includes few questions relevant to class; its definitions of "class of worker" (Report PC2-7A, #43) involves only self-employment, wage-employment, and private or government employment. While they allow for distinctions among class position, Census data reveal nothing about the labor process, supervisor responsibilities

or conditions of work. While there are eight surveys since 1945 which included relevant variable for analyzing class and occupation, they differ in sample sizes and compositions, and their questions are not the same. These are all valuable data but their differences and weaknesses make it difficult to precisely guage class situation and the processes of class change over time.

Organization of the Dissertation

This study combines two approaches, theoretical analysis and empirical evaluation. In the theoretical section, an attempt is made to clarify issues and definitions of class, in particular, the working class. The empirical section examines the propositions of the dissertation on class position and conditions at one point and over time in light of Census, survey and other data. Following introductory material, there are a review of the literature of class and white collar class, an examination of data on white collar class in the 1970s, reflections on theories and data on white collar proletarianization, the relations between education and white collar labor, and conclusions based on the study.

Chapter One introduces the thesis and explains its organization. It presents basic definitions and terms, the goals pursued, and the general significance and limitations

of the work. Here, too, is discussed the significance of the study for education.

Chapter Two includes the review of the literature. This begins with a brief survey of the subject of class. Proposed for this thesis is a structural definitions of class. Following is a review of the white collar class, including theories of the new middle class, the new working class, and the white collar proletariat. A critique of various theories in the literature, a restatement and support for the structural approach of the dissertation and a theoretical presentation on the class divisions within white collar labor conclude the chapter.

Chapter Three begins two empirically-based chapters. It presents an examination of data which pertains to the first propositions of the study on the class situation of white collar labor in the 1970s. The examination of the working class position and conditions of white collar employees in this decade includes a review of data from the Census of Population, other government surveys, and four national sample surveys which include the appropriate variables on occupation, ownership, supervisory status and conditions of work. In order to analyze the question of the working class condition of white collar labor, there are also discussion and operationalization of two working class categories, "workers," persons in working class conditions,

and "authorized employees," relatively independent wage labor.

Chapter Four addresses the extent to which white collar labor has entered the working class over time. In essence, this is the issue of the proletarianization of white collar labor. The literature on proletarianization is reviewed in brief. The results of seven national sample surveys, from 1945 to 1977, are combined to create a time series on the change in the class position of white collar labor over time. The studies begin with Richard Centers' 1945 survey and run to the General Social Survey for 1977. Specifically reviewed are conclusion about the proportions of white collar labor in working class position and working class conditions over time.

Chapter Five examines the connections between education and white collar labor. First it reviews the theory of the new working class, which was an early attempt to connect education and white collar. Second, it explores the class situation of two educational occupations, teachers and professors, applying to their examination the same analytic principles developed for white collar labor as a whole. The class situations of two educational occupations, teachers and professors are examined, using the analytic principles developed for examining white collar labor as a whole. In the context of class, the chapter examines theories and data

on the correspondence between levels and social relations of the higher educational system and the white collar hierarchy.

Finally, Chapter Six reviews the findings of the study. It presents overall conclusions on the class situation of white collar labor in the 1970s and over time and thereby reviews in brief the evidence on the propositions of the dissertation. It discusses ramifications of these conclusions for education. The final chapter also suggest further study and action which can be made in the areas of white collar class.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF CLASS AND WHITE COLLAR CLASS

Introduction

Chapter Two examines the literature of class, in general, and of white collar class, in specific, in four major sections. It begins with a review of various theories of class and stratification. The second section presents a structural approach to class. The third part of the chapter contains a review of the literature of various class assignments of white collar labor. The chapter concludes with a critique of the other class assignments and a statement of what is here considered to be the correct class analysis of white collar labor.

Conceptions of Class

In order to discuss the class situation of white collar labor, it is necessary to begin with an explanation of various conceptions of class. While in this thesis a structural and positional definition of class is maintained, to provide a context for comparison, both traditional and Marxist sociological definitions of class are discussed in brief.

The following introduction to the notion of class is not meant to be a definitive essay on the subject. Rather its purpose is to illustrate various approaches to class and to serve as a point of reference in examining class from a structural point of view. Conceptions of class, such as the newspaper definition of class as income group, are more familiar than the structural approach. While distinctions are made among the definitions, the attempt is not to prove here that the structural approach is better. The thesis maintains, however, that the structural approach, in fact, describes classes while others typically describe non-class stratification groups. As the dissertation examines white collar class in particular, the concern here is not only with class but with definitions of white collar class situations.¹

Class as common income levels.

"Undoubtedly," as Wright (1976:11) noted in Class Structure and Income Inequality, "the most common view of classes is that class positions basically represent categories of people with similar incomes: poor people constitute a lower class; middle income people constitute a middle class; and upper income people, an upper class."

1. See Wright (1976) for a related review of the nature of class and on classes in advanced societies.

This notion, commonly held and propagated by the popular press, is formally presented in Mayer and Buckley's (1970:15) Class and Society. "In a class system, the social hierarchy is based primarily on differences in monetary wealth and income."

In this view, the income distribution is the basis of the overall class structure. This approach is also used as the evidence for asserting that the U.S. is becoming a relatively homogeneous "middle class" society because the income distribution tends to have a broad center. This approach is open to criticism for a number of reasons. First, income levels change over time. Second, income is not a structural basis of class. Third, this approach mistakes an effect, income, for a cause of class stratification based in ownership. Parker (1972) in The Myth of the Middle Class, moreover, challenges the assertion that the income distribution aggregates in the middle levels.

Class as an occupational hierarchy.

Blau and Duncan (1967:42) in The American Occupational Structure employ an occupational approach in defining stratification into "three broad classes," white collar, blue collar, and farm. Their distinctions are based on the occupational structure, which

they (1967:1,6-7) call "the major foundation of the stratification system in our society" (cf. Parkin, 1971; Bell, 1973). Though they (1967:6) recognize that occupation is neither identical to economic class nor to status, they find it the best single indicator of what they see as class. "Class may be defined in terms of economic resources and interests, and the primary determinant of these for the majority of men is their occupational position (6)." Moreover, the "hierarchy of prestige strata and the hierarchy of economic classes have their roots in the occupational structure" (7) which they describe as a rank order of occupational groups.

The U.S. Census (1970) of Population uses a similar hierarchy of occupations though it denies a hierarchy of scaling (1970, Appendix B:22). Its data are presented in a ranked system of nine major occupation groups. Professional and managerial are at the top and operatives and farm labors at the bottom. This hierarchy has been the standard approach to ranking occupations since Alba Edwards (1938) of the Census Department revised the reporting scheme in the late 1930s.

Class and the technical division of labor.

Somewhat akin to the occupational notion of class, and essentially a functional approach, is the idea of classes

defined by common positions in the technical, as opposed to social, division of labor. More simply, the definition corresponds to the job structure. Here what one "does" for a living defines his or her class position. The middle class is identified with non-manual, white collar jobs. The working class is identified with skilled manual jobs; and the lower class is associated with unskilled, manual, blue collar work (Kohn, 1969:11).

A more sophisticated updating of this idea is suggested in theories of "post-industrial" society by Bell (1973) and Touraine (1971). In The Coming of Post-Industrial Society, Bell (1973) assigns experts, scientists, engineers and technicians to a new, dominant class position. Their situation is based on their monopoly of technical knowledge, through which, according to Bell (Wright, 1976:14), they control the key institutions of post-industrial society such as the universities. Touraine also stresses the role of experts and technocrats within a technical division of labor as the basis for their being the leading class in such a society. Veblen (1921) suggest a similar idea in his institutionalist analysis discussing the possible role of "soviets of engineers" who would rationally control production for the public good. Veblen's idea incorporated both the occupational and managerial roles suggested by the two above authors and by Burnham (1941).

Class as common status positions.

Perhaps the most common sociological approach defines "social class" in terms of status, measured by perceived factors such as prestige. This is typically associated with occupation in the terms of occupational status or occupational socioeconomic status (SES)). As Williams (1960:98 in Kohn, 1977:10) states, "social class" refers "to an aggregate of individuals who occupy a broadly similar position in the scale of prestige...." While "groupings or strata" may derive from any measurement of the distribution of prestige, privilege or power, "the distribution of privileges ... begin to take on full sociological meaning only when it is related to prestige rankings, social-interaction groups and beliefs and values held in common" (emphasis in Kohn).

Parsons (1970:24) offers a similar status definition in which class is

an aggregate of ... units, individual and/or collective, that in their own estimation and those of others in the society occupy positions of approximately equal status...

As Wright comments (1976:7), "the ideologically defined 'worth' of different positions within the social structure thus becomes the core criterion for class." "Achieved statuses," based on societal views of inequality (rather

than ascribed or property-based ones) and tied essentially to occupational position become the core criteria for class. Occupations themselves "become the primary focus of household status, both through the prestige value of occupational position and functions themselves and through the income and style of life they ground" (Parson, 1970:24).

While Parsons (1954:326) finds the occupational system to be most fundamental, his definition (1954:328-29) of class is, in fact, more complex.

A class may be defined as a plurality of kinship units which, in those respects where status in a hierarchical content is shared by their mates, have approximately equal status... We have a class system, therefore, only in so far as the differentiations inherent in our occupational structure, with its differential relationships to the exchange system and to property, remuneration, etc. has become ramified into a system of strata, which involve differentiation of family living based partly on income, standard of life and life style, and, of course, differential access for the younger generation to opportunity as well as differential pressure to which they are subject.

Or more simply put and similar to the first definition, Parsons (1951:172) defines class as being "an aggregate of kinship units of approximately equal status in the system of stratification." Hence, the link to status, which is linked to occupational position, is clear.

The prestige ranking approach to class is essentially an approach to social stratification on a continuous hierarchy. This view is opposed to the one which sees discrete class units with internal coherence or an organizational principle. Most definitions involve the continuous approach, finding class a perceived status phenomenon indicated by some means of ranking measurement. Kohn (1969:129-31), following Williams, is perhaps the most persuasive advocate of this position; his research was successful in operationalizing class as a continuum of positions. Yet Kohn's is not a structural approach nor are the classes discrete.

As Reiss (1961:83) notes, many variables have been "used to delineate a status structure."

The two most common types of measures employed to stratify a population have been those of prestige rating of persons and socioeconomic status scales. The three most commonly used measures of socioeconomic status employed in socioeconomic status scales are income, education, and occupation. Each of these measures is thought of as having a rank- or scale-order such that the population can be stratified from high to low status.

Duncan's estimates of socioeconomic status by prestige scores (SEI) using income and education are but one example of stratification through calculations of socioeconomic

measures.

Barber (1968:292 in Kohn, 1969:11), among others, has noted that power, prestige, privilege, income and education are all related to the status order approach to stratification or class. Prestige, or a calculus of occupation and education, is the typical basis in sociology for socioeconomic measures of class.

A number of national surveys of the prestige rankings provide various systems of social stratification or social "class." These systems are typically based on prestige scales or scaling on some measure of socioeconomic status such as social or economic (hence socioeconomic) variables like occupation or income. In 1947 and again in 1963 (cf. North and Hatt, 1947; Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi, 1964), the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) established prestige ratings for various occupations based on samples of the population who evaluated the social rank of various occupations.² The results of the two years are almost perfectly correlated ($r=0.99$) (Bendix and Lipset, 1966:326).³

Based on the NORC prestige scores from 1947 and income

2. The scores may run from 20 [poor] to 100 [excellent]; the actual distributions for 1947 runs from 33 to 96; for 1963 from 34 to 94; NORC (1977:9 to 82.)

3. The pioneer study of occupational prestige is George Count (1925); see Hodge, Trieman, and Rossi (1965) for cross-national comparisons of prestige; and Trieman (1977) for a large cross-national study. See Page (1940) for another pioneer study.

and education from the 1950 census, Duncan (1961) established a socio-economic index (SEI) for all occupations. These scores produce a hierarchy of social status, or a non-class system of stratification. The prestige ratings for all occupations were estimated by regressions of 1947 prestige scores for 45 occupations on the percent having at least high school education and income of at least \$3,500 in 1949. The scores range from 2 to 96. Duncan also produced population decile scores (0 to 9) based on the distribution of the population with the relevant scores. (For instance, Duncan Decile score of 0 corresponds to occupational prestige scores of 0 to 4, 9 corresponds to 66 thru 96.)

As Reiss (1961:83) notes, many variables have been "used to delineate a status structure."

The two most common types of measures employed to stratify a population have been those of prestige rating of persons and socioeconomic status scales. The three most commonly used measures of socioeconomic status employed in socioeconomic status scales are income, education, and occupation. Each of these measures is thought of as having a rank- or scale-order such that the population can be stratified from high to low status.

Duncan's estimates of socioeconomic status (SEI) using income and education are but one example of stratification

based on calculations of socioeconomic indicators. Warner (1941, 1942, 1945, 1947, 1949; 1969, 1963), Hollingshead (1949), Packard (1959) and Coleman (1971) follow in the tradition.

The Lynds (1929, 1937) in two pioneering community studies, provide the bases for the transition from occupational to status definitions of class. In Middletown (1929:22-23), people "getting a living" in Muncie, Indiana were divided into Business Class and Working Class by their kinds of occupational activities. Business Class members were involved in occupations like education or promotions addressed to people (using their "tongues" i.e. heads). Working Class members were involved in activities addressed to things (using their hands). Differently classified, these were a middle class and a lower class (but no upper class) based largely on occupation (but somewhat on income). About 29% were business class members and 71% working class.

By the time of Middletown In Transition (1937:457-60), the class structure in Muncie had diversified. Both the business class and working class had become subdivided into three different "Groups" (1 to 6). The business class had become an "upper class" of a few wealthy and powerful families (including the "X" family) and individuals, an (upper) middle class of smaller ("old middle class") owners and better paid salaried managers ("new middle class"), and a "middle class" of minor professionals, entrepreneurs, and

clericals. The working class became an "aristocracy" of labor" of skilled workers and foremen, a "working class" of semi-skilled and unskilled workers of operatives and laborers, and the poor without regular employment. In essence, occupation was the measure of status, but income and property holding underlay the stratification.

In the Yankee City series on Newburyport, Massachusetts (1941, 1942, 1945, 1947; 1949; 1963), W. Lloyd Warner, drawing upon his training as a social anthropologist, placed Americans into a six class system, modified to five in Jonesville (cf. Social Class in America, 1949), of (upper and lower) upper, upper middle, lower middle, upper lower and lower classes on the basis of status characteristics. Warner (1941:82) defined class as "two or more orders of people who are believed to be, and are accordingly ranked by members of the community, in socially superior and inferior positions." (Wives and children typically take their social standing from the husband or father of the family.) The top three were called "Levels above the Common Man," the next two "the Level of the Common Man," and the bottom, "Below the Level of Common Man." At first Warner's approach was reputational, assigning class positions based on an evaluations by knowledgeable people of social participation by families in Muncie. Developed through reanalysis of the Yankee City data (Warner, 1949s:40n), this approach was

quantified into an "Index of Evaluated Participation" or EP scale. A related approach, first used in the study of Jonesville (1949s:166), and based on "objective" criteria, is the "Index of Social Characteristics" (ISC), based on occupation, source of income, type of home and residential area.⁴ In his study of inequality in Morris, Illinois, Democracy in Jonesville, Warner (1949) applied both the IEP and ISC to a group of families, and found very similar results.⁵

Another reputational classification is that of Hollingshead (1949) in his classic study of the relationship of social class to adolescent behavior also in Morris,⁶ Illinois, Elmtown's Youth. Raters divided city families into five Classes, I to III for business and professional

4. Earlier measures of social status were Chapin (1933) for an urban area and Sewell (1940) for farm stratification. See also Census (1963), and Ellis (1963) Index of Social Position for students. Reputational approaches can be seen as attempts to provide unidimensional scales of prestige; calculated scores are based on multidimensional approaches. Class designations based strictly on occupation are also unidimensional. Edwards (1936) proposed "social-economic groupings" of occupations which suggest a unidimensional system of stratification. See also Warner (1949) for a comparison of occupation and social class. Warner's (1963:90; Robinson, 1969:338) occupational classification is one of the most detailed.

5. Among "Old Americans" in Jonesville (1949:209), the correlation between EP and ISC class placements was $r=0.97$. The correlation between the seven point occupation scale alone and EP was $r=0.91$ (Robinson, 1969:362).

6. Hollingshead wrote the chapter in Warner (1949j) on status in the high school in Jonesville.

people (30%), and IV and V for the working classes (70%). (Applying their different methods to a group of 134 families in Morris, Warner (1949j:41) using the I.E.P and Hollingshead (1949) using his reputational approach agree in more than three-fourths of the cases.) In his and Redlich's (1958) study of mental illness and class in New Haven, Hollingshead produces an "Index of Social Positions," (ISP [20-134]), involving five classes, based on a weighted index of seven occupational statuses and seven education levels (and place of residence). In this approach, there are three levels of middle classes, (elite, upper middle class, and middle class) and two working classes (the working class and lower class).

In an influential lay book on status seeking in America, Packard (1959) proposes a five class system of stratification based on a weighted average of occupation (x_5), education (x_4), source of income (x_3) and area of residence (x_2). Position on the scales locates a person in the "real upper class," "semi-upper class" (upper middle), "limited income class" (middle class), "working class," or

7. Kohn (1969; 1977:11) uses Hollingshead's approach in his studies of class and values because he finds that the "two dimensions of stratification that appear to be the most important in contemporary American society [are] occupational position and education." He does not use place of residence as a factor. Hollingshead's seven level occupational scale is a one of the most detailed occupational schemes.

"real lower class." Packard argues that a major distinction is between college educated "middle class" people, the "diploma elite," and the rest of white collar people. Lower white collar, clerical and salespeople, are in fact closer to the blue collar working class.

Coleman (1971) produces a social stratification system of five major classes (upper, upper middle, middle, working, lower), subdivided into a total of thirteen subclasses, or strata. Assignment to a particular positions, as in Hollingshead (1949) and Warner (1949), is based on socioeconomic status (SES) characteristics like income and education, but also involves neighborhood characteristics, and wife's education and background. In Coleman (1978:26), the system is simplified into three major classes. Upper Americans include the old rich, the new rich, and college educated professionals and managers. Middle Americans include the comfortable and those just getting along. Lower Americans include the poor but working and those on welfare.

Class and economic life chances.

Economic life chances, or market positions, are also cited as common determinants of class. Max Weber (1922; Lipset and Bendix, 1966:21) in "The Distribution of Power in the Community: Class, Status and Party," presents the classic statement of this position.

We may speak of a 'class' when 1) a number of people have in common a specific causal component of their life chances in so far as 2) this component is represented exclusively by economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income, and 3) is represented under the conditions of the commodity or labor market.

The "decisive moment" is the "kind of chance in the market" which determines the person's fate. "Class situation," Weber (Bendix and Lipset, 1966:21) concludes, is ultimately "market situation."

Weber, in fact, proposes a tripartite model for social stratification where class, status group, and (power) "party," each have independent and interdependent contributions. In this sense, he was the first sociologist associated with the multidimensional (as opposed to single or unidimensional) approach to stratification (Gordon, 1958:13). In comparing class to status, Weber (Bendix and Lipset, 1966:27) asserts that,

'Classes' are stratified according to their relationships to the production and acquisition of goods; whereas 'status groups' are stratified according to the principles of consumption of goods as represented by special 'styles of life' (emphasis in original).

While status honor is, in ways, independent of class situation (24), it is class situation which is "by far the .."

"predominant factor" even in forming status groups. Like "classes," "status groups," and especially "parties," according to Weber (1966:21), are all "phenomena of the distribution of power within a community."

In Class Inequality and the Political Order, Parkin (1971) discusses social stratification in both capitalist and socialist countries. Here class is grounded in the material order of occupational positions (1971:17-18) and is tied to success in the market place. Property ownership, however, is also acknowledged by Parkin as having an independent dimension in producing a class elite (23-24). Parkin proposes a two class system of a dominant, or middle class, vs. a subordinate, working, or under-class; the distinction is based on the cleavage of manual and non-manual labor. Moreover, he criticizes the approaches to stratification which accord a separate role to social status and to power (42) in stratification. For Parkin, these flow essentially from the basic aspects of (economic) class structure: the dominant class over the subordinate.

Giddens (1973:103) in Class Structure of the Advanced Societies uses the idea of "market capacity" in his notion of class. Here he is referring to the different levels of attributes which "individuals may bring to the bargaining encounter" in the market. There are three types of market capacities which structure classes: "ownership of

property in the means of production," possession of educational or technical qualifications, and possession of manual labor power" (107). According to Giddens, to the extent that these three are tied to closure in inter-generational and intra-generational mobility, they are the basis of the three class system in capitalism of upper, middle, and lower or working class (107). While both Giddens and Weber refer to other considerations in determining class, the three are essentially concerned with market capacity.

Class and authority relations.

Dahrendorf (1959) is preeminent among analysts who define class essentially in terms of authority relations. In Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Dahrendorf (1959:138) describes class solely in terms of authority relationships within institutions, political, social, economic and other.

Classes are social conflict groups the determinant...of which can be found in the participation in or exclusion from the exercise of authority within any imperatively coordinated association.

For Dahrendorf (1959), as opposed to Marxists or Weberians, class is not an economic category per se. Classes are defined by relations to authority. Authority relations

within economic structures do define classes for Dahrendorf (1959:137), but only as a special case of authority in an institutional sphere. "Classes within an economic organization are but a special case of the phenomenon itself." Hence, it is the social relations of the organization and authority factors within even economic organizations which define class for Dahrendorf. (Wright (1976), on the other hand, sees authority relations only in the economic sphere as defining class.

Lenski (1966:75) in Power and Privilege takes a similar position, defining class as "an aggregation of persons in society who stand in similar position with respect to some form of power, privilege and prestige." Moreover, "power classes" are the chief determinant of "who gets what and why." These are aggregations of similar positions in a form of institutionalized power.

Similar in concern with power relations is Burnham (1941), who coined the term "the managerial revolution." He saw a change in society, called capitalist since the economic, social and political institutions, as well as ideologies, took particular (capitalist) forms, to a different type of society differently characterized. The institutions of society, he proposed, were undergoing a transformation, with the new dominant groups which were emerging not the capitalists but the managers. The

managerial characteristics, he maintained, would come to typify all spheres of society, not just the economic institutions but the political and social as well. Those in power, the ruling class, would be the managerial class.

Class defined by class conflict.

Poulantzas (1975) and Przeworski (1976) define class through class struggle. Poulantzas (1975:14) claims that "classes involve in one and the same process both class contradictions and class struggle: social classes do not firstly exist as such and only then enter into class struggle."

Przeworski (1976:32ff.) argues in "The Process of Class Formation" that class struggle itself determines the definition of class:

Classes are not prior to their organization... 'Class-in-itself' is simply not a class; it is nothing but a designation of categories of empty places in the system of production.

Until activated by class struggle, these "empty places" in the social structure are but class forms filled by individuals. "The occupants of these places become...organized...as classes by the results of class struggle" (80). Then, what were "empty places" are
8 transformed into class formations.

Przeworski (1976:51) claims further that class "is not a matter of an 'objective' classification but of understanding the ideological, political, and economic constraints upon the practice of various movements which continually form the occupants of these places into classes." Here he echoes the arguments of Poulantzas (1975), Carchedi (1975), and others, that political and ideological factors, as well as economic ones, can determine class.

Class as a subjective category.

There are also conceptions which find class to be essentially a phenomenon created by the thinking of a particular group of people. This type of "class consciousness" approach is used by Centers (1949) in

8. I do not agree with Wright (1976:21) and Przeworski (1976:32) that classes are "empty places" in the social structure. Class are more like the phenomena in modern physics theory which define light as simultaneously a particle and a wave. (An alternative conception considers particles caught in certain positions in a magnetic field.) Classes are interconnected groups of people who are placed in certain historically and structurally defined agglomerations with definable, though somewhat flexible, boundaries. Like the penumbra on the moon, the boundaries of classes, especially the capitalist-working class boundary, are in motion as the development of capitalism continues. Individuals may, like discrete quanta of light, escape the gravity of a class position (though this is not easily accomplished), but overall, there are structural imperatives and contiguities, which maintain the form, position and relative positions of classes. To describe classes as empty places is to vitiate the concept of classes as historical and relational to other classes.

The Psychology of Social Classes, (subtitled "a study in class consciousness"). Besides discussing class in general, Centers queried a national sample on their class identification. According to Centers (1949:78), "in essence, a class is no more nor less than what people collectively think it is.

It is a psychological structuring and must be observed...before we can infer its basis and nature... Thus conceived, it becomes readily apparent that classes demand social definitions. That is, they must be defined by people collectively (emphasis in original).

Like prestige rankings based on the evaluations of others, subjective social class, while possibly related to objective factors, is essentially based on constructs of the mind not of reality.

Others, who have recognized the importance of objective factors in determining class, have also touched upon the subjective. For instance, Lukacs (1922; 1971:46) defines class in terms of positions within the social relations of production, yet he sees class consciousness as the crucial problem of class today. Similarly, Aronowitz (1974), while dealing with class in history, explore in narrative form the "shaping of working class consciousness."

E.P. Thompson (1963) in his classic study of the making of the British working class suggests that class is a

historically-common experience, in essence a subjective phenomenon. It is not a structure or a category "but...something which in fact happens...in human relationships (9)." As he puts it, "class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences ... feel and articulate the identity of interests among themselves, and as against other men whose interests may differ from...theirs." In other words, class is defined "by men as they live their own history." While class experience "is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born" (11). According to this approach, when class consciousness occurs, it determines class.

Synthesis of class conceptions.

It is clear that, even without exploring yet in detail, structural definitions of class, there exists a wide range of approaches to the subject. Few are the studies which attempt to synthesize the various ideas. In Class Structure In the Social Consciousness, the Polish sociologist Stanislaw Ossowski (1963) recognized a number of historical types of classes. Specifically he included the Marxist approach, concentrating on the relationship to the means of production, yet he also observed definitions of class through status stratification in the social order. For Marxists, classes, which Ossowski (1963) found akin to

estates in notion, relations to property and relations of dependence are central (129). In stratification orderings, on the other hand, social classes "are consequences of social statuses otherwise achieved (130)."

Ossowski (1963:176) does not advocate the correctness of either approach, for "different conceptual categories correspond to different problems." He does, however, suggest both his own model and a synthesis of others'. For Ossowski (1963:141), classes are "basic groups" with internal cohesion in a social structure. This structure must form a system; that is, there must be a systematic relationship wherein each component has its position fixed by relationship to others (148). Ossowski suggests, then, a distillation of the preceding definitions and of those in the section on structural approaches to class which follows.

Structural Definitions of Class

This section outlines the structural definition of class which is followed in this study. Here, as in the preceding section on other definitions of class, the attempt is to develop a point of reference, not to provide a definitive discussion of the structural or Marxist approach to class.

Class is defined by Wright (1976:1) as "common structural positions within the social relations of

production." These are the relationships involve in the overall process of production. As Wright explains (1976:2), the relationships of class are "social relationships between those actors who are directly engaged in production activites and those actors who direct and control the apparatus of production." The important points are that these are social, not just technical, relationships; these are ties between actors--people involved in production. Members of a class occupy common positions, structured in certain ways, between and in juxtaposition to other classes. Most importantly, these are social relations between the capitalist class and the working class, where the former own the productive means and the latter do not.

Bukharin (1921, 1969:276 in Wright, 1976) in one of the few Marxist sociological textbooks defines class as

the aggregate of persons playing the same part in production, standing in the same relations toward other persons in the production process, these relations being also expressed in things (instruments of labor).

While Marx discussed class in virtually all his writings, he never undertook a complete and systematic review of the subject. The last chapter of Volume III (Marx, 1977:506) of Capital is an uncompleted section on the subject of class. While his statements are generally

consistent in various writings, his exact definitions of class appear to differ throughout his writings. This section from Volume III comes close to a common definition of class in Marx's (Dahrendorf, 1959:13) words.

The specific economic form in which unpaid surplus labor is pumped out of the immediate producers determines the relation of domination and subjection as it grows directly out of and in turn determines production. On this is based the whole structure of the economic community as it comes forth the relations of production, and thereby at the same time its political structure. It is always the immediate relations of the owners of the conditions of production to the immediate producers--a relation whose specific pattern of course always corresponds to a certain stage in the development of labor and its social forces of production--in which we find the final secret, the hidden basis of the whole construction of society, including the political patterns of sovereignty and dependence, in short, of a given form of government.

More simply put in the Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, "it is a specific type of production, and of relations of production, which determine rank and influence all other activities" (Dahrendorf, 1959:15). What is clear is that this is a relational phenomenon. "Individuals are dealt with only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class relations and class interests"

(Marx, 1906:10).

Lenin's (1914; 1947:492) definition is more precise.

Classes are

groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

In more detail, he (1947:492) stated that

Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relations (in most cases fixed and formulated by law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions and methods of acquiring the share of social wealth of which they dispose.

It is clear, moreover, that the Marxist tradition discusses class as an historical as well as structural phenomenon. It should also be clear, as Wright (1976:21) stresses, that classes are commonly held positions and that they are relational to other classes.

In discussing structural definitions of class, it must be clear that the main structuring principle is economic, in particular, the ownership or non-ownership of the productive processes. This analysis, moreover, is presented on essentially what is called the "highest level of

abstraction," that of the pure capitalist mode of production, which analyses class in terms of capital vs. labor. From this (and the structuring function of production) flows the class organizational structure described in terms of employers and workers. At a lower level of abstraction, that of the "social formation," the economic approach becomes more complicated; here political and ideological factors come into play, though they do not fundamentally change the economically determined class situation.

What is meant by economic structure must be clarified. In Marxist terminology, the economic level, or "base," is fundamental and determining. The superstructure, the political and ideological levels, are secondary. This does not mean that a simple "economic determinism" model is to be advocated, where the economic level causes all other aspects. As Wright (1976:2) notes,

A more appropriate reading of the expression 'base' and 'superstructure' is that the base, like the foundation of a building, determines the limits of the variation of the superstructure, not that it defines all aspects of the superstructure.

The central concept here of limit and limits of variation: outlines are set by the economic level, and yet much variation goes on within them on the political and

9

ideological planes.

The base (or infrastructure) and the superstructure are the two major levels of Marxist analysis. The base, or economic level at production, moreover, has two parts: the level of production and the level of exchange. The production level refers to the relationships binding actors involved in producing goods and services (Wright, 1976:2) or commodities. The social relations of production are thus the relations between the people involved directly in production, i.e. the workers, and, on the other hand, the capitalists, the people who control the process but are not directly involved in producing. As Wright (1976:3) points out, this is not the same as the technical relations of production, which refer to the division of labor among jobs. Social relations of production are hierarchical, with the group in control dominant over that which produces. Technical relations do not imply domination and supervision

9. While Wright claims that "viewed historically, this means that the process of structural determination at the present is a consequence of the dialectical interaction of base and superstructure, production and exchange social relations and technical relations in the past (18)," this may not make clear enough the primacy of economic relations of production. A possible analogy is that of the solid in a supersaturated solution, the solid being economic factors of production, the solution the other factors. Once a complex equilibrium and continuing pattern of interaction is set up, the solution and the solid continue to change, but the overall relations are set.

but specialization and coordination (Wright, 1976:3).

The main concern here is with the economic level of production. There is also the economic level of exchange involving the social relations in the exchange of goods and services already produced. One of these "goods" is labor power, the commodity form of human labor, which workers sell on the labor market prior to entering into the exploitative production relationship (3). It should be clear that the Marxist concern is the economic level of production, while the concern of Weber, Parkin and Giddens is for "market capacity," on the economic level of exchange.

Wright (1976), among others, holds that the structure of the production relationship involves social relations of control over investment, production and the labor process. That is not pursued here in detail other than to note the importance in defining class of owning the productive machinery; moreover, as noted earlier, over the last century, a greater number of workers seems to have lost control of their labor process and have become, in this sense, proletarianized. Rather than pursuing this point further, it suffices to define actors as being in a working class position when they do not own the means of production; actors are in working class situation when they do not control their labor process.

Another major controversy in the subject of class

involves the question of what factors should be included in a definition. In traditional sociology the concern is over the uni- vs. multi-dimensional view of stratification. In Marxist terms, it involves the question of whether political and ideological factors can determine class. In Marxism, the political and ideological levels are parts of the superstructure. "The political level refers to the social relations of domination and subordination involving the use of power" (Wright, 1976:3), especially in relationship to the state. The ideological level "refers to social relations of domination and subordination involving ideas." Particularly important here is the relationship with status hierarchies--the way people are viewed in an unequal structure. As Wright (1976:4) points out, the ideological level involves not just ideas, values and consciousness, but the social relations of domination and subordination involving ideas. "Ideas become part of the social structure at the level of ideology only when they are embodied in real social relationships" and have consequences for people.

While many argue that class is defined on the superstructural levels, the economic level, in particular, the social relations of production, is determining of class, though not in a vulgar deterministic sense. Wright (1976:17), among others, has pointed out that the economic levels is primary.

The economic levels plays a determining role in shaping the political and ideological levels of social structure... Within the economic level, social relations of production play a determining role with respect to both exchange relations and technical relations.

As has already been noted, the most important point here is that the production relations set the limits and possibilities fo the other superstructural levels. Just as in Marx's claim "men make their own history," but under circumstances established for them (Marx, 1977:300), politics and ideology influence class but only under circumstances laid down by the economic level.

Moreover, that the economic level has a "determining role in shaping" class and the other levels does not mean that the economic level, or technology, are simply causes of the other levels. The process, instead, is dialectic: there is interplay among factors, but one, production, is central; it energizes and also limits the others. As Wright (1976:17) notes,

To say that the social relations of production play a determining role in shaping exchange relations...means that the social relations of production determine the limits within which the exchange relations can vary (emphasis in original).

Within those limits, political and ideological relations may vary, or have what is called "relative autonomy" (18). This makes it possible for the other levels to have an impact on the social relations of production to some degree--a process sometimes called "overdetermination." Yet production remains primary.

To paraphrase Wright and Stinchcombe's (Wright, 1976:1), the social relations of production are the "independent variable." The assumption underlying the analysis here is that

the economic level plays a determining role in shaping the political and ideological levels and that the social relations of production play a determining role within economic relations

then it follows that an analysis of classes should be grounded in the social relations of production (Wright, 1976:18). Neither political or ideological factors, the impact of industrialization (technology), nor modernization (culture) can thus be the fundamental starting point for understanding or changing society, since they are aspects of the superstructure. Production and class are at the base.

Class Theories of White Collar Labor

The debate over the class situation of white collar labor, as Mills (1951:290) as well as Coyner and Oppenheimer (1976:1) have pointed out, has been ongoing "without significant resolution" for almost a hundred years. Since the late nineteenth century, authors have speculated about the question; the various theories have essentially been repeated as time goes on without analytic advancement or synthesis of theories with empirical evidence. This section provides an overview of the various theories of white collar class, including a typologies of the theories, toward developing a framework to fit together various approaches to the question. Following the overview, several of the most important theoretical statements are reviewed in detail. Then the various theories are examined for their insights while also criticized in a search of advancement of the theoretical understanding of the class position of white collar labor.

10. In attempting to advance the debate on the class situation of white collar labor, this literature review indicates how various designations of white collar class recur over time, often under different names (e.g. new middle class, new petty bourgeoisie), typically without recognition of the previous work or the fact of the repetition. (The review tries to be page specific in references wherever possible to aid in the precision of the revision and advancement over recurring theories. Moreover, in attempt to make the bibliography complete, the reference

The class situation of white collar employees has been approached in the literature from essentially five major positions. First is the position that white collar employees are middle class, or new middle class. Second is the view that white collar employees are part of an elite or managerial "new class." Third is an alternative positions that white collar employees are working class, or new working class. A fourth position is that white collar employees are in-between, forming a third division. A fifth approach sees white collar employees as divided between the capitalist ("middle") class and working class.

Middle class

Perhaps the most common view is that white collar employees are members of a "middle class" defined in terms of income, lifestyle, culture and affluence. This "class" is large and growing, encompassing over time more of the population as white collar employment grows. Typically found in journalistic "examinations" of class in America, this view holds that the growing middle class is a stabilizing force in society. More scholarly approaches (Mills, 1951:290) see the (white collar) middle class "as a

there include studies which I have not reviewed, including several which appeared after the substantive work here was complete.)

major force for stability in the general balance of the different classes," in essence, a "buffer between labor and capital" (Mills, 1951:290). This bridging-class takes over old middle class entrepreneurial and managerial functions in running society, yet it has connections to wage workers. Here the middle class is the "balance wheel of class interests, the stabilizers, the social harmonizers" (Mills, 1951:290-1).

The theory, holding that virtually everyone, in particular, all white collar employees, constitute one great class --the middle class-- is essentially identical to the theory that there are no classes in American society. Related is the theory that "white collar" is synonymous with "middle class." And a similar theory is that there is a "white-collar class" (Bell, 1973:13), presented as synonymous with the middle class. These broad theories tie in with the idea of a growing homogenizing, mass society, the same as the middle class (Bell, 1973:23). Here the white collar middle class consists of "mental workers," while the blue collar working class is composed of manual workers. This position is represented in somewhat sophisticated manner in Bell's (1960) 1950's "end of ideology" approach to
11
classes.

11. A variant of the theory that a large, encompassing middle class exists is the "embourgeoisement" idea wherein

New Middle Class.

A more concrete middle class theory is that most white collar workers, in particular, professional and managerial employees are members of a "new middle class." Mills (1951:65) divides the middle class in modern society into two parts, the old middle class of small property owners and the new middle class of white collar employees found in the four occupations of professionals, managerial, clerical and sales. Unlike (old) middle class status, which Mills (1951:14,71) explains, is conferred by owning property, new

blue collar workers attain "middle class" affluence, life styles and values, swelling the ranks of the middle class. Lenin, in fact, discussed the "embourgeoisement" idea when he spoke of craftsmen as the "aristocracy of workers." "The absence of a revolutionary working class movement," Lenin claimed, (Low-Bear, 1974:3) derives from the fact that a large part of the British working class "merrily share the feast of England's monopoly of the colonies and the world market." (Lenin, 1939:107 in Low-Bear, 1974). Sombart (and Engels) made a similar remarks when he suggested that "On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie socialist Utopias of every sort are sent to their doom" (in Low-Bear, 1974:5). Modern embourgeoisement theorist include Bell and Lipset who see the end to the working class through assimilation to the middle class. In an early article on this topic, Lockwood (1960) used the term the "new working class" to describe blue collar workers who seemed to be taking on middle class values. The work of Goldthorpe and Lockwood (1969) on affluent workers in Britain, however, challenges the embourgeoisement thesis empirically and finds little evidence of the industrial working class taking on "middle class" patterns. Their studies of blackcoated workers (the British term for white collar workers) are also important in this regard. Giddens finds similar conclusions against embourgeoisement thesis in his study of Providence, R.I. This approach is related to Parkin's (1971) idea of the deproletarianization of the Eastern European ruling classes and the new class theories.)

middle class status is assigned because of occupational, skills, function, or the prestige of one's position. In essence, the situation of old middle class was based on ownership, while the new is based on skills. Members have important "market capacities," in Giddens' (1971) Weberian terms, based on training, educational, technical or functional qualification. In the age where property is no longer widely held and wage labor status is widespread, it is occupational skills which determine the standard of living one obtains from selling labor-power in the labor market.

The discussions and theories of the new middle class have a long history. An early formulation is Schmoller's (1897 in Coyner and Oppenheimer, 1976) view that white collar being new middle class boded social reform. Lederer (1912:8 in Mills, 1951:241) is a basis for later study of white collar class, not only through theoretical analysis, but through a review of relevant statistical data on white collar. Lederer attempts to determine consciousness by the type of organizational tendencies and union-alliances exhibited by white collar workers, who were at this point in time, typically middle-class-oriented. In 1926, the term "neue middlestand" was used by Lederer and Marshak (1926) in a study of salaried employees and civil servants, noting here, as in Lederer's earlier work (1912), the change in

jobs from self-employment (old middle class) to salaried (new middle class) work for others by professionals and managers. As noted above, the essential shift came from a status basis in property to a basis in skills or function. It is, in fact, the salaried (vs. property owning or wage working) status which is often seen as the distinctive feature of white collar workers (Mills, 1951:299). Today for most professional and managerial employees the designation holds. "The salary, as contrasted with the wage, has been the traditional mark of white collar employment" (Mills, 1951:299). In fact, Mills (1951:289) and Bell (1960:222) both refer to white collar employees as members of the "salarariat."

Another new middle class designation is used by Nicos Poulantzas (1975) who focuses on employees who do not work on production i.e. "unproductive labor." He calls the employees the "new petty bourgeoisie." This new middle class designation is chosen for the proposed affinity of this "class" with the values, attitudes, and expertise of the old middle class, of small owners, as well as similarities in managerial functions. For Poulantzas (1975) only manual, non-supervisory employees, who produce surplus value, i.e. are "productive workers," are members of the working class. Poulantzas includes in the new middle class upper white collar (Wright, 1977; Packard, 1959:31)

professional and managerial employees who are unproductive labor. For ideological reasons, he assigns to the new petty bourgeoisie lower white collar employees in clerical and sales jobs, even if their conditions of employment closely parallel those of traditional, blue collar members of the working class.

The debate over the class position of "unproductive" commercial employees, or employees involved in the "realization" of surplus value, also is a long one. Pannekoek (Mills, 1951:296) and Loren (1977), to a degree, hold that certain white collar workers share an ideological affinity with the traditional petty bourgeoisie, though for Loren this does not place them in separate classes. In essence this is another example of "function," or perhaps better put "functionality," defining class. For Poulantzas (1975) it is the performance of unproductive labor which puts one in the new middle class. For Nicolaus (1967), as well as Urry (1973), it is their absorption of surplus income which creates the new middle class designation; its members are paid out of revenue drawn from surplus value. In fact, Nicolaus (1967) holds that the function of the new middle class is to consume surplus; since producers in the working class produce more than they and the capitalists can absorb, there must be a class which consumes more than it produces. The function of the class, to consume surplus,

determined, in Nicolaus formulation, the new middle class situation of its members. O'Connor (1973) calls the new middle class "the surplus class." Though Loren (1977) agrees that many white collar employees may share ideological (e.g. conservative) affinity with the petty bourgeoisie, he does not thereby put them in a separate class. He and others also challenge the idea that a separate class is necessary to absorb surplus income. While Becker (1973, 1974) concurs that white collar employees have the function of consumption, he does not use this as a criterion for class.

Control in reproducing hierarchies.

Some white collar people are assigned to the new middle class for the role of reproducing or preserving hierarchic capitalist social relations by their work as lawyers, psychologist, social workers or teachers. Essentially similar is the conception of most white collar workers being in what the Ehrenreichs (1976, 1977) describe as a "Professional/Managerial Class" (PMC), which they find important for social control and reproduction. For the Ehrenreichs the PMC and its role are particular developments of the monopoly stage of capitalism. The focus on control functions is a keynote of these theories. By analogy to supervision in production, persons involved in social control in the reproductive spheres (e.g. non-production) of

society and in particular in reproducing or maintaining the hierarchical social relations of capitalist society, are placed in the new middle class. This includes teachers, social and health workers, psychologists, lawyers and others who are involved in social control through professional service functions. Oppenheimer (1972:30,32) calls this the "middle class, new managerial strata" for their role in social organization and social control.

Croner (1954 in Dahrendorf, 1959:91-2) proposed a related new middle class approach in his theory of delegation. "According to Croner the function of white collar employees corresponds essentially to the dismemberment of the activity of the leader" which "necessarily entails 'delegation'" (Crozier, 1971:31). "The explanation of the special social position of salaried employees can be found in the fact that their work tasks have once been entrepreneurial tasks"¹² (Dahrendorf, 1959:53). "Historically, most clerical occupations were differentiated out of the leading position

12. While not designating them part of the middle class, O'Connor calls these persons "guard labor," a form of unproductive labor, for their control and reproduction functions. The Deutschnationaler Handlungsgehilfen Verbund (DHV), the German-National Federation of Business Employees, in pre-War Germany held that white collar employees were essentially entrepreneurial in character (Speier, 1939:12) and hence separate from blue collar labor. Obviously, this position considered white collar employees to be middle class.

in industry, commerce and the state" (Dahrendorf, 1959:53), hence the characterization of delegated authority.

For Croner, there is a "new social class: white collar" (Dahrendorf, 1959:9). It is a "subdivision of the entrepreneurial function in industry and of leading position in the state" (Dahrendorf, 1959:91). While really referring to a social stratum, Croner's delegation idea appears in many new middle class theories which attach white collar jobs to elite jobs for supposedly similar functions. Here, by the delegation process, clerks are like managers, bureaucrats are like state officials.

Control of labor in production.

Perhaps the most cogent arguments for the existence of a new middle class are those which focus on the control function when performed in the sphere of production-- the organization and control of production and the labor process. In the beginning of capitalism, this role was performed by the entrepreneurial capitalist. Now those persons, who are in managerial or supervisory positions, who control the labor of others but are not owners, are designated as new middle class. Based on an analysis of economic determinants of class, Carchedi (1975) ascribes new middle class status to those workers who, individually, perform the "function of capital" in organizing and controlling labor, or, collectively, performs the "global

13

function of capital." Gorz (1972) holds that technicians in production, rather than performing an essential coordination function which expands the forces of production, are controllers of labor as part of a specific capitalist function in reproducing hierarchic relations of production. Based on this analysis, both Gorz (1972) and Bridier (1965) hold that technicians are in a new middle class.¹⁴

13. Lederer (1912:3) saw the growth of technicians as a concomitant with white collar growth, and as a result of the "concentration of the enterprise brought about by modern technical methods ... Above all, there emerges a class of technicians who, from a social point of view, cannot categorically be classified as either employers or workers." "The modern giant enterprises, however, have created an entire superstructure of technicians, an apparatus without which they would not be able to operate... The functions of the technical employees are two-fold: either they are analogous to those of working men, only on a higher level (such as draftsmen or engineers) who prepare the production processes, or they are managers, foremen, etc. plus the commercial employees of industry, who organize the production processes" (6). Typically such people were included in the new middle class.

14. Il Manifesto (1969) takes a middle position on the idea that technicians are clearly middle class. They find that certain essential coordination functions of technicians are necessary to production. Moreover, they find that technicians are being alienated and proletarianized like other employees (78), including the "white collar proletariat" (68). Eighty percent of employees in administration, for instance, "do nothing but repeat strictly predetermined tasks" (69). Based on Il Manifesto's analysis, the editors of the English version in Socialist Revolution conclude that while "the specialization of activity of modern capitalism does not derive from the complexity of modern production alone but rather from the need to maintain capitalist hegemony amid this complexity" (73), "some degree of specialization is certainly required

Wright (1976), and in a similar way, Carchedi (1975) and Urry (1973), divide the capitalists' roles into three types of control. Most important is the control of investments, financial or money capital (surplus value), in essence, ownership and financial control. Second is control of physical capital, the control of machinery in production (constant capital). Finally there is the control of labor (or variable capital) (Wright, 1977:2). Persons who are not owners but control labor are in "contradictory locations within class relations" (Wright, 1977:3, 17), in this case, in the new middle class. In Wright's analysis, such employees are neither in one class, nor another yet share certain characteristics with members of each, since "the three processes which constitute capitalist social relations of production do not ... perfectly coincide (3)." Here Wright is referring to class not at the highest, economic level of abstraction, but at the level of the social formation.

Urry (1973:186) essentially agrees with the contradictory nature of these positions, though he calls the place of supervisors "ambiguous" rather than contradictory for their combination of capitalist function and wage status. Carchedi (1975) identifies the combination of the functions of collective worker and the global function of

by the imperatives of large-scale technology, by criteria of productive efficiency ..." (73n).

capital in his presentation of contradictory positions. The important point which distinguishes this argument from statement about persons with control functions in the reproductive sphere is that these supervisory functions are in the productive sector and hence closer to the economic basis for class. Wright (1977:4) recognizes that nominal supervisors essentially belong to the working class, though he provides no clear line or criterion for determining when people in "contradictory class locations" can be assigned to a specific class.

Political and ideological determinants of class.

Related to designations of new middle class situations based on superstructural phenomena like reproduction functions are theories by which class situation is determined by political and ideological factors. Poulantzas, Wright (1976), Carchedi (1975:59) and Przeworski (1976) all maintain that political and ideological factors can codetermine class. Poulantzas (1975) designates the "new petty bourgeoisie" as ideologically similar to the traditional petty bourgeoisie and designates supervisors and professionals as members of the new middle class for their political dominance over other employees. Ideological consideration here are two-fold. First, Poulantzas (1975) holds that both the "expertise" of "mental" workers and the

sharing of values with the petty bourgeoisie place white collar workers in the middle class. (Pannekoek (Mills, 1951:296) and Bridier (1965) hold similar positions.) Similar to this conception is Dahrendorf's (1959:136) idea that that one's class situation is determined not by one's relation to production but to one's relationship to authority in any sector.

Related to the political theory of class and the conception of indeterminate positions between classes is Przeworski's (1976) idea, echoed in Poulantzas (1975) and Wright (1976:44), that only in struggle does class situation emerge. Hence, class is not in the abstract but only in concrete situations. Alignment in revolutionary or pre-revolutionary conflict determines class situation.

Dahrendorf (1959:136) proposes a weak version of this theory in his idea that class and class conflict are intimately intertwined with authority relations. Thompson (1963:9) suggests a stronger idea when he states that classes are only phenomena in history and cannot be structurally or categorically defined. Simply this theory says that class cannot be determined outside of class struggle. In this formulation there is no class-in-itself discovered by careful research and analysis. There is only class-for-itself in class struggle. In essence this is a theory of the indeterminant class position of all, including

15

white collar, labor. (These theories, moreover, seem to imply that white collar workers will not join workers in class struggle and hence are middle class.) These approaches neglects, however, the structural imperatives which predispose persons to certain actions in class struggle.

New Class

Related to "middle class" theses, in particular ones emphasizing the managerial functions of the middle class, is the conception that people of the middle class are an elite who run the business and governance of society. This theory is often tied to a conception of white collar people as enlightened societal ruler. In some formulations they are modern day philosopher kings, the best and the brightest, well educated technocrats, "new mandarins" (Chomsky, 1969),

15. Unfortunately, this approach helps to defeat its ultimate goal. For without an adequate analysis of the structural determinants of class-in-itself, on which class-for-itself is largely based, it is less likely that a class will become a class-for-itself in struggle. Class-for-itself implies a mixture of theory and practice, praxis; or better put a mixture of class consciousness and class struggle. Class struggle without class consciousness is activism, not revolution. And revolution, is an ultimate, not a normal situation of society. Hence it is virtually impossible to know by Przeworski's approach what class white collar employees are in. When clear class analysis abets class consciousness of class position, class struggle and revolution are possible results. (Cf. Marx in The Poverty of Philosophy, Bendix and Lipset, 1966:9).

"the brain trust," "new class" (Bazelon, 1963). This is often known as the "new class," "new ruling class" or "new elite" theory. Here is a social synecdoche, describing the whole for the part: as some white collar people rule society, all white collar people share in the ruling function. (This is somewhat similar to Croner's (1954) theory of delegation.)

Veblen (1921:440-1) was perhaps the first proponent of a like idea when he spoke of the "general staff of the industrial system" consisting of "technicians, engineers and industrial experts," who could run the production system more efficiently than profit-motivated businessmen. Veblen (1921) preceeded by a decade the rise of the ideas of technocracy so popular in the depression decade of the 1930s. Burnham (1941) advanced a similar idea in his "managerial revolution" study. Bell (1973), Touraine (1971) and Gouldner (1979) have similar ideas regarding leadership roles for scientist in "post-industrial" society. Galbraith (1967) speaks of "scientists and engineers within the technosphere" (291) and the "educators and research scientists of the educational/scientific estate" (291) in his vision of the "New Industrial State" (1967). Djilas (1957) describes the new (ruling) classes in eastern Europe, and Parkin (1971) discusses the deproletarianization of these ruling circles of eastern Europe. The non-class char-

acter of the "new class" becomes clearer when they are seen as the "new elite" (cf. Lebedoff, 1978; Birnbaum, 1969).

As Dahrendorf (1959:54) has pointed out, this theory is not of a "middle class," which implied a class above and a class below, but of "a New Class," in this case a new ruling class. "It seems obvious that so long as the middle class is a middle class there must be a class above it, and once it is a ruling class it is no longer the middle class." While some variants of this theory proposed that technocrats are only agents of the rulers, rather than the rulers themselves, these technical elites are best seen not as in a white collar middle class but as a separate "New Class." This usage should be compared to the nineteenth century Marxist use of the term "middle class" to describe a group between a ruling class and the working class. In the nineteenth century the emergent class was the capitalist, then between the aristocracy and workers, and called the "middle class." In this century in the United States, where there is no hereditary aristocracy, the capitalist "middle class" is the ruling class, while the group in operative control and tied to the capitalist class, are the technocrats and managers.

This is only a small segment of the white collar force but one giving the entire sector a particular connotation: as some white collar people run business and government,

this approach implies that all white collar people are part of an elite (Braverman, 1974:349-50; Mills, 1951:292). It is the managerial character of the white collar elite, be it the businessman as manager, or the manager per se, which gives the favorable image to the white collar sector. By the fact that some in the sector run society, all white collar employees are seen with a managerial prestige and cast. In essence, then, theories of the new middle class tend to focus on upper white collar labor, professional, technical and managerial jobs, placing them in the middle class for their functions.

Working Class Theories.

A third major approach, often presented in a Marxist framework, views white collar employees as members of the working class with blue collar workers. It is this theory which gives the term white collar employee "a proletarian cast" (Mills, 1951:292). Non-owners, wage-paid, hierarchically controlled and performing fragmented labor, with little say in decision-making, the vast bulk of white collar employees are workers. Kautsky's (1891 in Przeworski, 1976) early formulation of the proletarian thesis of white collar employees appeared in the late nineteenth century. A working class position was presented by Lederer and Marshak (1926) in their study of the changes in the

situation and organizational tendencies of white collar employees. They (1926:25) concluded that there had been a "proletarianization of the middle class strata" during the years surrounding the First World War in Germany. Contrary to an earlier non-working class formulation by Lederer (1912:44), this study concluded that for these "new middle class" groups "the fact of being employed in a dependent capacity triumphs over all class and traditional constraints." Their identity and social interests had become tied with Labor.

While neither a Marxist nor ascribing solely to a working class theory, Mills (1951:297) held that most white collar workers are closer to wage workers than to the old middle class in terms of working conditions and social situation. According to Speier (1934:125n), both Coyle (1928:25) and Fuykscot (1927) presented "non-socialist," working class views of white collar employees. Though not holding to a strict working class view himself, particularly in the later of his two works (1934, 1939) on salaried employees in Germany during the depression, Speier (1934:111, 118) spoke of salaried employees as the "youngest stratum of the working classes" and of the "rise of the unskilled and semi-skilled salaried workers" whose very designation indicated an "assimilation of the process of work in the office to that in the factory." In essence,

Speier held (1939:10,17) that like the craftsmen during the revolution, the clerk has experienced proletarianization. Once the clerk was a person destined for entrepreneurial independents, with dependent situation only as an interim position; the typical course of his career was "apprentice--assistant--boss" (17). Then clerical work became fully dependent, both in employment situation and conditions. The three most significant signs of the sinking level of white collar workers are the mechanization of their work based on specialization, the insecurity regarding unemployment, and their increasingly being drawn from strata "considered inferior in social esteem" (1934:122). Closely tied to these changes are the change in the sexual composition of white collar labor, with the increase in the number of women, though at the same time that the remaining men tended to retain the authority previously associated with the "confidential" clerk (1939:122).

Geiger (1949 in Dahrendorf, 1959:54), though also not entirely sympathetic to the working class thesis, claimed that "from the point of view of class structure in Marx's sense, the salaried employee is undoubtedly closer to the worker than to any other figure in modern society."

In examining the changing structure of the working class, Budish (1962:18) found that the "classification of white collar workers as a separate "middle class" has no

foundation in fact." J. Mandel (1970:54) includes all white collar employees but managers, officials and proprietors in the "white collar working class." Oppenheimer (1972:30) speaks of a "new white collar mass." Freedman (1975), Becker (1973) and Loren (1977) include all white collar employees except top management in the working class. Bowles and Gintis (1976:201) describe "an emerging white collar proletariat," tied to changes in the educational system. They (1976:220) make the observation that both the system of higher education and the people being schooled there are being integrated into the system of wage labor, proletarianization in its basic sense, and impetus for political response.

Braverman (1974) explores for the entire labor force the "degradation," deskilling and fragmentation, of the labor process, as capitalism develops. In his extensive study of white collar labor he emphasizes the "mechanization of the office" (326) and the "office as manual labor" (319) the factory-like conditions. He places among the "growing working class occupations" (291) jobs in clerical, sales and service work. Drawing on a host of other studies, Braverman points to Speier's (1934) description of "unskilled and semi-skilled" white collar workers underscoring both divisions within and similarities between white collar and blue collar labor. In mentioning, too, that keypunching,

for example, is in actuality as "semi-blue collar" job, he (1974:332,347) highlights the routinization of office work into a factory-like process. While his analysis of managerial and professional labor is less sanguine to a working class designation, he finds aspects of working class conditions at each level. Braverman also finds that in terms of income (297) and skills required on the job there is little difference between most white collar and blue collar employees.

Wright (1977), while focusing more on overall position rather than the labor process, finds in his empirical research that most lower white collar employees in clerical and sales jobs are in the working class. In fact, the proportion of lower white collar employees who are in non-supervisory members of the working class (57.5%) is greater than the proportion of upper blue collar workers in the same position (32.1%) (Wright (1977:27). Wright (1977:12) concludes that "crafts occupations are ... much less proletarianized ... than clerical white collar occupations," a result tied to the inclusion of foremen in the craft category.

In general, lower white collar employees are placed in the working class by Marxists, first because they are wage-paid, but also for their job situations, which closely approach those in the blue collar sector. They are

non-owners and, as they do not control production or their work situations, they are alienated; hence many authors include them in the working class.¹⁶ While Poulantzas and Nicolaus hold that unproductive employees are in the new middle class, Hodges (1971:21) speaks of the "commercial proletariat of unproductive workers." Smith (1974) and others explore the partially exploited labor of white collar workers, particularly in the circulation and distribution sectors. These laborers produce surplus labor and help realize surplus value by turning products (Smith, 1974:207; Budish, 1962:14; Hodges, 1971) into profits from which they are not fully paid; commercial employees are partially exploited and hence partially productive, and thus should be placed in the working class. Similar analyses by Freedman (1975), Smith (1974:209) and Loren (1977) suggest that government workers are in the working class for their assistance in reducing the social costs of production.

Szymanski (1972:103) places most clerical and sales workers are in the working class in the context of his

16. Yet some author challenge the working class designation of lower white collar employees on the basis that they are not directly productive of surplus value, and thus are not exploited. In fact, one of the continuing debates in Marxism involves an analysis of the situation of unproductive workers, for example, commercial workers. This group includes persons employed in clerical and sales but more broadly, employees in the realization of surplus value. Poulantzas (1975), Nicolaus (1967) and O'Connor (1973) use consumption, ideological or political functions to put white collar employees in a new middle class.

belief that the labor force has developed as Marx foresaw.

Of all Karl Marx's predictions about the trends of Western capitalism, the one that has most clearly been verified is that the proletariat--workers who do not themselves own their own tools, but rather are forced to sell their labor to someone else who then appropriates their labor, would be an ever increasing percentage of the total population.

Applying this approach specifically, he (1972:115) includes lower white collar employee, white collar proletariat" and most technical/professional upper white collar labors in the "new working class" (1972:114).

Sexual division of working class labor.

Szymanski (1972) provides an analysis of the sexual division of labor in the white collar sphere and its implications for overall class structure. As Howe (1977:111) noted, clerical and sales jobs are largely filled by women. In fact, in 1970 66.5% of all clerical and sales jobs were filled by women, a major increase from 20% in 1900.

Crozier (1965, 1971) calls this the "feminization" of white collar work. He maintains, also, that since many working women come from outside the labor force or from jobs in domestic service that their movement to lower white work should be seen as upward mobility for the individuals and downward valuation for the clerical positions (18). The theme that the filling of white collar jobs by women is an

indication of the proletarianization of previously high-level clerical and sales position is a persistent one in the literature. Crozier (1971:15) maintains that "the feminization of office jobs is certainly one of the fundamental phenomena in the evolution of the occupational structure..." But he differentiates the impact on men and women, claiming that "the proletarianization of white-collar employees does not have the same meaning at all for women, and not heads of family, who comprise the majority of the group" (15). In fact, Crozier (1971:16) maintains that the proletarianization process, mirabile dictu, did not seriously affect either men or women, for the arrival of women in white collar jobs "was superimposed on a process of mechanization and automation," and therefore the effect on males was reduced.

[Men] were pushed toward more skilled occupations and toward executive positions so that the general proletarianization of the white collar group ... was not experienced as such by those directly involved. To the old white collar group which had pretty much retained its social status--when it had not improved it by technical and hierarchical promotion--was added a new group consisting in part of females with distinctly inferior social status.

Speier (1939:122) notes a general proletarianizing of salaried work, a shift "quantitatively" in favor of women, but at the same time a shift "qualitatively" in favor of

men. While the number of women has increased, men have tended to retain the authoritative and high level positions in the white collar sphere. Somewhat like the male clerk of old, men have retained the more distinctive and managerial aspects of being clerks. On the other hand, even among foremen and supervisors, Speier (1934:116) recognizes a decline in real authority. Similarly, Crozier (1971:16) claimed in the mid 1960s that "eighty percent of the fantastic increase in the numbers of American white collar employees during the last twenty years is due to the massive recruitment of females."

Szymanski (1972) suggests that the marriage patterns of women clerical workers has surprising implications for the class structure. While white collar jobs have grown greatly in number, Szymanski (1972:110) holds that "white collar jobs as a percentage of the male work force have stagnated for the last thirty years..." Moreover, "this rapid rise [in number of white collar jobs] results almost entirely from the shift in female occupations and the rising percentages of the work force that is female." Yet Szymanski (1972:111) is cautious in drawing implications for class change.

In terms of the social class composition of the population, there has been no significant tendency for the white collar proletariat to grow relative to, or at the expense of the blue collar proletariat. What has happened is that the women from blue collar families whose husbands work in factories or at similar jobs have left home and taken jobs ... as saleswomen or office workers.

To support this assertion he points out that 40% (1967) of women working in clerical and sales jobs had blue collar husbands. In cases where white collar employees are women married to blue collar workers, the family unit is consistently working class: a blue collar male in the working class married to a women white collar clerical worker in the same class means the entire family is in the working class. This thesis implies that the growing white collar to blue collar job ratio does not mean in itself a change in class structure because the growth is in working class white collar women. Loren (1977:148) correctly criticizes Szymanski for his tendency to use occupation as an indicator of class. Yet Szymanski's point about the joint working class situation of white-collar/blue collar families is an important one in reinforcing the notion of the working class situation of white collar workers.
17

17. The question of the increasing proportion of women in clerical jobs is one addressed by Szymanski, Crozier, Smith, and Lockwood. Closely related is the concern for the appropriate unit of analysis for defining class. Is class

New Working Class.

A number of theories of white collar class consider white collar labor as part of a "new working class." Theories of the new working class generally focus on the upper white collar, professional and technical, occupations. Oppenheimer (1972:30) speaks of "the white collar mass," particularly lower white collar labor. This is better

determined on the level of the individual or of family (household)? When class is determined on an individual basis then a women's class is defined by her own relation to ownership. However, class is more typically identified as that of the head of household, in cases of marriages, the husband's position; for unmarried people, the father's. Szymanski holds that class is a family phenomenon (105), determined essentially by the relation to the means of production of the head of household, typically the head male of the family. Stoddard (1973) and Wright (1976:264) hold, on the other hand, that the individual is the basic unit for class, though the family plays a role in the sphere of reproduction of social class. Obviously when both the male and female partners are in the same class there is no conceptual problem; when their classes Schumpeter holds that families, not individuals make up class; Sweezy (1942) and Loren (1977:148) indicate that freely intermarrying families is a definition of class, hence it is not surprising that both husbands and wives of blue collar/white collar marriages are in the same class. Though there are few interclass marriages, Szymanski suggests that the position of women may have more of an influence in determining class as time goes on (106). See Smith(1974), Wright (1976), Rossi (1974), Crozier (1971), et al. on the question family vs. individually defined class. This problem becomes similar, or more complex depending upon how it is viewed, when the wife is not a member of the labor force. While it may be assumed that in this case a wife will draw her class position from the husband, this neglects the analysis of the class position of housework. This is a broad question which will not be addressed here. However, it, as well as questions of the class positions of other persons not in the labor force, such as students, and the unemployed need to be examined in greater detail.

thought of as part of a white collar working class than as part of the new working class analysis.

18

Akin to Veblen (1921), Mallet (1963, 1975) and the early works of Gorz (1965) emphasize that the technically-skilled members of the white and blue collar sectors are in the new working class. Mallet includes technicians in technologically advanced industries such as aeronautics and electronics in the "new working class" for their skills and centrality in production at the same time as they are experiencing increasingly peripheral positions in decision-making. His concern is with technicians, scientists and skilled workers in the advanced sectors of industry tied to the transformation of the productive process of society. Belleville (1963), in a less known study which appeared almost simultaneously with Mallet's, examines the labor process of technicians and engineers in five such industries. Without using the name "new working class," Gorz (1965) and Blauner (1964), who considers technicians in continuous process industries to be blue collar, explore the same phenomenon.

18. Veblen (1921:442) explains that "the technicians are indispensable to productive industry of this mechanical sort..." He called for a "Soviet of technicians to take over the economic affairs of the country" (462), forming in the process a "self-directing General Staff of the country's industry" (443). The plan of attack, similar to the historic role ascribed to the industrial working class, would be to "incapacitate the country's productive industry" through a "general strike" (463).

The American statement of the theory by Gottlieb et al. (1967) explores "the upper stratum of highly skilled workers" (Hedges, 1969), including blue collar technicians, in the new working class. Professional and technical employees, both blue collar technicians in advanced industries, and service workers like teachers and researchers who performed important social reproduction functions compose the class. Other American expositions of this theory like Smith (1975), Davidson (1967) and Calvert and Neiman (1968, 1971), focus on class analysis of upper white collar, professional and technical jobs. Bowles and Gintis (1976:201) focus their class analyses on the "emerging white collar proletariat." In the sense that Smith and others focus on higher education, and the ties to university education of professionals and managers, they are dealing with new working class analyses. Bowles and Gintis' (1976) analysis of the educational system, particularly the community colleges, has implications for the larger white collar sector.

There are a number of intertwined reasons why the new working class theories are considered, on the one hand, working class theories, and, on the other, theories of a new working class. Since traditionally, self-employment has been connected with the white collar sector, particularly professional and managerial jobs, in coming into employee

positions, some white collar people have been "proletarianized." This is proletarianization in the original sense of the word, i.e. going from independent employment to dependent employee status. In the sense that white collar persons or their jobs were not previously in working class positions, they are new members of the working class, having previously been members of the "middle" class.

Technicians in advanced industries have also been placed in the working class, because, like the traditional industrial working class, they hold strategic positions, central to the production process. This is essentially the approach of Mallet (1963) and Belleville (1963), but Veblen's (1921) focus is here when he speaks of "technicians" in production and "soviets of technicians" controlling the productive process. (This is close to a formulation of engineers as technocrats, and to new class theory.) Davidson (1967) essentially saw the new working class as strategic professionals central in both production and in reproduction of modern society.

Other theories see the new working class as emerging from the declining position, status and conditions of white collar employees whose jobs are being "deskilled" and their work process fragmented. These changes are associated with loss of decision-making and declining conditions of work. Braverman (1974) emphasizes the degradation of the labor

process is explored in general, and Mills (1951), Klingender (1935) et al. have commented on it for the white collar sectors. Since the conditions of white collar work were once more autonomous and skill-related, the lowered status is a new situation. The conditions of employment have declined so that white collar employees are newly in working class conditions.

In sum, the idea is that technical employees are new members of the working class in new conditions. The combination of their new class positions, new centrality in new, advanced industries, and newly experienced proletarian conditions of labor has created a new kind of working class. This group is also only newly recognized as in the working class. In some views the "new" working class is either replacing the old working class or the old working class has disappeared or is less central. Also "new" are the kinds of demands of this group, focusing on control of the production process rather than on wages or physical conditions.

Low-Bear's (1974) study examines the political factors involved with militant activism among new working class technicians. Based on original work and a recapitulation of other empirical studies, he generally supports predictions of the theory of the new working class that there will be political activism among technicians. For Low-Bear, two preconditions, the social class background of the

technicians and the opportunities for mobility within the company are more important predictors of activism than the "immediate causes" linked to job and decision-making structures. Low-Beer does not consider the contradictions between workers educational or skill levels and the lack of decision making power on the job as the main causes of such activism. Moreover, he calls the new working class an essentially new middle class group with important functions and strategic positions in advanced industries in Italy.

There are also several cultural variants of the new working class theory, focusing on superstructural, rather than the production, level. In a cultural pursuit of the theory, Flacks (1970, 1971a,b) explores youth and social change, educated labor (1971:116), and "young intelligentsia in revolt" (1970). Similar in many ways is the Rowntree's (1968) concern for "youth as a class." Gintis (1970), in a formulation he later criticizes and Denitch (1970) speak of "educated labor" as the new working class or revolutionary

19

youth.

19. These analyses are close to the ideas of "post-capitalist" society, (cf. Bell (1973), Touraine (1971), Bookchin (1971), Smith (1974), etc.) (See Chapter Five for details on the American version of the new working class theory.)

Third Position Theories

A fourth major approach holds that white collar employees constitute a third position, neither middle class nor working class. In optimistic expositions tied to ideas of societal reform like Bernstein (1899 in Coyner and Oppenheimer, 1976), white collar workers are considered a distinctive "in-between" group. This independent or "new" group has the potential in alliance with other strata for moving society accretionally in a reform direction" (Coyner and Oppenheimer, 1976:1). Bell and Harrington take up this approach from a quite different direction in the 1960s. Close to this position is one supported by Union officials in Germany in the 1930s, wherein, white collar employees were distinguished as having separate interests from workers and hence in need of separate organizational vehicle. "Commerical employees are different from all other gainfully employed groups...not notwithstanding rationalization in the large scale enterprise, the skilled commercial employees cannot be dispensed with" (Dreyfuss, 1938:134).

The pessimistic version of this theory, enunciated by Lederer (1912) and Mills (1951), hold that the white collar sector is an "occupational salad" (Mills, 1951:291), with no organizing principle. In this sense, white collar "class" is a negatively defined class. There is no principle binding the strata other than its lack of connection with

either the capitalists or workers. It is in "limbo" between the other two classes (Coyner and Oppenheimer, 1976:10). As Lederer (1921:8 in Mills, 1951:241) stated,

The 'middle position' of white-collar people between independent employers and wage-workers, a 'negative' characteristic, rather than definite technical functions is the social mark of the salaried employees and establishing their character in their own consciousness and in the estimate of the community.

There appear to be a number of hallmarks of the "third position" school. They tend largely to be empirical studies whose conclusions are based on the data presented. In form, they tend to include at least two specific components, review of relevant data about conditions of clerical employees and discussions of the ideological, class-identification, or stratification factors which are used to distinguish this group from the traditional working class. The empirical analysis often shows great similarities to working class analyses in their focuses on objective, deskilled conditions. The theoretical analyses indicates the factor on which white collarities are distinguishable. In these formulations, white collar employees are typically described as a separate class, group, or stratum, but in any case, distinct from either capitalist or workers. In optimistic strains, this group is

independent and positively distinct; in pessimistic strains, it is negatively distinguished as not owners and not-workers but still dependent employees.

Mills (1951) and Klingender (1935) suggest that white collar employees are in a third position due to a combination of contrasting factors. On the one hand, white collar tend to be in the same economic position as blue collar employees: both are dependent employees, working for wages and salaries, and share, at least at the lower levels, pay and work conditions similar to blue collar people. On the other hand, white collar employees tend to identify with the middle class, see themselves as middle class and aspire to upward mobility. The combination of essentially working class conditions but middle class identification is used by some authors to put white collar employees in a third position. Suhr and Engelhard base their analyses of white collar class position on the conditions/ideology split. Engelhard concluded that white collar employees were an "acquisitive class," different from employers or workers, though close to a "stratum" than a true class. Based on a very similar analysis of conditions and ideology, Dreyfuss (1938), on the other hand, concluded that white collar labor is in the working class and afflicted with false consciousness.

Klingender (1935) though a Marxist, held a third

position view in his study in the middle 1930s of the conditions of clerical labor in Britain. The white collar sector was composed of "semi-working class sections" or "bordergroups" (xii). The movement of capital was bringing about "centralization and proletarianization" (synonomous with concentration of capital) (xvii), creating a "new petty bourgeoisie" of officials, clerical workers, and others (xxii). Once clerk had been a quasi-managerial position, but by the mid 1930s it had taken on a subordinate role. Still clerks worked in close contact with managerial persons and continued to assume a "middle class ideology."

Another type of third position analysis places white collar workers in a separate class because the conditions under which they live and work distinguish members of this class from other propertyless employees. This is a theory of stratification within the propertyless. In his first of two major works on the problems of salaried employees in Germany, Lederer (1912) though a socialist and thus perhaps predisposed to a proletarian view of white collar labor, presents a "third position" view of white collar employees, which he would subsequently change (Lederer and Marshak, 1926) in light of changed conditions. Prior to the First World War, he analyzed white collar employees as the "gainfully employed who are neither employers nor workers" (3). While not owners, white collar employees could not be

placed with manual workers in the working class. Socially, the group fell in a middle position, it was a different group, "sui generis." Yet even at this point he noted a merging of the "lower strata of salaried employees with the proletariat and the higher stratum of salaried employees overlap with the class of employers, managers, immediately above them" (8). Each of the above classes tend to absorb the salaried employees, but, the possibility of independent status still existed (9). Though there was not "uniform technical function" which distinguished the white collar sector, it was distinct from either owners or workers based on "social appraisal" (9). Lederer (1912:10) concluded at this point that Marx's prediction of a growing "homogeneous proletarian mass" did not "conform altogether to reality" (10).

In retrospect (cf. Lederer, 1912), Lederer and Marshak (1926:3,4) proposed a "third school" position where the new middle class was "between the classes," independent, "sui generis." They (1926:5) concluded that "the fact that the position of the 'new middle class' is an intermediate one between the classes makes the criterion rather a negative one." Since the position was not based in technical or economic functions but on common social position, the group could "be comprehended as an entity only in contradistinction
20
to the other classes" .. (6).

In his study of "blackcoated workers" in England and their class consciousness, Lockwood (1958) recognized that class was defined by economic position, as Marx postulated, or economic and work condition, a more Weberian approach. Yet within this class conflict he saw a third level stratification theme. The material factors were offset by what he considered white collar employees' higher status position, which might be seen as contradictory to economic class.

Speier (1934, 1939) and Geiger (1949), in detailing the conditions of white collar labor, note the extent to which the situations of white collar employees have been proletarianized to those similar to blue collar labor. Yet each author defines a theory of stratification within the propertyless, distinguishing the white collar employees from the capitalist class above and the manual workers below on the basis of skills, esteem and attitudes. In his earlier work on white collar labor in Germany, Speier (1934:128, 129) explored how social valuation, or esteem, separated the salaried employee from the manual worker, though he held that these were "differences in rank within a class."

20. In essence, this was a view, in which white collar employees, or the white collar stratum, either did not have a class position (when class could only be capitalist or proletarian) and hence was "declassé," or was a separate class, though one tied to both the others at the margins. (Lederer (1912:9) proposes the idea of a "class of technicians.")

Though not created by the nature of white collar work itself (128), social estimation is both claimed by the white collarite and acknowledged by the blue. In his later work, Speier (1939:15) held that the sociological investigation of white collar work should point out the objective differences between white and blue collar labor and determine their importance. Here he sees the white collar situation as proletarianized yet held that the social position of white collar employees does not only depend on their objective situation but since they "stand in a certain relationship to other social strata, their 'being' is not theirs alone" (15).

Speier (1934:133) also analyzes the stratification within the white collar groupings, stressing that white collar social structure, and its changes, reflect the overall stratification of society and its changes. His concern is the "restructuration of the proletariat (10)," and he discusses essentially within-class stratification in the white collar groups based along technical and hierarchic lines, particularly in terms of conditions of employment,
21 complexity of jobs and responsibility levels (1939:113).

21. Speier (1939:9) mentions that Marx made two predictions about the change in the class situation of white collar labor. Best known is the prediction in the Manifesto (1848) of the proletarianization of the middle class; but also in Theory of Surplus Value is the prediction of the expansion of a "middle class" group whose existence aids the capitalist class. While noting these alternatives, Speier

In the above formulations, then, the white collar sector is seen as what Bell (1960:13) and others have called a "white collar class." Essentially in "between" the capitalists and the working class of industrial employees is a separate class of white collar employees.

Division Between Middle and Working Classes

A more promising approach, whose roots go back to Lederer and Marshak (1926), is one presented in detail by Becker (1973, 1974) and Freedman (1975), and supported in parts by Dahrendorf, Corey (1935) and Aronowitz (1971). In these formulations, the white collar sector is divided between two classes, the capitalist class and the working class. Besides the major owners of capital themselves, those persons in high level executive and managerial positions who partake in the economic perogatives and privileges of the owners are themselves part of capital. On the other hand, the vast bulk of white collar employees, including lower level supervisors, employed professionals

holds to a general proletarianization theory. Even among foremen and supervisors, Speier (1934:116; 1939:29-38) recognizes a decline in the technical component of their work and of their authority. In his discussion of "technical personnel" (29), he found essentially in giant enterprises (and whom he contrasts with commercial employees found in small operations), including foremen, engineers (a product of specialization), and technicians, Speier sees a general decline in their objective situations and authority as rationalization and hierarchy increase.

and administrative labor, as Freedman and Becker confirm, are part of the working class. Simply, they do not own, they lack power in decision-making, their conditions of employment have declined, they are workers. By this definition, most of both the "new middle class" and "new working class" are in the working class.

While somewhat ambiguous (cf. Loren (1977:151-5), Corey (1935) essentially puts most white collar employees (including salespeople in stores as wage paid workers) in the working class, with only those top white collar members functioning as capitalist as outside of the proletariat. Corey (1935:147) divided the "'new' middle class," which he held was not a class, into two strata considered together, the aggregation of salaried employees, divided between an "upper layer of managerial, supervisory and technical employees in corporate industry" who are "wholly identified with monopoly capitalism" and "the masses of lower salaried employees" (after Coyner and Oppenheimer, 1976:16). For Corey, in true class terms, the middle class, or new middle class, was composed only of small independent "enterprisers" and upper managerial employees who perform the "more decisive" functions of supervision and control, which the older independent enterprisers once performed. Managerial members of the new middle class, for instance, are thereby, "institutional capitalists" (249) despite their

22

dependent employee status. The mass of white collar employees, including employed professional and clerical employees who are among the propertyless (and during the depression years substantially unemployed (15)), while nominally members of the new middle "class," "broadly defined" (274), are, in fact, members of the "new proletariat" (259) and closely allied to other wage workers. Corey (1935:261n) holds that the new proletariat emerged out of changes in the (old) new middle class.

23

Aronowitz (1971:195) proposes the distinction between technicians in industry and service sector without significant power, and the technocrats, "the wage-earning middle class," technically and scientifically trained and serving in managerial positions, who ran production (201; after Fey). Dahrendorf proposes an important distinction: those white collar persons (1959:55) who are in

22. Particularly interesting in this regard is Corey's (1935:140n) citing Marx's prediction that as modern industry developed the petty bourgeoisie, essentially the group he and Marx called the middle class of small enterprisers, would cease to exist "as an independent section of modern society" and be replaced "in manufacturing, agriculture and commerce by managers supervisors and foremen."

23. Coyner and Oppenheimer (1976:16) call Corey's a "straightforward Marxist 'working class' view." While Corey's overall presentation is an wide-ranging discussion of a Marxist perspective on the course of capitalism, collectivism, and their impacts on bifurcating the middle class, his analysis of the white collar sector is not "orthodox" Marxism in that he includes some white collar workers in the (new middle class) and some in the working class.

bureaucratic hierarchies are connected to the middle class. Those who are not tied to bureaucratic hierarchies are in the working class. He suggests "that the ruling class theory applies without exceptions to the social position of bureaucrats, and the working-class theory equally generally to the social position of white collar workers" (55). Though his idea is tied to authority, rather than economic bases, it points out a helpful distinction, and clears up the confusion between a ruling class, some of whose members may be placed in a social "middle class," and a new "middle class" most of whose members are in the working class. There are stratifications within both classes, but the basic class assignments should be clear. Freedman and Becker make clear the basic working class unity, based in non-ownership and the wage-relation, of most white collar employees. Their functions may put them into different strata, or fractions, of the class.²⁴ In essence, the white collar "new middle class" is divided between two class, with the large majority in the working class and small number as capitalists.

24. The above distinctions between the middle class and the working class should not be seen to imply that there are not differences within the two broad classes. There are, for example, differences between supervisory workers and non-supervisory workers. Blau and Duncan (1967) and Pomer (1976) presents empirical evidence of differences in mobility patterns and cleavages along the white-collar/blue-collar line, but these are not class division. There are in Freedman's (1975) terms, class

In essence, then, the theories of the class situation of white collar employees hold that such workers are part of the middle class, or of an elite, part of the working class, in a third category, or divided between a small "middle class" elite and general membership in the working class.

Critique and Analysis

This section will attempt to answer the question of what is the class situation of white collar labor. The answer will be based in the ownership definition of class followed in this study and in the specific, structural analyses of the working class proposed by Freedman, Becker and others.

The structural definition at the level of analysis of the modes of production holds that class is an economic category defined by relationship to ownership of the means of production. The fundamental, structuring level is economic; and economic class is the focus here. On this

fractions and strata within the working class. The main point is that the different groups are bound by common relations to production. Nor is this to deny that political and ideological factors influence class fraction. These are bases for stratification within the working class. Just as there is multidimensional stratification theory in traditional sociology there can be multidimension stratification in Marxist class categories based on use values, functions, in particular, and superstructural factors in general. In discussing these "differentiations within the working class," Mallet (Howard, 1975:68-75) calls for development "toward a Marxist sociology of work" which can explore these patterns of differences more fully.

structural basis different theories of the class situation of white collar employees are fundamentally critiqued. Class as defined on the economic-based level is not simply a matter of definition but is a structural characteristic, delimiting the dimensions and interests of the class. There is a basic class unity in non-ownership and wage- and salary-paid labor. Non-ownership and wage-labor status are structural bases which unify the working class on both real and conceptual levels.

The class situation of white collar workers is defined by relationship to ownership. All white collar employees who are non-owners, and hence wage-laborers, are members of the working class. Specifically, they are in working class position. Within the white collar sector, only owners and highest level managers are in the capitalist class. Simply put, white collar employees are split along class lines created by the division between owners and non-owners of the productive means. In sum, most white collar labor is in the working class, though a small part at the top is in the capitalist class.

There are, of course, differences within the working class, white and blue collar, as there are differences within the capitalist class. But these are not class differences. The arguments that factors besides ownership create distinctions are on a lower level of abstraction, the

secondary level of social structure or social formation which involves factors such as politics and ideology. In essence, these are discussions of social class, not economic class.

As Mallet (Hodges, 1975:69-75) points out from a Marxist perspective, there are differentiations within the working class which needs to be analyzed sociologically. This is the level of social stratification, as Freedman (1975) indicates, which is the level of class fraction or strata within the working class, not separate class categories. Based upon these principles, most distinctions made in this critique are within the working class, not between the working class and another class. Proposed here is a unidimensional theory of class divisions on the level of economic-base, and a multidimensional theory of within-class stratification based on secondary economic, political and ideological criteria. While not determining class differences, secondary economic factors, as well as political and ideological differences, do contribute to differences in class fraction, as well as to differential affinities for class identification and for participation in class conflict.

The conclusion that white collar employees are in the working class is challenged by traditional and Marxist analysts who consider white collar employees to be part

of the new middle class. Hence, the new middle class theses of white collar work are the major target of the analytical critique to be presented here. The position taken here is that the "new middle class" itself, typically seen as coterminous with "upper white collar labor," is, like the white collar sector as a whole, divided between the working class and the capitalists. In other words, most members of the "new middle class" are actually in the working class; and thus the new middle class is a fraction of the working class, based essentially on functions. Most of the new middle class should not be seen as a separate class but as a stratified constituent part of the diversified working class of modern capitalism. The major part of the "new middle class" is in the working class, but some of its parts are in the old middle (i.e. capitalist) class. This is not to deny differences within the working class but to assert a basic unity based on lack of ownership of the means of production.

Productive and unproductive labor: exploitation.

White collar employees are placed in the new middle class for three types of reasons--economic, political and ideological. One important challenge to the working class designation of white collar labor come in the new middle class theories of Poulantzas (1975) and Nicolaus (1967) who put white collar workers in the "new petty bourgeoisie" for their performance of unproductive labor. These arguments

can be challenged on a number of grounds. As the economic sphere is determining, arguments on the economic level are the initial focus of this criticism. The economic sphere itself has two levels: the determining level of the mode of production and secondary levels of the market. Class designation on the level of production define class, so challenges are to class defined on the secondary economic level. Moreover, while non-economic factors cannot determine class, arguments in the political and ideological sphere are still criticized in some detail. Poulantzas' arguments will be addressed directly, in effect, addressing other authors holding such positions.

Like other Marxists, Poulantzas does hold that the economic sphere is determining of class position. He does not hold, however, that relations to ownership alone determine class. For Poulantzas, Nicolaus, Carchedi and Wright, unproductive employees are in the new middle class.

This new middle class assignment can be challenged on three levels. In the first place, Poulantzas (1975:216) includes as unproductive some employees who are properly productive. This mistake arises from using a restricted definition of productive labor. For him, to be productive, one must produce material items. "We shall say that productive labour, in the capitalist mode of production, is labour that produces surplus value while .."

reproducing the material elements that serve the substratum of the relations of exploitation" (Poulantzas, 1975:216; emphasis added). This is an obvious error for Marx holds only that to be productive one must produce use-values, which can be either physical commodities or services. In Capital Volume I, Marx (Wright, 1976:15n) defines the "worker who is productive" as "one who produces surplus-value for the capitalist, or in other words contributes toward the self-valorization of capital." He emphasizes that to be productive a worker need not produce material goods.

If we may take an example from outside the sphere of material production a schoolmaster is a productive worker when, in addition to belabouring the heads of his pupils, he works himself into the ground to enrich the owners of the school. That the latter has laid out his capital in a teaching factory, instead of a sausages factory, makes no difference to the relation.

Clearly, when someone works for an employer who makes a profit from the employee's services, that capitalist profits from services sold.

It is also a mistake to designate certain occupations, such as commercial clerks, as either productive or unproductive for their activites may often have a dual character mixing the two designations. Wright (1976b:15) demonstrates what he calls the "dual quality of social positions as both productive and unproductive" in the case

of clerks in stores. "A good example is grocery-store clerks. To the extent that clerks place commodities on shelves (and thus perform the last stage of the transportation of commodities), then they are productive; but to the extent that they operate cash registers, then they
25
are unproductive."

It is true that some commercial employees are unproductive employees. However, unproductive labor does not mean the same as unexploited labor (though one need not be exploited to be in the working class). Most white collar employees are indirectly exploited of surplus value and more directly of surplus labor. While Poulantzas recognizes this distinction that commercial employees are exploited in part,

25. Wright (1976b:17n) provides another example of where the same position may be solely productive in one case and solely unproductive in another. "By every definition of unproductive labor, a janitor in a bank is unproductive. No surplus-value is produced in a bank and thus the labor of all bank employees is unproductive. A janitor in a factory, however, is productive, since cleaning up the work area is part of the socially necessary labor time in the actual production of commodities." Wright asks rhetorically whether the two janitors have different class interests. While not on the economic level, Wright also claims that the fact that productive and unproductive employees share the same interest makes clear that they are not in different classes. Wright (1976b:17) claims "the fundamental fact that all workers, by virtue of their position within the social relations of production, have a basic interest in socialism." These arguments have their strengths and weaknesses, but whether state and private workers (the one paid from taxes which the others pay) share the same interests on a non-fundamental level is unclear. In any case, arguments on the level of interests are essentially in the political sphere and are not determining.

he holds that the unproductive state is the telling criterion in distinguishing working from middle class.

As Marx, Smith, and Poulantzas all point out, while commercial employees, do not directly produce surplus value, they do help to realize this value in commercial activities of selling and record keeping. It is here, in essence, that the sale is made and commodities are turned into money. In Volume III of Capital, Marx (Smith, 1974:206-7) describes this process as partial exploitation.

The commercial worker produces no surplus value directly... His wage is not necessarily proportionate to the mass of profit which he helps the capitalist to realize. What he costs the capitalist and what he brings in for him are two different things.

As Marx (Smith, 1974:207) notes in Volume II (132), the commercial employees' exploitation exists in that no matter how high is the pay,²⁶ "as a wage laborer he works part of his time for nothing." In Capital III (300), Marx (Smith, 1975:207) holds that the commercial employee

creates no surplus value directly, but adds to the capitalist's income by helping him to reduce the cost of realizing surplus value, inasmuch as he performs partly unpaid labor.

27. Carchedi (1975:19) calls this form of indirect exploitation, "economic oppression." "The distinction between surplus value exploitation and surplus labor

In Theories of Surplus Value (III), Marx (Loren, 1977:173) remarks that the "unpaid labor of these clerks, while it does not create surplus value, enables [the merchant] to appropriate surplus value, which, in effect, amounts to the same thing with respect to his capital."²⁸

Smith claims that the combination of alienation and exploitation constitute membership in the working class. "In the pure form, class relations are essentially

exploitation is a subtle one.

28. Nicolaus (1967) suggests that commercial employees are unproductive workers because they not only do not produce surplus value, but actually consume it. In his model, it is, in fact, their function to consume surplus value. On the simplest level, this mistakes one's position in production (which defines class) for "position," in consumption which is similar to the income or life style approaches to class. Second, he uses "function" to define class, while, at most, function can only affect class fraction. Most basically, he mistakes consumption of an increasing flow of produced commodities (which all the population, including the capitalists, workers, and new middle class, consumes) for the supposed consumption of surplus value, a product extracted from workers in production. Capitalists extract surplus value in production by obtaining goods and services whose total value exceed the paid labor value (the unpaid value is surplus value). Profit is realized when products are consumed, but surplus value is not consumed by the buyer, middle class or not.

Loren (1977) challenges both Nicolaus and Malthus for their errors in theory. While the new middle class may consume surplus, so do the capitalist class and the workers. Consumption is not a function of the new middle class but a property of all societies where goods are produced. The relationship to ownership determined class; the questions of productive or unproductive labor is secondary. The supposed consumption of surplus, or receipt of surplus income drawn from revenue, which are typically tied to the role of unproductive labor as a consumer, do not determine class. Tying income, and its resultants such as life style, to class is mistakes effects for causes. A class's income is closely related to ownership.

relationships of alienation and exploitation in the realm of the labor process" (175). "The position of being a proletarian is simultaneously a condition of alienation and exploitation" (176). Smith defines exploitation both in the realm of surplus value and surplus labor. He suggests by his concentration on the idea of alienation, the lack of control over the labor process which most employees experience.

Political and ideological criteria for class.

A number of theories of class assign the new middle class designation on political and ideological factors as coequal to economic base for defining class. These neglect the determining role of production relations and are contradictory in their own arguments.

Supervision as necessary coordination.

Functional theories of the new middle class for white collar labor, such Carchedi (1975) which stress the "global function of capital" or Ehrenreichs' which stress control functions, also neglect that class is defined by position in relation to ownership of the productive means. As Becker, Marx, Gorelick (1977) and others have pointed out, supervision is a necessary function in the coordination of production. A distinction should be made between socially necessary work of supervision and the managerial work

29

involved in the extraction of surplus. Moreover, as Freedman (1975:43) indicates, performance of the global function of capital, like all other functional, or use-value, questions, places one in a fraction within a class, not in a separate class.

Typically, supervisors are placed in the new middle class for one of two reasons. First they perform the functions of capital (Carchedi, 1975), or for their political domination over other employees in the hierarchy of production (Wright, 1975; Poulantzas, 1975:15). Both of these are on the basis of function or use-value and hence contribute only to different fractions of the working class.

Inherent in placing supervisors in the new middle class is the idea that supervision is inherently a capitalistic function. While it is true, that managers and some supervisors do perform a function once part of the role of the capitalist, this function is not inherently capitalist. Supervision is an inherently necessary part of any production process, technically necessary to the smooth running of production. It is, as Becker notes, a socially necessary use of labor-power, and as Marx and Freedman point

29. Gorz (1965) discusses the concept of socially necessary labor in relationship to education in a provocative article. He holds that technicians, including those working in supervision, are socially necessary. In subsequent work, Gorz (1972) changes his position on technicians and the social division of labor.

out, a performance of productive labor.

Smith (1974) points out that supervision is part of the increasingly collective process of production, resulting from the concentration of capital, which becomes a socially organized process. As Marx (Smith, 1974:213) notes in Capital,

No longer the individual laborer but rather the socially combined labor power becomes the actual agent of the collective work process. The various competing labor powers which constitute the productive machinery as a whole participate in very different ways in the immediate production of commodities... One individual works with his hands, another with his head, one as manager, engineer, technologist, et cetera, the other as overseer, a third as direct manual laborer or mere helper. Thus more and more the function of labor power are being subsumed under the immediate concept of productive labor and the workers under the concept of productive workers.

These workers "are directly exploited by capital," and they are "member(s) of this collective labor" whether the work is "remote or close to immediate manual labor" (Smith, 1974:213, after Marx). More succinctly put in Capital, Marx (Smith, 1974:214) summarizes the question.

The labor of supervision and management is naturally required whenever the direct process of production assumes the form of a combined social process... all labor in which many individuals cooperate necessarily requires a commanding will to coordinate and unify the process... This is a productive job, which must be performed in every combined form of production.

Smith (1974:215) concludes that

most technical administrators are steeped in the immediate work of production, functioning just over the heads of the scientists and technicians from whose ranks they are drawn. Their labor is alienated since they lack control over the purposes and results of production, and they are exploited as a part of the 'aggregate' technical mass producing either surplus value for a capitalist or reductions in the social costs of production for the capitalistic class as a whole. In brief, they are workers (emphasis in Smith).

Supervisory functions can be divided into two parts: on the one hand, there is a coordination function; on the other, there is a control function. The coordination of the labor process, which Carchedi calls the "collective function of labor," will be defined here as "non-antagonistic" to working class membership. Coordination, or "administrative labor" as Becker (1973) terms it, is an essential function in the creation of value, i.e. in the production process. There is no production of scale without coordination. While coordination is clearly one of the functions of

supervision, it is not a capitalist function per se. Supervisors who perform coordination alone, without significant components of hierarchic control, are clearly performing the function of productive workers; as they are also in non-ownership positions, they are clearly in the working class. These are lower, or nominal, supervisory workers.

Freedman (1975:64) makes similar points about the social, productive and socially necessary character of supervision.

The growth of the managerial function within capitalism confirms nothing more nor less than the increased socialization of the means of production --that is, the concentration and centralization of capital. This process develops pari passu with the increasing social division of labor, and hence creates a body of managers to coordinate the different operations of the firm. This constitutes no change in the property relations of capitalism, no creation of a new class. Rather, property relations become less personal, more abstract and achieve the appearance of independence from human relations.

Freedman (1975:65) concludes that "Marx clearly includes these 'supervisory' workers in the ranks of wage labor, assigning them the position of skilled workers, whose labor, 'like any other wage,' finds a definite market and price!" In support she cites Marx in Capital III that

The labor of supervision and management, arising as it does out of the supremacy of capital over labor ... is directly and inseparably connected ... under the capitalist system, with productive functions when all combined social labor assigns to individuals as specific task...

"It must be re-emphasized here," Freedman (1975:65) concludes, "that middle-management is part of the working class." Though highly paid, such managers do not have sufficient financial assets to put them economically in the capitalist class.

Freedman (1975:74) emphasizes the distinctions between supervisors and other members of the working class, moreover. "The requirements for foremen and supervisors arise out of the hierachization of the job structure. This structure must have its specific social agents whose job is the supervision and maintenance within fractions of the working class." Placing them outside of the working class, however, "is a confusion of class role with class membership." In value terms as wage laborers they are members of the working class, though they may have antagonistic functions. Because supervisors do perform control functions, they are placed in a higher fraction of the working-class. This is part of the stratification within the working class, which is, on the whole, unified by ownership.

In his discussion of administrative labor which includes supervisors as well as technicians, Becker (1973; 1974) emphasizes that such labor is a socially necessary functions. In speaking about the "work of social administration, i.e. the coordination of social activity," he concluded that "all of this labor aids in the reproduction of social labor through its contribution either to production or to the coordination of production," and he reemphasizes that all it would be technically useful and reproductively necessary outside the confines of the capitalist mode" (444).

Gorelick (1977) makes some particularly penetrating criticism from a Marxist perspective of other Marxists as well as traditional sociological placements of supervisors in the new middle class. Simply put, Gorelick (1977:28) states that the focus on hierarchy in production is misplaced and misleading when attempting a class analysis: "Hierarchy is not class." Emphasis on hierarchy per se distorts the class relationships which are intimately tied to questions of exploitation. It is in the economic realm of exploitation and ownership that Gorelick (1977:31), like Freedman, finds the basis for class: "Alienation is simultaneously a process of the creation of wealth by makers and a robbery by owners." The autonomous use of the concept of hierarchy outside of its economic content is what

Gorelick calls the "uprooting and embourgeoisement of the concept of 'alienation'" (30). Focusing on hierarchy turns a qualitative concept of class into a quantitative one more akin to stratification (32). "By magnifying hierarchy," authors reify it, and turn it from a form and mechanism of class rule, into a metaphor for class itself" (30). Gorelick (1977:30) stresses this in light of the fact that "coordination, 'directing authority', and the division of labor were for Marx general social processes, which, under capitalism, took particular oppressive forms." While the work of Marglin (1974), Stone (1975), and Bowles and Gintis (1976) are extremely valuable for explaining the mechanism of class rule, they often lose sight of the base and significance of class in their examinations of the techniques of hierarchy. Gorelick (1977:31) stresses that class must be seen in its economic basis: The central fact of class is the creation of capital, "the process of production or the production of surplus value."

Even Carchedi, the central theorists of the new middle class designation being based on the performance of the global function of capital acknowledges indirectly that the designation of supervisor or technician does not necessarily imply new middle class status. Over time all labor

30. Using Ossowski's (1963) typology, Gorelick (1977:32) likens this distortion to making class a continuum rather than a dichotomous concept.

experiences two forms of proletarianization. On the most basic level, there is the movement of skilled labor to average labor. More specifically, there occurs the process of "devaluation through dequalification" (392) in which supervisors and administrative labor lose the global function of capital and joins the working class. Carchedi (1975:65) sums up the process: "In short, proletarianization is the limit of the process of devaluation of the new middle class' labour power i.e. the reduction of this labour-power to an average, unskilled level coupled with the elimination of the global function of capital." Hence this process has two parts, and for the new middle class, the global function of capital becomes lost and then the labor power is devalued.³¹

At the opposite end of the supervisory spectrum are persons who perform functions of capital, but do little coordination. Their work is mainly hierachic control of labor for exploitation. If these supervisors also have a

31. This is part of the "proletarianization of the new middle class," which Carchedi (1975:65) describes as the process of moving from employee to worker. He sees this process as almost completed among clerical employees.

32. Wright (1976) provides some empirical basis for Carchedi's conclusion. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics asks supervisors about their abilities to affect the pay and promotion of supervisees, which would establish them as real supervisors vs. nominal ones. The PSID (1975) showed that only half of all supervisors had such powers, greatly reducing the size of the supervisory group in real terms. Wright (1976) concludes that many supervisors are essentially in the working class.

large amount of ownership in productive enterprises, either within the company they manage or in some other company, by virtue of their ownership, they are members of the capitalist class.

33

Another complex question involves person who do not supervise labor in production but who perform functions of social control, or social reproduction. These persons assist in the reproduction of hierarchic capitalist social relations outside of production. Indirectly, by socializing future employees, they assist in exploitation within production. Analogously to the labor process, such persons as teachers, ministers, and psychologists, by assisting in the socialization and reproduction of society, perform necessary coordination functions for any society. On the other hand, they also assist in socialization to specific hierarchically organized capitalist society and thus assist in social control which abets exploitation of labor by capital.

There is a significant difference here, because social reproduction is not in the same sphere as production. It is essentially a non-economic, and hence, non-determining

33. As there is little empirical data on ownership by managers, nor on the proportion of their work in control vs. coordination, it becomes largely a theoretical question to define the class situation of managers who control labor in the assistance of exploitation. As noted before, this thesis does not attempt to answer those issues.

aspect of society. Socialization like coordination is a function of any social system, though it may take may take particular forms in various societies. Moreover, analogies do not determine class: Reproduction is not production. Of course, distinguishing the proportion of coordination vs. the proportion of control carried out in socialization is even harder than in the productive sphere. Yet placing teachers, social workers and others social services providers in the middle class because of control function is erroneous. These people are non-supervisory employees, who perform importance coordination functions, but do not control labor in production.

The situation of high level administrators in social service bureaucracies and in schools is somewhat more ambiguous. Since their level of authority is limited, they are in a higher fraction of the working class from non-supervisory employees, but not in the capitalist class.³⁴ As Sweezy (1942:232) suggests, the situation of high level government officials including executive officers in the federal government, is more complicated. Most important in determining the class situation of these

34. Another interesting theoretical question is whether supervision and control of major amounts of labor power, including the ability to hire and fire, essentially investment in variable capital, might be defined as a form of ownership and hence assign such persons to the capitalist class. At this point, control can only be seen as a non-ownership dimension.

persons is that they control the state apparatus of investment and production. Much state activities are either directly or indirectly productive of surplus value. The state in state capitalism is both a producer and an executive coordinator. High officials of government as essentially owners of the states productive capacities in their roles as government officials, and are placed in the capitalist class for this reason.

Distinctions within the working class.

Market relations and work situation, to pursue Lockwood and Gidden's Weberian typology, make important distinctions within the working class. Higher salability of labor power produces different levels of living and security; yet such differences are only along a spectrum; they are not differences in kinds as are created by the ownership/non-ownership dichotomy. Differences in work situation--physical and social relations in work--provide for distinctions within the working sphere, implying stratification. But these are superstructural phenomena. While the extreme ends of the propertyless spectrum are greatly different, these differences are not on the order of magnitude of differences from owners; owners draw their wealth from ownership of productive possessions and exploitation of workers, who are only able to maintain a living standard because they work. Some owners manage but

their work is productive and in the case of large owners not necessary for their subsistence. Moreover, owner-managers have independence in control because of their ownership, which is diametrically opposed to the dependence of most salaried employees who, in a flooded labor market, can lose their jobs and have little to fall back upon. Within the white collar working class, the differences are ones of degree and not of a fundamental kind. These are objective bases of stratification, not principles for class distinctions.

In essence, objective conditions are secondary indications of working class situation, but they do not overdetermine class situation per se but indicate fractional positions within the working class. Wage and salary employees who lack significant control over their jobs, and who produce surplus value or surplus labor are in working
35 class conditions.

35. On the level of conditions of works, it appears clear that there is a growing similarity between lower white collar "semi-skilled" jobs and lower blue collar jobs. Similarly, skilled white collar technicians blur with skilled blue collar technicians. At the level of the lower collar sectors and the "new working class" then the distinctions between white and blue collar conditions essentially blur. While conditions themselves do not determine class, a large proportion of white collar employees are in conditions similar to blue collar workers, another indication of their joint class status. As Mallet (1963) noted, the situations of white collar and blue collar employees are merging, especially at the upper levels. Upper white collar and upper blue collar labor begin to blur. Similarly, lower white collar and lower blue collar

A non-objective criterion upon which both Marxist and non-Marxist analysts place white collar employees in the new middle class are for ideological reasons. Many traditional sociologists, while noting that most white collar employees are wage workers and have similar conditions to those of blue collar workers, place them in the new middle class because white collar workers are supposed to think of themselves as in the middle class or because there is more prestige, or social esteem, attached to white collar work. Poulantzas (1975) puts white collar workers in the "new petty bourgeoisie" due to the "expertise," "secret knowledge" and "mental vs. manual" labor, which he supposes separates white from blue collar workers. Poulantzas claims that white collar employees are in an ideological dominant position to manual workers in ideological subordination. He also claims that white collar labor shares the values of individualism, reformism, etc. of the old petty bourgeoisie with whom he connects them.

Ideological matters are not ownership (though they may be based in ownership or its absence). As Freedman (1975) points out, this is an idealist mistake in Marxist terms in the sense that it dominates the economic by the ideological. There is, in fact, no structural or material basis for such

labor merge in characteristics. It is not function--either in the technical division of labor or minor control of some form of capital--which determines class.

claims. Ideology or prestige, while sometimes reflecting material differences, are essentially ideas in the mind. They cannot structurally affect class situation. Nor can the values and attitudes people hold affect the structural and economic constraints under which they find their class position. Similarly, what class position a person identifies with can not change class position (though when identification coincides with structural class position its abets the conditions for class struggle). White collar people, especially deskilled white collar workers in clerical and sales jobs, have no more expertise, nor "secret knowledge" that comparable blue collar workers. As Braverman has shown, and Carchedi has postulated, many white collar jobs are increasingly removed of their skill and knowledge content, approaching, like many blue collar jobs, the positions of homogeneous, abstract labor. Moreover, many blue collar workers, particularly, skilled craftsmen, have much great expertise and secret knowledge than most white collar clerical workers. For this reason, blue collar craftsmen are sometimes called an aristocracy of labor, yet they are still seen as being in the working class.

Many of the ideological new middle class theories, as well as third position theories, actually support the working class position of white collar employees: to the extent that they agree that the objective situations and

conditions of white collar and blue collar employees are the same, they are confirming the working class position of these employees on the economic level.

The argument that white collar workers are non-owners in similar condition manual employees, but think differently, is, on the economic level of class analysis actually an argument for placing white collar workers in the working class. In ownership and physical terms their objective situations are the same, hence their class situations should be the same. The only distinctions are ideological ones and arguments on ideological grounds do not involve class analysis but social and stratification analyses.³⁶ Marxists like Poulantzas who modify designations of working class situation based on economic factors because of ideological factors such as "expertise" make a similar idealistic fallacy (Freedman, 1975). Ideological "domination" may separate workers from each other on the level of consciousness but not on the structural, economic basis. The factors of prestige and class identification have no material basis, and while they may contribute to stratification, they do not involve class differences.

36. It is not clear that the extent of identification with the middle class is as large among white collar employees as is often suggested. According to the 1976 National Election Study, for instance, 43% of people in clerical and sales jobs identify with the working class.

Conclusions

This study holds that class is defined on the base-economic level, the modes of production. By this definition, all employees who fall into the non-owner category are in the working class. Arguments that other factors determine class are at a lower level of abstraction, that of social formation. Such analyses are best classified as theories of stratification within class. For Marxists and non-Marxists alike, questions such as those of relationship to the market, are issues of class fraction or stratum. Moreover, objective conditions do not overdetermine class situation, but define levels or strata within classes. In essence, most white collar labor is in the working class; only a small portion is in the capitalist class. The basic inter-class division is based on ownership; intra-class distinctions, stratifications and fractions have many bases. These conclusions tie into the empirical work to follow.

C H A P T E R I I I

THE CLASS SITUATION OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR IN THE 1970s

Introduction

This chapter explores data pertaining to the class situation of white collar labor in the 1970s. It endeavours, in essence, to support the Proposition One in its two parts. The first part of the Proposition holds that a large proportion of white collar labor is in the working class. The second part holds that a significant proportion of white collar labor is in working class conditions. In the process of evaluating the propositions, the chapter examines data sources including the Census of Population, government reports on industry, and national sample surveys.

1

The first part of Proposition One holds that a large

-
1. The original statement of Proposition One holds that a large proportion of white collar labor is in the working class. In other words, people employed in white collar jobs, to a great extent, are wage earners who do not control the productive machinery. Much white collar labor is also in particular working class conditions in that control is hierarchic regarding what and how work is done and such workers are exploited, i.e. they produce more value or labor than they are paid for. As is indicated in Chapter Two, exploitation is not a necessary condition for being in the working class (though some such as engineers and draftsmen in production are exploited and much white collar labor is indirectly exploited through surplus labor and reducing realization costs). Hence, exploitation is not considered in Chapter Three which explores questions of class category distributions.

proportion of white collar labor is in the working class. Essentially this means that a large proportion of white collar labor is in working class position. Working class position is defined as not being an owner of productive means and resources, that is, not self-employed. Hence, members of the working class are wage-paid or salaried employees. As is demonstrated in this chapter, Census data for 1970 and 1975 show that between 75% and 95% of all people in white collar jobs are in the wage- or salary-paid category.

The second part of Proposition One says that a large part of white collar labor is in working class condition. Someone in working class condition is a "worker." While a more detailed definition is offered toward the end of this Chapter, someone in working class condition is a non-supervisory employee who lacks significant authority and decision making power on the job, in essence, has little control over the labor process. In pursuing the definition of the worker category, the focus is on a class subcategory called the "central working class" (CWC), employees who do not hold supervisory position.

Definitions and Operationalizations

This dissertation focuses on two areas, white collar labor, and working class situations. The Census of

Population (1970, PC(2) 7A:11) includes four major occupational groups in white collar: professional, managerial, clerical and sales. (Professional, technical, and kindred; managers, and administrators except farm, clerical and kindred; sales and kindred.) One may divide the white collar sector into upper white collar (professional and managerial) and lower white collar (clerical and sales) (Packard, 1959:37; Wright, 1977:26). In this study white collar labor as a whole as well as the upper and lower divisions and occupations are each analyzed statistically.

In order to explore the validity of the propositions about the class situation of white collar labor, a number of class categories had to be operationalized. A system of three formal classes (with subdivisions) is used here: capitalists, petty producers (or independents) and working class are the classes. There are subclass divisions within each,² particularly within the working class. The operationalizations are as follows: The capitalist class is designated as self-employed persons who employ others. Independents are self-employed who do not employ. And

2. Wright (1976) uses a four "class" system of employers, petty bourgeoisie, supervisors and employees. Kallenberg (1980:731-2) calls this "positional" sources of inequality. This thesis stresses the important of position, in terms of ownership in defining classes, but finds supervisors a "class category," or better put a "subclass category."

working class (position) is defined as non-self-employed, in
 other words, persons who work for wages or salary.³

While the concentration here is on the working classes, each class can be subdivided into subclass categories. For instance, while unified by the fact of ownership, the two groups of self-employed are actually separate classes (Loren, 1977:47). Independents include self-employed persons who do not employ (though they may rely on the help of unpaid family workers). In Marxist terms, self-employed (petty producers) are involved in "simple commodity production," in that they produce commodities (goods and services) simply through their own work without the assistance (or exploitations) of employees. Wright (1977:3)⁴ calls such persons, "petty bourgeoisie." Loren (1977:10) refers to the same group as "petty producers." Centers (1949:50) designates them "independents," the term to be used in this study.

The basic category which includes the capitalists is "employers" (employer-owners), self-employed who employ other people. In fact, this group includes both large

3. The broad definitions of working class and capitalist class positions build upon the ideas of Loren (1977) et al.; the more detailed definitions build upon Wright (1976).

4. The French term "petite bourgeoisie" means small capitalists; the petty bourgeoisie can be seen to include small employers and independents.

capitalists, major employers who have a large labor force and small capitalists (properly called part of the petty bourgeoisie) for whom employment of a few persons produces goods or services whose magnitude in terms of value is not significantly greater than the employer's own production. Only the very few large capitalists (or big bourgeoisie), less than 1% of the population (cf. Lundberg, 1969:22), are truly important owners in the capitalist class, which is why the more general term "employer-owners" is used in this work. Since the emphasis in this thesis is on the proportion of white collar workers who are in the working class, neither a great deal of attention is given to distinctions within the capitalist class, nor to white collar labor near the capitalist class, for instance, high level managers.

The second focus of this study is on the working class. On the most simple level, the working class is all non-owners. This class can be divided into two class categories, supervisory employees and non-supervisory employees. Supervisors, in general, are also members of the working class, though they are not members of the central working class (CWC) of non-supervisory employees.

By the nature of the focus on persons in certain occupations and the fact that the data usable for this analysis are labor force statistics, the conclusions here

apply in the main to persons in the labor force, i.e. employed for pay or those temporarily unemployed. People outside the labor force (e.g. housewives, the permanently unemployed, students) are not directly included in the data analysis. (A few of these might be in capitalist class, e.g. unemployed coupon clippers, but most of the non-employed would be closer to working class position by virtue of the fact that, though they would not be wage- or salary paid, they would be non-owners.) In essence, the results here, based on labor force data, are a proxy for the class composition of the entire population. The exclusion of persons not in the labor force suggests an upward class bias in the results. Despite their limitations, the available data give a fair approximation of the overall class character of the society and, in specific, of the white collar sector.

Unit of Class Analysis.

It is pertinent at this point to mention the question of what is the basic unit of analysis for class--the individual or the family? For the most part in this study, class is analyzed on the level of individuals, with class for males and females aggregated to produce a class composition for the entire labor force. In some cases e.g. 5 the "Panel Study of Income Dynamics" (PSID), where the data

are available, class as a household or family construct is explored.

Data Sources

There are four major types of data which illuminate the present class situation of white collar labor. The first source are data from the Census of Population on work status and by occupation; for example, the Census divides employed persons by "class of worker," which distinguishes self-employed from employees (see Census, 1970, Report PC-2-7A, Table 43). Using these data it is possible to calculate the percentages of self-employed and wage-earners for various occupations. Data for 1970 from the Census of Population and 1975 from the Current Population Survey (CPS) are analyzed here for the basic question of class position. Unfortunately, these data only provide information on the most basic class distinction of position --self-employment vs. wage-employment. They do not distinguish between employers and independents, nor between supervisors and non-supervisors. Nor do they provide information on

5. The "General Social Survey" (GSS) in each year and the PSID for 1976, interview both household heads (typically male) and their wives; this makes possible the operationalization of class based on the work status of both partners. Hence data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (1975-77) (and to a lesser extent the General Social Survey, 1977) provide the opportunity to explore family and interactive operationalizations of class.

conditions of employment or supervisory status.

There are also three government-collected statistical studies of industry which can be used to explore class position and central working class situation. These are the Department of Labor (DOL) studies of "Maximum Wage and Minimum Hour Standards under the Fair Employment Standards Act" (MWMH), the DOL study of "Wages and Hours of Work of Nonsupervisory Employees in All Private, Non-Farm Industries by Coverage Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act" (W+H, 1970), and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) "Current Employment Survey" (CES). Each provides data on supervisory vs. non-supervisory employment by industry for 1970. When combined with Current Population Survey data on

6. Similar to this analysis is one done from a Marxist perspective by Loren (1977:Chapters 4 and 6) in which he includes among the capitalist class people who earn more than \$25,000 a year on the assumption that such high incomes represent the fruit of exploitation and surplus value. His figures are for the class situation of the labor force as a whole, and he does not provide data on the white collar sector. His results, moreover, are very close in percentage terms to the simpler Census-based studies on class of worker, and provide worthwhile comparisons and verifications (see pp. 257-60).

Another study in this regard is one by Vanneman (1977). Through cluster analysis Vanneman examines the living patterns of white and blue collar employees, making inferences on class positions by similarities between the two groups. He concludes that 20% to 25% of non-manual employees are in working class situations. There are also several studies of subjective (e.g. Centers (1949)) in which large proportions of white collar employees place themselves in the working class. Neither of these types of studies use a structural definition of class and are outside the scope of this study.

self-employment, these surveys give a general view of the size of class categories by industry for the 1970s. Unfortunately, because these data are by industry and not occupation, exact conclusions on class sizes by occupation cannot be drawn. However, since the proportion of white collar employees is very high (60% to 90%) in certain industries (in the service sector), estimates of white collar class sizes can be developed based on these studies (see Table 3).

There are five national surveys of the labor force done during the 1970s which includes the appropriate variables for analyzing white collar class. The Survey of Working Conditions (1970), the Quality of Employment Study (1973), the Study of Modern Living (1976), and the General Social Survey (1977) are based on samples of individuals in the labor force. The "Panel Study of Income Dynamics" (PSID) (1975-77) is a study of households, and its data are about heads of households. Each includes variables on occupation, self- vs. wage employment, supervisory vs. non-supervisory status, and conditions of work. Using some of them, in particular, the "Survey of Working Conditions," it is possible to estimate the proportion of white collar labor in working class conditions.

Each of the above data sources were analyzed for the appropriate questions on class position and, where

appropriate, class conditions for white collar labor in the 1970s. Support for proportions on class position and class condition of white collar employees can be drawn from the available data.

Class position: Census of Population data.

Census of Population data (1970, PC(2)7A, #43) on occupation and self- vs. wage-employment provide the most straightforward conclusions. In the 1970s about 90% of all white collar employed people were in working class position, i.e. 90% of white collar employed people worked for wages or salaries. As will be the case in almost every evaluation, there is a differential pattern of class distribution between upper and lower white collar occupations. The "higher" occupations tend to be less working class, while the "lower" tend to be more working class. While the percentages, for example, for working class position, differ by white collar occupation, they are high throughout the sector.

TABLE 3
WHITE COLLAR GROUPS IN WORKING CLASS POSITION,
PERCENTAGES, 1970

	1970	1975
WHITE COLLAR	89.5%	90.9%
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	84.6	87.3
PROFESSIONAL	90.9	92.2
MANAGERIAL	73.4	80.2
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	94.1	94.3
CLERICAL	97.2	97.5
SALES	86.0	87.4
TOTAL LF	90.1%	90.3%

NOTE: "Employees of Own Corporation" are included as self-employed. Sources of Data: Census, 1970; CPS, 1975. TOTAL (here and throughout) refers to total labor force.

Upper white collar employees are about 85% in working class positions. There is, however, a fairly wide difference between the professional and the managerial percentages in working class position. While over 90% of professionals are in the working class, only about 75% to 80% of managers are so situated. It is not surprising, of course, that fewer "managers" are in working class position, since the Census category for managers includes owners and officials. On the other hand, the high proportion of professionals who are in the working class tends to counter the idea that most professionals are self-employed. Less

than 10% of this group works for themselves today, though in
some occupations the percentage is higher.⁷

At the lower white collar levels, the proportion of wage-earning working class members is even higher. Overall, 95% of lower white collar workers are wage or salary paid. Clerical workers are almost completely in the working class as approximately 97.5% of them are employees. The proportion of salespersons who are employees, however, is lower by about 10%. In the 1970s, about 87% of salespersons are in the working class. This figures reflects the continuing realities of self-employed salesmen or sales representatives. Though facing the competitive problems of Willy Loman, the self-employed salesman still lives. (In any case, a consistent differential pattern of greater working class percentages in the lower white collar sector is related to higher percentages of self-employment and supervision in upper white collar occupations.) In sum, the

7. In 1970 about 60% of doctors, 55% of lawyers (including judges), and 35% of architects were self-employed. (These figures indicate significant declines since 1940.) Marx (1977:34) in the Manifesto held that "The bourgeoisie ... has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborer"; see Loren (1977:41). In some cases, moreover, professionals have incorporated themselves as employees of their own corporation; this obscures their position as self-employed, and raises the reported proportion of "employees" in the labor force. In this study in 1970, employees of their own corporation are included among the self-employed and excluded from wage and salary employees.

vast proportion of white collar employees are in the working class in the 1970s.

Distinctions within the working class: government surveys.

It is also possible to expand the analysis of class and subclass categories to include distinctions within the employee category. An approximation can be based on government surveys of employment by industry which distinguish between supervisory and non-supervisory employees.⁸ These data, unfortunately, only give information by industry and are not reported by occupation. It is possible to approximate the proportion of white collar employees in various class position by examining those industries which contain high proportions of white collar jobs. In this case, the industries under study are in the "service sector." Specifically, these industries include services, finance (finance, real estate, and insurance), and trade (wholesale and retail).

8. See Appendix 3.1 to this Chapter for detailed information on the methods used for the estimations of overall class sizes and the distinctions between supervisory and non-supervisory employees based on the government surveys.

TABLE 4
INDUSTRIES WITH HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF
WHITE COLLAR AND SERVICE LABOR, 1970

(INDUSTRY)	%WHITE COLLAR	%SERVICE	%WC + SERVICE	%LABOR FORCE
SERVICE SECTOR	(72.8)	(14.3)	(87.1)	42.8
SERVICES	63.5	24.8	88.3	16.4
FINANCE, ETC.	91.9	3.8	95.7	5.2
TRADE	63.1	14.1	77.2	21.1
WHOLESALE	67.7	0.8	68.5	5.3
RETAIL	62.0	17.0	79.0	15.8

NOTE: Services and service sector do not include household services or government.

For instance in 1970, within trade, both wholesale and retail, about two-thirds of all employed there were in white collar occupations. In finance, where many clerical and managerial employees are found, just over 90% of all its employed were in white collar jobs. Using the fact of white-collar concentration in certain industries, reasonable estimates of the class situation of white collar labor as a whole can be made.

Table Three presents the estimated percentages of self-employed, supervisors and employees in the services and trade industries.

TABLE 5

9

CLASS PERCENTAGE FOR WHITE-COLLAR CONCENTRATED
INDUSTRIES, 1970, 1975

	SELF-EMP	SUPER	EMPLOYEE		SELF-EMP	SUPER	EMPLOYEE
SERVICE SECTOR							
1970	11.6%	10.1	77.1		9.8	9.8	78.7
1975	10.6%	11.0	77.4		8.9	10.5	79.8
SERVICES							
1970	15.3	7.8	76.1		5.6	15.0	78.8
1975	13.7	8.5	77.0		5.1	16.2	78.3
FINANCE							
1970	6.4	19.3	73.7		11.3	8.1	78.6
1975	6.7	22.0	70.7		10.2	8.9	80.9
TRADE							
WHOLESALE							
RETAIL							

The results for the white collar concentrated,
10

service industries indicate that more than 75% of the

9. Another caution must be made in evaluating the figures drawn from these surveys. The definitions of supervisors are problematical and differ among the surveys. Most surveys, for instance, include professionals in the supervisory category. Each seems, however, to include among supervisors, only persons with a great deal of supervisory authority, leaving "nominal supervisors" among employees. (See Appendix 3.1 for details on the definitions and differences among them.)

10. There is a great deal of confusion among the various terms which describe "service" jobs and "service" industries. Among occupational titles, there is a general group of jobs called service jobs. These included protective services, business services, and, household (domestic) services, among others. These are not included in either the white collar nor blue collar sectors, but some of the service jobs are akin to white collar and many are very much like blue collar jobs. (Service jobs are sometime known as "gray collar.")

Among the industrial classifications, there are also a number of Service industries, which includes all industries which are not agricultural, manufacturing, mining or

labor force is composed of employees. About 10 percent are supervisors and about 10% are self-employed. (These ranges hold for each white-collar-concentrated industries for the most part, though in wholesale trade, the proportions of both employees and supervisors are slightly higher, while the proportion of self-employed are lower.)

Distinctions within the working class: national surveys.

In order to approach in detail answers to the questions of the proportion of white collar employees in working class conditions, it is necessary to consult four national surveys of the labor force done in the 1970s. Each contains questions for distinguishing self-employed from wage employees, and supervisors from non-supervisory employees. Each also contains questions which indicate some of the condition under which various employee works, through which distinctions can be made among working class employees.

As it is not the emphasis here and the question is more accurately answered from Census data, the percentages of self-employed workers are not explored again. The

transportation. Included among the various service industries is one industry called Services. Among service industries are trade (wholesale and retail), finance (finance, real estate and insurance), government, and, of course, services. Many white collar jobs, as well as most service jobs, are in one of the service industries. But since service occupation and services industry do not fully coincide, many white collar jobs are not in service industries.

concentration here is employees, or more specifically, the central working class (CWC) of non-supervisory employees: The concerns here are for (1) the proportion of non-supervisory employees in the labor force and (2) the working conditions in the non-supervisory categories for the white collar sectors.

TABLE 6
SUPERVISORY PERCENTAGES FOR WHITE COLLAR
OCCUPATIONS, NATIONAL SURVEYS, 1970S

	SWC (1970)	QES (1973)	SML (1976)	GSS (1977)
WHITE COLLAR	43.4	41.4	39.9	38.9
UPPER WC	53.9	57.6	49.4	48.7
PROFESSIONL	62.9	62.2	45.8	44.6
MANAGERIAL	42.2	51.3	54.6	54.8
LOWER WC	32.1	24.8	30.1	29.1
CLERICAL	33.4	26.9	31.3	34.2
SALES	28.5	19.1	26.5	13.5
TOTAL LF	36.1	34.1	31.4	31.1

11. Using appropriate data it is possible to make further distinctions among supervisory and non-supervisory employees. These included the proportion of nominal vs. empowered supervisors, and "authorized" employees vs. "workers." See Sections on distinctions among supervisors and employees in this chapter.

TABLE 7
 (NONSUPERVISORY) EMPLOYEE PERCENTAGES FOR WHITE COLLAR
 OCCUPATIONS, NATIONAL SURVEYS, 1970S

	SWC (1970)	QES (1973)	SML (1976)	GSS (1977)
WHITE COLLAR	41.3	46.4	48.0	49.1
UPPER WC	19.5	22.1	30.3	34.0
PROFESSIONAL	30.3	31.5	47.9	46.3
MANAGERIAL	5.4	9.4	4.8	15.8
LOWER WC	65.0	71.2	66.5	64.3
CLERICAL	65.8	72.5	66.3	62.6
SALES	62.5	67.7	66.3	69.2
TOTAL LF	52.2	54.9	57.3	58.2

Basic Class Divisions.

Based on estimates in the 1970s, between 40% and a half of the white collar sector (41.3 to 49.1%) is non-supervisory employees in the Central Working Class. Approximately forty percent (38.9 to 43.4%) of the white collar employed are supervisory. In the upper white collar sector, only one-fifths to one-third (19.5 to 34%) of all member are non-supervisory. The proportion of supervisory employees is larger, about 50% (48.7 to 57.6%). Considering that this sector includes the occupational category of managers, the high proportion of supervisors and lower proportion of employees, as well as a substantial group of

self-employed, are not surprising.

The relationship reverses in the lower white collar sector however. About two-thirds to three-quarters of lower white collar employees (64.3 to 71.2%), are non-supervisory employees (CWC). On the other hand, less than a third (32.1% to 24.8%) of the lower white collar employed have supervisory duties. Hence, a majority, and approaching three-quarters of lower white collar employees are non-supervisory. Important to note here, and confirmed in the Census data, is the low proportion of self-employment in the lower white collar sector; supervisors and non-supervisory employees constitute almost the entire group.

Percentages within the working class vary among the four main occupations in the white collar sector. In the professional category, from 44.6 to 62.9% of the labor force are at least nominal supervisors. Less than half and approaching a third of these are non-supervisory and perhaps as low as 15%. Even the proportion of managers who supervise, at 42.2% to 54.8%, does not approach that of professionals. Fewer managers are non-supervisory employees, however, only 5.4 to 15.8%. An important difference comes in the higher proportion of self-employment in the managerial sector, which includes owners. On the other hand, clerical employees are about two-thirds

non-supervisory employees (62.6 to 72.5%). About a third to a quarter (34.2 to 26.9%) are supervisory. The proportion of employees in the sales sector is approximately the two-thirds (62.5 to 69.2%), though the proportion of supervisors is far less, 13.5 to 28.5%. Here again the difference derives in greater self-employment among salesmen.

Examining class defined on a household basis.

The surveys mentioned above are composed of individuals without specific reference to their position in a household or family. Thus class in those surveys must be operationalized on the basis of individuals. In some cases it is possible to examine the class situation of white collar labor on the basis of a family or household definition. The PSID (1975-77) provides such an opportunity

12. In many studies of social standing, particularly those using occupational status as the indicator of "class," the class designation of members of the family is derived from the status of the husband. An interesting question in this regard is how to define the class position of working women in married units. (This is a different question from that of the class position of women who are not in the labor force.) Should the class position of working, married women be evaluated on the basis of the women's individual situations or in relationship to their husbands' positions, or from the family unit as a whole (cf. Loren, 1977:32)? This is particularly complex in families where working husbands and wives represent different class positions, though relatively few marriages are made between classes (Packard, 1959:153). According to the Ehrenreichs (1976), "Paul Sweezy has argued that the basic test whether two families belong to the same class or not is the freedom to

in that it asks questions of (or about) the household head.

In the PSID then class is determined by the household head. In cases of married households, this has traditionally been considered to be the husband. In households headed by unmarried people, the head is male or female, depending on the actual situation. For the PSID in 1977, 75.3% of household heads were men and 24.7% were women. The resulting definition of class is reflected in the PSID (1977) figures.

TABLE 8

CLASS COMPOSITIONS BASED ON HOUSEHOLD HEADS,
PANEL STUDY OF INCOME DYNAMICS, 1977

	INDEPENDENTS	EMPLOYERS	SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES
WHITE COLLAR	5.0%	12.5	47.5	35.0
UPPER WC	6.2%	16.2	55.1	22.4
PROFESSIONAL	3.5%	9.2	49.8	37.5
MANAGERIAL	9.0%	23.2	60.7	7.2
LOWER WC	2.3%	3.8	30.0	64.0
CLERICAL	0.0%	0.4	32.7	67.0
SALES	7.3%	10.6	24.9	57.1
TOTAL LF	4.1%	7.4	38.1	50.4

13

The GSS provides figures on class for 1977 based on

intermarry" (cf. Sweezy, 1953:123). Recent works e.g. Rossi (1974) and Coleman and Rainwater (1978) have attempted to define social status on a basis which includes contributions from both husband and wife.

an aggregate of individuals in families. These can be compared to the PSID household based figures.

TABLE 9

CLASS COMPOSITIONS BASED ON INDIVIDUALS AGGREGATED,
GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY, 1977

	INDEPENDENTS	EMPLOYERS	SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES
WHITE COLLAR	2.2%	9.7	39.2	48.9
UPPER WC	2.0%	14.3	48.2	35.5
PROFESSIONAL	1.9%	7.4	44.4	46.3
MANAGERIAL	2.2%	27.0	55.1	15.7
LOWER WC	2.4%	4.3	28.4	64.9
CLERICAL	0.6%	2.6	34.0	62.8
SALES	7.3%	9.3	12.7	70.9
TOTAL LF	4.0%	6.9	30.6	58.5

Comparing the household definition in the PSID with the individual definition of class in the GSS, a consistent pattern of higher percentages in the working class in the GSS is apparent. At virtually every level, a higher percentage of the labor force is in the working class by individuals (GSS) than by families (PSID).

For instance, in the GSS (individual) nearly half (48.9%) of white collar employed are in the working class

13. The GSS, while essentially a survey of individuals, also asks questions of husbands and wives. If the husband is assumed to be household head in a married family, estimates of class composition for the population of household heads can be made based on these data, too.

while in the PSID (household) only a third (35.0%) are so situated. Similarly, more upper white collar employees (35.5%) are found in the GSS than PSID (22.4%), and the same pattern exists for the entire labor force (58.5% GSS vs. 50.4% for PSID). The only exception is for lower white collar employees where the percentages are virtually the same (64.0 vs. 64.9%). A contrary pattern exists in supervisory employees: more supervisors are found in the PSID than in the GSS. For the white collar sector as a whole, there are 47.5% supervisors in the PSID and significantly fewer (39.2%) in the GSS. More than half of upper white collar employed are supervisors (55.1%) in the PSID but less than half in the GSS (48.2%). Here the pattern is maintained in the lower white collar sector as the PSID has 30.0% supervisors and the GSS only 28.4%. One the whole, the PSID finds more supervisors throughout the entire labor force (38.1%) than the GSS (30.6%).

It is not surprising to find that the PSID shows more supervisors and fewer employees than the GSS in white collar jobs. The PSID's classes are based on the class situation of the head of household, who tend to men who typically have higher class or subhousehold-based class positions than women. For instance, in 1970, 8.9% of men were employers and 40.0% supervisors, while the comparable figures for women were only 1.3% and 28.7%. Thus a class distribution

based only on men would be skewed toward empowered (self-employed and supervisory) categories than for women. And a class distribution based on male household heads, with the female's position ignored, would tend to be skewed higher than class taken as individuals, any one of which might be male or female. In the PSID case, only the household head (typically male) determines class, and the class composition of a labor force explored would reflect a higher proportion of supervisor and owners than one based on individuals.

Sexual differences in class analysis.

In order to give a view of the class situation of white collar labor as a whole, the statistics reviewed here are for the entire labor force. While this gives an overview, it masks disproportions between e.g. men and women. In 1975 (CPS), the white collar sector as a whole was exactly 50% male and 50% female, but each of the upper/lower white collar divisions had a predominant sexual composition. The upper white collar sector is two-thirds male (67.7%) and the lower white collar sector is almost exactly the same percentage (68.8%)¹⁴ female. In a sense, then, discussion of

14. Because clerical work is the largest major occupational category (in 1977 17.8% overall, 34.7% for women) and three-quarters (77.8%) of the people employed there are women, the entire sector is sometimes referred to as "pink collar" (Howe, 1977) or "white-bloused" labor. Sales jobs,

the class situation of upper white collar labor is a discussion of better situated men and that of lower white collar labor is of worse situated women.¹⁵ In terms of an overview then, the total white collar percentages (where upper and lower white collar, men and women, balance out) give a valid impression. A proxy for a sexual division is to consider upper white collar percentages as male, predominantly white men, and lower white collar percentages as female.¹⁶ (Similar differential patterns occur on the basis of race.)

Distinctions within the working class: supervisors.

Within the owning class, distinctions between employers and independents may be made on whether one employs others or not. Distinctions may also be made within the working class on a number of criteria. One distinction among supervisors is the division between supervisors with power

on the other hand, include more men (57.5%) than women (42.5%).

15. The same sort of differential situation exists for white vs. black members of the labor force, with blacks, particularly black females, tending to the lower white collar and working class positions. See Table 3.3 in Appendix for details.

16. The exact male/female split in the white collar sector is not a neutral statistic, however. While 50% of white collar jobs are filled by females, women make up only 39.6% of the entire labor force, and are thus more concentrated in white collar (and service) job. Appendix 3.3 presents figures on the sexual and racial differences among white collar jobs.

17

(e.g. managers) and nominal supervisors. Speier (1939:51) hold that "generally...[supervisory] responsibility is connected with power to give orders." The PSID (1975:96,D16) suggests a distinction along a power dimension when it ask supervisors if they have any say in pay or promotion of the people below them.

Wright (1976:139) distinguishes between managers and supervisors on this power dimension. However, the PSID also asks a question about the number of persons supervised. It seems that a supervisor should oversee at least a limited

17. Wright (1977:8) excludes teachers from the supervisory category (i.e. he classifies all of them as if they were nonsupervisory employees) on the basis that those who answer "yes" to the question about supervising people are referring to their students, not other employees. Wright (1976:140) found that more than half of teachers in the SWC indicated that they supervise; in the PSID about a quarter indicated they supervise employees. For the QES (1973), 60% of teachers supervise; for the PSID (1976), 25% of teachers are supervisor; this suggests that many of the SWC/QES teachers are, in fact, referring to supervising students. (See Chapter Five for a more detailed analysis.) More important is that for Wright (1977) supervisory power suggests essentially a class distinction from non-supervisory employees. (In fact, for Wright (1977:3-4), supervisors are a new middle class category in contradictory locations within class relations.) Obviously, including all teachers in the working class decreases the number of supervisors and increase the number of employees. (For instance, Wright (1977) finds white collar jobs include 38.3% supervisors and 44.2% employees, while this thesis finds 43.3% supervisors and 41.5% employees based on the SWC (1970), largely because of the different assignments of teachers.) For this thesis, supervisors are part in the working class, and supervision of either other employees or students assigns teachers as supervisors.

number of persons before falling into a managerial category. Hence, in this analysis, persons who have a say in pay or promotions and supervise at least three employees are considered managers; other supervisors are essentially nominal supervisors. Using the PSID for 1976, manager/supervisors can be so distinguished, though these are household based data, and the results are not entirely comparable with those from studies like the SWC.

TABLE 10
¹⁸
 MANAGERS VS. SUPERVISORS IN THE PSID, 1976

	MANAGERS	SUPERVISORS
WHITE COLLAR	20.8% (50.0%%)	20.8% (50.0%%)
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	30.3 (55.8)	20.5 (44.2)
PROFESSIONAL	15.1 (34.9)	28.1 (65.1)
MANAGERIAL	42.0 (74.1)	15.0 (25.9)
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	13.5% (33.6)	16.1 (66.4)
CLERICAL	6.8 (23.8)	21.7 (76.2)
SALES	13.9 (51.2)	13.3 (48.8)
TOTAL	13.2% (33.9%%)	20.8% (61.1%%)

NOTE: %% means percentage of total managers and supervisors.

According to the conclusions of Chapter Two, most supervisors are, in fact, members of the working class. Figures based on Census data approximate the size of the working class (percentages of people in working class position) including supervisors. However, in order to concentrate on the unambiguous working class situations, emphasis here is on the non-supervisory, central working class (CWC). It is instructive to see how much the CWC would be enlarged if nominal supervisors were included within it.

Based on PSID data, it is possible to distinguish between managers and supervisors on the basis of power and number of supervisees. The following table includes the percentages of owners, managers, and expanded central working class members (ECWC) with only nominal supervisors included in the ECWC.

-
18. The percentage (13.2%) of "empowered" (real) supervisors in the PSID is about the same as the total percentages of supervisors (16.6%) in the government surveys of employment by industry. This suggests that the government surveys are actually picking up only empowered supervisors in their categories, and assigning nominal supervisors to the employee category. (Working supervisors in construction and manufacturing are included among employees.)

TABLE 11

CLASS CATEGORIES WITH NOMINAL SUPERVISORS
IN THE EXPANDED CENTRAL WORKING CLASS (ECWC).
PSID, 1975

	OWNERS	MANAGERS	EXPANDED CWC
WHITE COLLAR	15.0%	19.9	65.1
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	22.2%	28.2	49.7
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	4.0%	7.1	88.8
TOTAL	10.9%	13.1	76.0

NOTE: ECWC includes the central working class (i.e. non-supervisory employees) plus supervisors, hence all employees.

In the total white collar sector, two-thirds of the group as a whole are in the expanded working class.¹⁹ Even in upper white collar sector, nearly half of the members of these occupations are in the expanded CWC. In order to examine the most clear cut cases, however, all supervisors are excluded from the central working class (CWC) and thus from the focus of analysis.

19. Wright (1976) bases his division between managers and supervisors entirely on the question (in PSID, e.g. 1975) about whether one has a say in subordinates' pay or promotion. In this thesis, in evaluating the size of the expanded central working class (ECWC), a more conservative estimate of managers is used. To be a manager a supervisor must have a say in pay or promotion and supervise at least three subordinates. It is possible, moreover, that some of these true managers are also owners and hence in the capitalist class. Based on comparison with Wright's

Distinctions Within The Central Working Class

A second part of the first proposition holds that much white collar labor is in working class conditions. Analyzing this part of the proposition involves distinguishing among non-supervisory employees based on conditions of employment. (Though most of the data is based on subjective responses, it does give an idea of objective conditions.)

Wright (1977) suggests an approximation for the category of working class condition. He (1977:9) distinguishes in the non-supervisory category between "semi-autonomous" employees and "workers" based on answers to questions on freedom and decisions-making. Semi-autonomous employees are people who say they have a lot of both autonomy and decision-making on their jobs. He finds that roughly 10% (11.5%) of white collar labor is semi-autonomous. In addition, he finds that roughly one-sixth (16.5%) of upper white collar and half (54.5%) of lower white collar labor can be appropriately classified as workers (Wright, 1977:27) since they do not fall in the semi-autonomous category.

calculations (1976, Table I.1.1.) for males only, the ECWC would be about 3% smaller at each occupational level. (Wright also excludes all teachers from even being nominal supervisors.)

TABLE 12
WRIGHT'S PERCENTAGES IN VARIOUS CLASSES, UNWEIGHTED, 1970s

	PETTY BOURGEOIS	EMPLOYERS	MANAGER	SEMI-AUTONOMOUS EMPLOYEES	WORKERS
WHITE COLLAR	5.8%	11.6	38.3	11.5 (26.0%)	32.7 (74.0%)
UPPER WC	8.6	19.7	43.2	12.1 (42.3%)	16.5 (57.7%)
LOWER WC	2.2	0.9	31.7	10.7 (16.4%)	54.5 (83.6%)
TOTAL	6.0	7.3	34.2	11.0 (27.8%)	41.6 (72.2%)

NOTE: % means percentages within non-managerial employees.
SOURCE: Wright (1976).

Problems with Wright's formulations occur both in his conceptualizations and what his results suggest. While "worker" is the category Wright is most concerned with, it is the category "semi-autonomous" employee which he operationalizes. The operationalization, moreover, based on only two variables, which, while suggestive of the appropriate idea, have no empirical justification for their choice. The problems with these formulations are suggested by the fact that among members of the CWC in upper white collar jobs, where relatively free conditions might be expected, a majority (57.7%) are workers and a minority

(42.3%) are "semi-autonomous." While these proportions are less than lower white collar jobs (83.6% and 16.4%) where more restrictions should be expected, they do suggest problems in the evaluations.²⁰

A more complete designation of worker can be developed, however. Involved here are both a more detailed definition of the non-worker categories (cf. semi-autonomous) and of worker itself. In particular, a detailed evaluation and operationalization of what constitutes a worker needs to be provided.

Toward A Definitions Of Working Class Conditions

Membership in the working class can be identified by a non-owning (i.e. wage- or salary-paid) relationship to the means and processes of production. Yet there are differences among members of the working class. Particularly important is the distinction between other types of employees and what might be thought of as a "worker." While the classic image of the proletarian worker on the assembly line may come to mind quickly and clearly, exactly what factors make such a person a worker is not immediately apparent. Nor is it clear what other people

20. In fact, in the evaluations suggested for this study, only a very small proportion (6.2%) of upper white collar employees are workers. This is in part because of different operationalizations of categories. See below for details.

throughout the occupational structure (e.g. in white collar jobs) might share a proletarian situation with the classic (blue collar) worker. Though the concept of "worker" has not previously been operationalized in any detail, there are certain characteristics discussed in the literature which might be used to describe empirically such a group of people. A number of analyses and metrics pertain to this question.

As a member of the working class, a worker is, of course, a non-owning employee, someone who works for wages or salary. Typically such an employee does not have supervisory responsibilities (though some nominal supervisors might fall into the worker category.) The working class (essentially non-owners), then, on the most general level can be divided into two categories: a) supervisory employees, b) (non-supervisory) employees. Non-supervisory employees, moreover, can be considered the central section of the working class, or the Central Working Class (CWC).

Further distinctions may be made within the CWC. First, a group of "authorized employees," close to supervisors in terms of authority over their own actions may be postulated. The rest of the CWC, without such authority, may be called "general employees." It is within this residual, general group that workers are located. Those

general employees who are not "workers" are "normal" employees. In sum, the working class is composed of supervisors, "authorized employees," "normal employees," and "workers."

Defining and distinguishing the conditions which constitute a worker involve analysis of relevant literature and a application of appropriate statistical techniques. First, the factors and characteristics which are most appropriate to worker situation were identified in the literature, and where necessary operationalized. Second, a means of evaluating the importance of the factors was developed. Third, the relative importance of the factors was, in fact, determined, distinguishing apparently relevant factors from truly significant ones. Fourth, a scale, or metric, was created and operationalized to measure graduations along a dimension. Fifth, cutoff points were established indicating class categorical distinctions within the employee category. Sixth, the cutoff points were incorporated in the operationalizations of subclass categories. Seventh, these new categories were run in crosstabulations against labor force statistics on the appropriate occupational groupings, in particular, the white collar sector.

The Question of Operationalizing Worker.

Though the concept of proletarian worker may be considered "Marxist," Marx does not use a term of this meaning in either the Manifesto or Capital. In fact, he uses the terms, "workmen," "labourers," "proletariat," and "workers," to mean the same thing. The conditions of most working people were closer in the nineteenth century to those suggested by "worker" and Marx used each of the above terms for members of the working class in general. However, at the point in which Marx was writing, most members of the working class tended to perform what he described in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 as "alienated, externalized labour" (Marx, 1977:84). As he noted in the German Ideology (1847) such workers were "completely shut off from all self-activity" (1977:508). In Volume I of Capital (1906;385,489), Marx does, however, differentiate between "detail labourers" in manufacture and a "superior class of workmen," some scientifically trained, suggesting something like Wright's (1976) distinction between "semi-autonomous employees" and "workers."

A number of modern day authors have discussed conditions of employment through which workers, and other categories of employees in the working class, could be defined empirically. Robert Blauner (1964, 1960) examined a

number of dimensions of powerlessness vs. control in the situation and conditions of employment of various types of industrial workers. Martin Oppenheimer (1973:213) has described the factors defining the "proletarian type worker," with special emphasis on white collar employees. Melvin Kohn (1969, 1976) has developed scales of occupational self-direction, a category which suggests the opposite of a "worker." Louis Guttman's scale on "facets of employment" (1965) suggests a beginning way to distinguish objectively among different occupations on levels of autonomy and supervision. Jenkins et. al. (1975) have applied a standardized approach to measuring job characteristics. Wright (1977) defines as "semi-autonomous" employees who feel they have a lot of autonomy and decision-making power on their jobs. There are also a number of sample surveys of employment conditions, such as the Survey of Working Conditions (1970) which provide data on which appropriate operationalizations can be applied and scales developed.²¹

In Alienation and Freedom and "Work Satisfaction in

21. The Roper Study (1947), "The American Factory Worker," on which Blauner bases his analysis, also asks a number of questions on conditions of work. The focus of Blauner's book (1964:167), subtitled "The Factory Worker and His Industry," is blue collar worker. Among factory workers, Blauner (1964: Chaps. 6,7) includes workers in automated chemical plants; such technicians in continuous process industries are typically seen as white collar workers in studies such as those about the new working class.

"Modern Industry," Blauner (1964, 1960) outlines the various dimensions of work life which might go into a definition of worker, or its opposite. In the article, he stresses the dimension of powerlessness in one's work; in the book, his stress is on the converse relationship, control. Blauner indicates that powerlessness has four major social dimensions and subdivisions. First is the dimension of separation from ownership of the means and products of production. The second dimension is the inability to influence managerial policies. Third is the lack of control over opportunity for employment, and fourth is lack of control over the work process.

The separation from ownership is a given fact for employees, who by their very definition are non owners. Since this is the defining characteristic of being in the working class, the point bears little further elaboration. The opportunity for employment is related to relative job security vs. the threat of unemployment. Stressed regarding the work process is the lack of control over the pace of work, over physical movement, regarding the quality and quantity of the products one works on, and the methods of work. Related to work process analysis are the level of supervisory oversight experienced and the relative repetitiveness of the actions one does on the job. Blauner does not develop scales based on his concepts. A worker

would, however, fall low on the scale of voice in policy and decision-making, both on what and how things are produced; such a person would also lack control over opportunity to work and of the work process itself.

Oppenheimer (1973:213) discusses what constitutes the "proletarian type worker." For him such an "ideal type" is defined by a number of factors: first, one's primary source of income is in the form of wages (the sale of labor time in advance of the creation of anything) determined by large-scale market condition and economic or bargaining processes. A worker is involved in forms of work characterized by extensive division of labor in which any single person performs only a small number of tasks in a total process while working on only part of a product. The pace of work, the character of the workplace (typically bureaucratic with a hierachic command structure), the nature of the product, and the uses to which it is put are not determined by the worker but by superiors. Like one's wage, the fate of the product worked upon is determined by market conditions. The worker lacks discretion and judgement in work which tends to be standarized. The spectre of unemployment and pressures to increase productivity hang over the employee. To defend their situation from deterioration in living or workplace standards, such workers move toward collective organization

or bargaining. (Oppenheimer's emphasis is on the "white collar proletarian type of worker," represented by lower-white collar employees; and he juxtaposes to this the "professional," artisan-like employee, whose characteristics are opposite to the "worker." Oppenheimer holds that lower white collar employees have already been proletarianized, and that the proletarianization process is affecting the upper white collar strata now.)

In "Occupational Structure and Alienation" and in Class and Conformity, Kohn (1976:1969) develops the concept of "occupational self-direction." Kohn develops a single scale for this overall concept, composing it of several dimensions: The three main dimensions making up occupational self-direction are closeness of supervision, substantive complexity of work, and routinization of work. Closeness of supervision includes a dimensions of autonomy, decision-making power and planning mechanism. Substantive complexity of work (previously called substance of work with data, things and people (1969)) involves the complexity and time spent with work with people, data, and things. Routinization of work (called in 1969, complexity of organization of work) involves two dimensions: what constitutes a complete job and the level of repetitiveness of work tasks. Kohn develops a metric for each of the three main subdimensions (similar in some ways to Oppenheimer's

typologies), as well as an overall, single factor, scale of occupational self-direction. But he does not describe the meaning of the various levels of the scale.

Guttman (1965) has outlined a "Facets of Job Evaluation" Scale which rates job features independent of a person's line of work or a prestige rating. He develops a twelve level "Guttman scale" based on five factors: subordination of supervision, time of supervision, freedom to focused on levels of supervision, and autonomy. The factors are a) specificity of guidelines (involving a policy dimension), b) subordination of supervision c) time of supervision, and d) freedom to change matters received. A fifth dimension is the "level of the receiver," an optional and ambiguous category.

Jenkins, et al. (1975) develops a standardized approach to measuring the nature of jobs. This approach attempts to "objectively" measure characteristics of jobs through observation by trained examiners rather than the subjective responses of survey subjects. About five hundred different employees throughout the occupational structure were examined and eighteen major dimensions were identified. Dimensions, such as autonomy and pace control, touch upon the distinction between worker and less restricted employees.

Wright (1977) focuses on two major dimensions in

distinguishing among non-supervisory employees. For him a "semi-autonomous" employee is one who answer that he or she has both "a lot" of autonomy and "a lot" of decision-making power on the job. Workers are the residual category of non-supervisory employees who do not answer the two question this ways.

There are several national, sampling surveys which could provide the data bases on which to develop the appropriate operationalizations and scales for pursuing the analysis of "worker." For instance, both the "Survey of Working Conditions" (SWC; 1970) and the "Quality of Employment Study" (QES; 1973) contain questions on the occupational dimensions mentioned above. Kohn's study also includes a broad range of questions on occupational conditions and would be useable for operationalizations and scaling. In his study, moreover, he presents a single factor scale for occupational self-direction. Though in the SWC there are a number of simple additive scales, of five to sixty-one variables, which measure dimensions of occupation and "quality of employment," there is no single variable or single index for occupational self-direction in the Survey. While Kohn and Guttman develop scales, they do not propose cut-off points which might designate the appropriate categories.

Besides Wright's use of the SWC to operationalized

semi-autonomous employees none of the other authors designate an empirical definition of worker. Using the above data sets and suggestions for analysis, it is possible to begin operationalization of the category. This involves, to review, (1) designation of the relevant factors which constitute workers and non-worker employees; (2) operationalization of these categories for empirical analysis; (3) development of a metric, variable or procedure for evaluating these factors on a continuum or a self-dividing scale; (4) development of criteria and cut-off point for worker and non-worker categories; (5) incorporating the cutoff points in operational definition of class categories, and 6) crosstabulating these class categories by the appropriate occupations focusing on the white collar sector.

Development of A Metric.

Based in particular on Blauner, Kohn, Guttman, Jenkins and Wright, a number dimensions appeared to be salient in describing the situations and conditions of employees, and thereby differentiating among "authorized employees," "normal employees," and "workers." The purpose of the statistical analysis in this chapter is both to distinguish among the apparent dimensions of employees' situation and to determine which are, in fact, important, and then to

discover the order among their significance. The apparent dimensions for describing employee situations (their absence, in fact, in the case of "worker") emerge from the above review of the literature. They include decision-making power, supervision level, complexity of work, physical conditions and movement, overall situation, pace and press of work, and job security. The dimensions which emerged from analysis as significant are closely allied to the apparent ones.

Procedures were developed to determine which of the apparent dimensions for describing and evaluating employee situations were in fact significant. The significant dimensions were then built into a metric. The procedures, in brief, were as follows: Based on Wright (1977), class operationalizations for independents, employers, supervisor and employees were developed. Independents and employers were self-employed persons, who, respectively, had no employees or employed others. People who worked for someone else were either supervisors (supervisory employees) or (non-supervisory) employees depending on whether or not they oversaw subordinates. Independents and employers were coded, 0 and 1, respectively; supervisors and (non-supervisory) employees, 2 and 3. For regressions (and discriminant analysis), employers and employees were recoded into a dummy variable, employers 1 and employees 0.

Variables in the SWC which touched upon the dimensions (e.g. decision-making) which were appeared to define worker were chosen from the codebook for further analysis. What was then found was a way to find those variables (and their order) which best predicted the distinction between (non-supervisory) employees and more empowered persons in the labor force.

An initial list of about 150 variables was pared down to 100 by a correlation procedure and further pared down by a regression procedure (see Appendix 3.2 for details).²² The 100 variables were then run in a stepwise, least squares, linear regression against the recoded 0-1 dummy employee variable. The variables which turned out to be the 15 most significant predictors (i.e. had a F-ratio significant at $p \leq .05$) were identified.

The procedure which was used to select the final set of distinguishing variables was step-wise, discriminant analysis, a particularly appropriate to discovering which variables best predicted the distinctions between employees

22. In Appendix 3.2 is found information on recoding and selection of variables as well as a list of the variables which turned out to be the significant predictors. Regression was used here in a preliminary analysis and as a data reduction procedure. As regression with a dummy variable violated the assumption of normality for the dependent variable, it was abandoned in favor of discriminant analysis, which is more robust (see Klecka, 1975: 435 n2), for the final selections.

and all other members of the class structure: discriminant analysis finds which variables are the best discriminators between the two groups designated (non-supervisory) "employees" and all other members of the labor force, e.g. independents, employers and supervisors, who were designated in the aggregate as "authorities." The step-wise feature gives the order, from best to worst, among the discriminating variables.

In running the discriminant analysis on "Survey of Working Conditions," seven variables turned out to be the most substantive predictors at $p < .05$ or better. Each one indicates a significant dimension on which the concept of worker, or its opposite, might be defined. In order, the variables were:

TABLE 13
SIGNIFICANT DIMENSIONS FOR WORKER METRIC,
SWC, 1970

- 1) Having an immediate boss (i.e. being supervised)
- 2) Having a job which allows decision making
- 3) Having a job requiring creativity
- 4) The length of time one has been on the job (job tenure)
- 5) Being given enough authority on the job
- 6) Having repetitious work
- 7) Belonging to a union or employees association

23

Some of these dimensions, e.g. having a boss, indicate a worker dimension, while others like being able to make decisions, indicate authors. By exploring these variables a portrait of a worker begins to emerge. While in a statistical sense, a worker is someone who scores high on the worker dimensions and low on the author dimensions, in real description, a worker is someone who is supervised, is not required or allowed to plan ahead or make decisions, has a short job tenure, is neither given enough authority nor

23. An eighth variable, having the opportunity to develop one's abilities, also turned out to be significant for 1970 but was not included in the metric or class operationalizations for that year. This is because the variable is not significant for comparable 1973 data (QES), and in order to compare 1970 and 1973 figures in Chapter Four, the respective results must be based on the exact same variables and procedures.

allowed creativity, and experiences repetitive work. Most workers are belong to unions.

Using the discriminant coefficients (c 's) from the classification analysis part of the discriminant analysis, a metric was created on which to place each person in the relevant part of the SWC sample, in this case members of the central working class (CWC). A score for each person was derived by summing the discriminant coefficients multiplied by the relevant variable values and adding the constant. The scores for (non-supervisory) employees were the focus of concern.

It was then necessary to make distinctions within the CWC for various subcategories of employees. Three subgroups were determined: workers, "authorized employees,"²⁴ and residual category called "normal employees." The distinctions between these groups were made by scores on the

24. Because autonomy turned out not to be a significant predictor in the discriminant (or regression) analysis, Wright's term "semi-autonomous" employees was abandoned in favor of "authorized employees," which indicated a significant discriminating dimension (authority) on the SWC. However, the term "authors," suggesting a creative dimension is perhaps more appropriate still. In the 1973 follow-up to the SWC, the "Quality of Employment Survey," neither autonomy nor authority are significant predictors in the discriminant analysis. Because 1970 and 1973 results are compared, and therefore the procedures developing them must be exactly the same, authority was left out of the operationalizations to develop the statistics to compare the two years' results since it was not a significant variable in 1973.

metric developed from the discriminant coefficients. In other words, it was necessary here to develop cutoff points to distinguish the groups. The chosen procedure were statistical and based on the distribution of scores of the two types of employees, supervisory and non-supervisory.

First, "authorized employees," or "authors," were distinguished from a residual category of non-supervisory employees, "general employees." The means and standard deviations for the scores for both supervisory and non-supervisory employees were calculated. The point (K) 25 an equal number (N) of standard deviations (S) from each mean represented a place of equal distance from the central tendencies of both distributions.

The equation for determining the cutoff between authorized and general employees is:

TABLE 14

EQUATION FOR CUTOFF BETWEEN AUTHORIZED AND GENERAL EMPLOYEES

$$K = \bar{X} (\text{supervisor}) - N * S(\text{supervisor})$$

(where N is the equal number of standard deviations).

$N =$

$$((\bar{X} (\text{supervisor}) - \bar{X} (\text{employee})) / S(\text{supervisor}) + S(\text{employee})).$$

25. See Appendix 3.2 for details on the calculation of means.

Scores above this "mid-point" are closer to the central-distributional tendency of supervisory employees and these scores place a person in the "authorized employee" category. Scores below the cutoff point put persons in the more general employee category.

A distinction was also made within the remaining ("general" employees) between "normal employees" and "workers." Persons with scores above the mean for general employees were designated "normal" employees. Persons with scores below the mean were "workers."²⁶

Non-supervisory employees, members of the "central working class" (CWC), are thus divided into (1) authorized employees, (2) normal employees, and (3) workers for each level among white collar occupations. Using the cutoffs set above, the percentages in the white collar sector for each of the three employee subclasses were established through crosstabulations of occupation by the class categories.

26. Analyses of percentages of employees in the various class categories (e.g. authors, workers) were refined by comparisons of histograms of the actual distribution of scores (based on regression) and by exploring a "hypothetical worker" and "representative occupations" approaches to developing the cutoff points. Using the regression coefficients from the SWC to develop a metric, preliminary estimates were made that about 44% of assemblers, and 33% of auto-assemblers--classic examples of "proletarian" on the assembly line--were "workers." Crosstabulations of class categories with the variables e.g. decision-making which define workers and authors showed that for each characteristic the workers had lower scores on the relevant variable than did authors.

TABLE 15

CATEGORY PERCENTAGES, AND CATEGORY PROPORTIONS
 WITHIN THE CENTRAL WORKING CLASS,
 SWC, 1970

	CENTRAL WORKING CLASS	AUTHORIZED EMPLOYEES	NORMAL EMPLOYEES	WORKERS
<u>WHITE COLLAR</u>	41.3%	16.3% (39.6%%)	15.1% (56.7%%)	9.8% (23.8%%)
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	15.9	9.4 (48.0)	6.7 (34.2)	3.5 (17.9)
PROFESSIONAL	30.3	13.8 (45.5)	11.1 (36.6)	5.4 (17.8)
MANAGERIAL	5.4	3.5 (64.8)	0.9 (16.7)	1.0 (18.5)
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	65.0	23.9 (36.8)	24.3 (37.4)	16.8 (25.8)
CLERICAL	65.8	21.0 (32.0)	25.5 (38.9)	19.1 (29.1)
SALES	62.5	31.9 (51.0)	21.0 (33.5)	9.7 (15.5)
<u>TOTAL</u>	52.3%	18.6% (35.6%%)	18.3% (35.1%%)	15.3% (29.3%%)

NOTE: % means proportion across the three employee categories. N=1533.

Workers and the Class Structure

Overall, it appears that approximately one-tenth (9.3%) of people in white collar jobs are workers in conditions analogous to classic proletarian workers on the assembly line. Moreover, 9.8% workers in white collar jobs represents about a quarter (23.8%) of white collar members of the CWC. In general then, a significant percentage of white collar labor is in working class condition.

Not surprisingly, for upper white collar, professional and managerial jobs, the percentages and proportions of workers are much smaller. Only 3.5% of all people in upper white collar jobs are workers, a proportion of about one-in-six (17.9%). On the other hand, among all clerical and sales employees in the lower white collar sector, about one in six are workers (16.8%). In proportion terms, this represents more than a quarter of lower white collar employees (25.8%). Persons employed in clerical work are, in fact, the most proletarian in white collar work; almost one in five (19.1%) of the clericals are workers, nearly 30% (29.1%) of the non-supervisory working class for this occupation.

This analysis suggests that "workers" in working class condition make up a small but significant percentage of the labor force even in white collar jobs. Almost one quarter

of white collar employees (23.8%) are "workers." These data tend to support the second half of the first proposition, that much white collar labor is in working class condition.

Conclusions: White Collar and the Working Class

Using figures on the labor force to approximate those for the general population, this chapter explores various sources of data, which tend to support the two parts of the first proposition linking white collar labor and the working class. First, a large part of white collar labor is in working class position. Second, a significant part of white collar labor in the working class is also in working class condition. There is, of course, a differential pattern between upper and lower white collar jobs, with lower white collar jobs more closely following the predictions of the proposition.

TABLE 16

SUMMARY TABLE

WORKING CLASS CATEGORIES FOR WHITE COLLAR LEVELS,
1970s

WORKING CLASS (POSITION)	ECWC (NME)	CWC (NSE)	WORKERS (CONDITION)
WHITE COLLAR			
INDIVIDUAL	90.9%	--	9.8% (23.8%)
HOUSEHOLD	(85.0)	65.1	35.0
UPPER WHITE COLLAR			
INDIVIDUAL	87.3	--	3.5 (17.9%)
HOUSEHOLD	(77.8)	49.7	22.4
LOWER WHITE COLLAR			
INDIVIDUAL	94.8	--	16.8 (25.8%)
HOUSEHOLD	(96.0)	88.0	64.0
<hr/>			
RANGES	80.2MG	49.7UW	4.8MG
	-	-	-
	97.5CL	88.8UW	66.3LWC
			19.1CL (28.0CL)

NOTE: NME means non-managerial employee; NSE, non-supervisory. Sources: for working class position, CPS, 1975; for household data, PSID, 1976; for individual CWC, SML, 1976; for workers, SWC, 1970. Working class figure for industry surveys is 77.4%, ranging from 70.7% for finance to 97.5% for retail.

Working class position.

The data presented in this chapter are strongly in support of the proposition that white collar labor is in the working class. Based on Census data for the 1970's, over 90% of white collar labor is employed for wages and salaries and hence in working class position. Consistent with the trend of differential results at higher and lower levels,

the exact percentages differ by occupational level. They range from about 80% (80.2%) of managers to almost 100% for clerical employees. As is the pattern for all working class categories, lower white collar labor shows a large proportion in working class position, 95% overall (94.8%). Upper white collar labor, including managers and professionals (occupations which have concentration of self-employed) is just less than 90% (87.5%) in working class position.

While in Chapter Two it is argued that virtually all supervisors are in working class position, a clearer view of the dynamics within the working-class can been seen by examining non-supervisory employees alone, defined as members of the Central Working Class (CWC). An initial estimate of the size of the CWC is obtained through the government surveys of employment by industry, focusing on those industries (e.g. services) with large concentrations of white collar employment. According to these data, about three-quarters of white collar labor is in the CWC, an estimate which appears to be high. The figures range from about 70% (70.7%) for the finance industry to over 80% (80.6%) for retail trade.

A closer look at the CWC can be obtained through data derived from national sample surveys of the labor force during the 1970s. These examine class situation as derived

from an aggregate of the class situation of individuals. Results differ by survey, but for the "Study of Modern Living" (1976), about half (48.0%) of all white collar labor is in the CWC. Again there is a range from only 5% (4.8%) to over two-thirds (66.3%) in the CWC for both clerical and sales groups of the lower white collar sector. Upper white collar labor, where a large proportion of owners and managers (and males) are found, is only one third, (30.3%) in the CWC.

Similar, though slightly different results are found when class is viewed from the basis of a household unit. In this approach, the head of household or family, typically taken to be male in married units, establishes class. Overall, the results from the household vs. individual data are lower, a pattern to since male family heads as a group might be expected to have higher class positions than non-household heads. While the figures for the CWC for (e.g. PSID, 1977) range from less than 10% (7.2%) to more than two-thirds (67%) for clerical employees, about one-third (35%) of all white collar labor is in the CWC based on household data. Between one-fourth and one fifth for the upper white collar sector (22 is in the CWC4%). Interestingly, for both individual (66.5%) and household data (64.0%) the results for the lower white collar sector about the same.

While all supervisors were excluded from the CWC for the initial analysis, it is possible, using the "Panel Study of Income Dynamics" for 1976 to include within an expanded central working class (CWC) category those who are supervisors in name only, lacking power to hire and fire, and overseeing few employees. The addition of nominal (vs. empowered supervisors, or managers) expands the CWC significantly so that almost two-thirds (65.1%) of the white collar sector are in the expanded CWC (ECWC). This figure is almost one-half (49.7%) of upper white collar labor. For the lower white collar groups, almost 90% (88.8%) are in the ECWC; evidently few supervisors in clerical and sales jobs have significant authority.

Working class condition.

The second half of the first proposition holds that much white collar labor is in working class condition. Working class condition was operationalized as "worker," a category similar to the conditions expected for the classic proletarian. This group was defined based on the work of Oppenheimer (1973), et al., and using discriminant analysis on the "Survey of Working Conditions" (1970) data.

Though not large in absolute terms, a significant group, about 10% (9.8%) of white collar labor, are "workers." Moreover, as a proportion (%) of the working class, this figure represents nearly one-fourth (23.8%) of

all white collar members in the CWC. The range in percentages of workers in the white collar sectors is from 1% for managers to 19.1% for clerical employees. Yet for each group, the proportion of CWC members for each occupation is high: from 17.8% even for professionals, to 29% for clericals. Not surprisingly, only 3.5% of upper white collar labor are workers; still this is one in six of all UWC members of the CWC (17.9%). Moreover, one-sixth of all lower white collar employees (16.8%) are workers, over one-quarter in proportional terms (25.8%).

In sum then, Proposition One, that a large proportion of white collar labor is in the working class, appears to be strongly supported by the data. This holds true especially for working class position. Within each occupational sector, too, a large percentage is in the central working class. The second part of Proposition Two, concerning working class condition, is supported but less strongly; there is a significant group of white collar employees whose conditions of work are similar those those in industrial jobs. In sum, the conclusions are upheld that there are close ties between white collar labor and the working class in its various dimensions.

C H A P T E R I V

CHANGE IN THE CLASS SITUATION OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR

Introduction

This chapter explores the second proposition of the dissertation, which involves the change over time in the class situation of white collar labor. Proposition Two holds that white collar labor is coming into working class situation at differential rates up the job hierarchy. The question addressed in this chapter is essentially to what extent white collar labor has been "proletarianized" over time. The first part of this chapter reviews the literature of proletarianization. Prominent here are the works of Marx (1906), Braverman (1974), Carchedi (1975), Oppenheimer (1973) and Freedman (1975). Then it examines data relevant to discovering whether white collar labor has been coming into the working class over time. The exploration involves an examination of data from Census of Population, other government studies, and seven national sample surveys. The appendices present additional findings.

There are, in fact, two types of proletarianization, as well as an intermediate phenomenon. The first involves the process of moving into wage or salary employment from self-employment. Essentially this involves the change from

a position of ownership to non-ownership. This is a straightforward process called simple-class, or primary, proletarianization. The second process, more focused upon and more prominent, is the decline of working conditions making one a "proletarian." This is harder to operationalize and harder to capture with the existing data. Here the question is the relative decline (or improvement) of job related conditions or structures. This is called condition, or secondary, proletarianization.

Intermediate between simple-class proletarianization and condition proletarianization is the decline in the proportion of supervisory employees and a corresponding increase in nonsupervisory employees. Supervisory employees can be considered as a proxy for employed persons who have significant authority and decisions-making (cf. "authorized employees") and (nonsupervisory) employees as a proxy for proletarians (cf. "workers"). A first approximation of the change in conditions within the working class can be made by comparing change over a number of years in the percentages of the labor force that supervisory and employee groups compose. The percentage decline in supervisory employees and the expansion of (nonsupervisory) employees (CWC) would be prima facie indication of proletarianization. This approach is limited, however, as it may mask more subtle overall processes. For instance, the proportions of

supervisors may rise but fewer may have real authority; or the proportion of employees may increase but so may the number of members who have authority similar to supervisors. In some cases, both supervisors and employees may rise or decline in at the same time.

In a cross-sectional analysis such as Chapter Three, an occupation may be considered proletarianized if more than half of its members were in the working class. This chapter looks to the direction of motion of working class situation. On the one hand, an occupation only 20% of whose members are in the working class but moving toward a higher percentage is being proletarianized. On the other hand, an occupation at more than half in the working class but with a declining percentage is being deproletarianized.

There are four major section to empirical presentation in this chapter. First is a review of simple proletarianization based on Census of Population data. The question is the extent to which white collar labor has gone from ownership and self-employment to wage-employment and dependent situations.

Second is an examination of intermediate proletarianization through supervisory vs. nonsupervisory employment in various industries based on government surveys. Supervisory status is used as an indication of more empowered situations; a decline in the proportions of

supervisory employees and increase in (nonsupervisory) employees would be evidence for proletarianization. These data are limited, however, since they are presented by industries rather than occupations. As a proxy for white collar occupations, industries, like services and trade, with a high concentration of white collar jobs are used as proxies for the white collar jobs themselves (cf. Table 4, Chapter Three). Third is the review of seven national sample surveys from 1945 to 1977 to examine the trends in percentages of supervisory and nonsupervisory employees over a longer periods in the relevant white collar occupations.

Fourth, there are sets of studies which bear directly on the empirical evidence for condition proletarianization. First, is Singleman and Wright's (1978) work on class change from 1960 to 1970, which examines the change in the percentages of "semi-autonomous" employees a decade apart. This provides preliminary evidence on the proletarianization question for the labor force but does not focus on the white collar sector. Then there is a review of two pairs of studies, Gurin (1957) vs. Veroff (1976) and Quinn (1970 vs. 1973), which contain the appropriate data for examining to what extent condition proletarianization has occurred in the white collar sectors.

Review of the Literature of Proletarianization

Among others, Marx (1906), Braverman (1974), Carchedi (1975), Oppenheimer (1973), and Freedman (1975) have discussed various aspects of the proletarianization process. Oppenheimer (1973), Carchedi (1975) and Larson (1977) have focused on white collar jobs. As is indicated in the empirical analysis, proletarianization involves various processes. Freedman (1975:60n) distinguishes between two types of proletarianizations. The first is simple proletarianization which involves the movement from independent ownership to dependent wage and salary employment. The second is the more complex process of proletarianization which involves the fragmentation and deskilling of labor. While Singleman and Wright (1978:17) find that simple proletarianization is still occurring as the "petty bourgeoisie" move to the proletariat, the concentration in much current literature has been on condition proletarianization, the decline in conditions of the labor process. Simple and condition proletarianization are related both to each other and to intermediate proletarianization, the loss of supervisory authority.

Simple class proletarianization.

Marx and Engels (1977:222) predicted the simple proletarianization of the middle class of small owners into

the proletariat. In the middle of the last century, they wrote that "society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great...classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat." As a result of industrial development the working class grows because "the lower strata of the middle class--small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants--all sink gradually into the proletariat." Hence, "the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the populations" (227), including "entire section of the ruling classes" which are either "precipitated into the proletariat" or are at least threatened with such conditions by the advance of industry (229).

Simple proletarianization derives from the centralization and concentration of capital in fewer hands over time. Corey (1935) described proletarianization as part of the process of the centralization and "collectivism" of capital and the decline in the market possibilities (or position) for small enterprisers in the stage of monopoly capitalism. Corey held that the first of two transformations, or crises, affecting the middle class over history was a proletarianization crisis. This crisis, which took place during the "upswing" of capitalist development occurred as the loss of ownership of property (15) for most "middle class" members. By 1930, 75% were dependent

employees, according to Corey (1935:275), middle class only for the functions they performed.

Klingender (1935:xvii) held that the movement (concentration) of capital was bringing a "centralization and proletarianization" of capital, creating a "new petty bourgeoisie" of officials, clerical workers, and others (xxii). Once clerk had been a quasi-managerial position, leading to self-employment, but by the mid 1930s it had taken on a subordinate role. By the mid 1930s, for Klingender (1935:xiii), the white collar sector was composed of "semi-working class sections" or "border groups." As Mills (1951:xiv) noted, the crisis of property, in other words, the loss of self-employed status, was an accomplished fact for most of the "middle class" by World War I.¹

As Singleman and Wright (1978:17) noted, the process of simple proletarianization of the petty bourgeoisie, i.e. the disappearance of independents and small employers continues to affect the class structure in the last quarter of the twentieth century. They observed that the destruction of

1. Mills (1951), who follows much of Corey (1935) including his equating of middle class with (dependent) salaried employees, noted that by the 1950s, the crisis of property which had essentially occurred prior to World War I (Mills, 1951:xiv) was such an accepted fact that it was no longer seen as a crisis. The crisis of employment, too, had passed temporarily, and it was the decline in working conditions and status which afflicted the white collar world.

self-employed locations for the "petty bourgeoisie and small employers" (1978:17) is an ongoing process, continuing to have an impact on the class structure. This is particularly clear in the case of professionals, once in "free professions," now mainly employed in large organizations and associations. In particular, Larson (1977:234) notes the decline in self-employment among professionals.

Przeworski (1976:15-16) hold that the penetration of capitalism results in the "separation of ownership of various groups but there is not a corresponding increase in the creation of places of productive workers. In other words, the rate at which capitalism destroys small production is greater than the rate at which it generates places of productive capitalist employment." Instead are created a group of persons with indeterminate class relations who are separated from the socially organized process of production (14).²

2. Bowles and Gintis (1976:201) describe "an emerging white collar proletariat," tied to changes in the educational system. They observe that both the system of higher education and the people being schooled there are being integrated into the system of wage labor, proletarianization in its basic (simple class) sense, and impetus for political response.

Intermediate Proletarianization.

In Chapter Two, most supervisors were located in the working class. While the loss of the function of capital for supervisors may be seen as a condition proletarianization, it is better seen as an intermediate proletarianization between simple and condition. Among foremen and supervisors, Speier (1934:116; 1939:29-38) recognizes a decline in the technical component of work and of real authority. In his discussion of "technical personnel," including foreman, engineers (products of specialization), and technicians, found mainly in giant enterprises (whom he contrasts with commercial employees found in small operations), Speier (1939:29) saw a general decline in objective situations and authority as rationalization and hierarchy increased. (Because they perform supervisory functions for technical processes, technicians are often associated with supervisors of employees.)

Carchedi's (1975) approach to the proletarianization of the new middle class, essentially supervisory labor and (administrative) employees, has two interrelated aspects. One is technical and the other social structural. On the one hand, there is the (technical) devaluation of labor power. Essentially this is a fragmentation, "devaluation then dequalification" (384) of the labor involved in new

middle class work, a reduction from skilled to average labor. Related in structural development is the loss of the function of capital for supervisory labor and (white collar) "employees" (394-5). Carchedi holds that it is this control and surveillance function, typically tied to capital, which assigns supervisors to the new middle class. He ascribes new middle class status to those workers who perform the "function of capital" in organizing or controlling labor. Individuals perform the function of capital; collectively they perform the "global function of capital." Carchedi's theory of proletarianization considers the loss of the supervisory functions of capital to constitute part of proletarianization. In specific Carchedi holds that during proletarianization new middle class members lose their control function over (collective) labor.

Singleman and Wright (1978:9) hold that both post-industrialist and Marxist theorists expect an increase in supervisory labor. Their data tend to support this for the period of the 1960s but do not establish this as the trend for the later period.

3. Particularly interesting in this regard is Corey's (1935:140n) citation of Marx's prediction that as modern industry developed the petty bourgeoisie, essentially the group he and Marx called the middle class of small enterprisers, would cease to exist "as an independent section of modern society" and be replaced "in manufacturing, agriculture and commerce by managers supervisors and foremen."

Condition proletarianization.

Most prominent proletarianization theories (cf. Braverman, 1974) focus on condition proletarianization, the declining conditions of employees whose jobs are being "deskilled" and their work processes fragmented. These changes are associated with loss of decision-making and declining conditions on the job. Braverman is most closely identified with the emphasis on the degradation in the labor process. Mills (1951), Klingender (1935), et al. have commented on it for the white collar sectors.

In Capital Volume I, Marx (1906:73) is essentially speaking of condition proletarianization when he discusses "labor in general," or "simple labor in the abstract." There is a tendency in capitalism to reduce all labor to simple labor, though it moves at different, and sometime contradictory, rates. Bowles and Gintis (1976) discuss the uneven development of capitalism and its differential impact. As Marx (1977:84) noted in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, workers experienced "alienated, externalized labour" and were, as he (1977:508) noted in the German Ideology (1847), "completely shut off from all self-activity." In the Manifesto and some parts of Capital, Marx (1977:227-8) does not differentiate within the working class, using the terms "workmen," "labourers,"

"proletariat," and "workers" synonomously to mean the entire working class.

Marx saw the conditions within the working class of his time as roughly similar for all members and becoming more so. In A Contribution to A Critique of Political Economy (1859), Marx (1970:210) noted that

The fact that the particular kind of labor employed is immaterial is appropriate to a form of society in which individuals easily pass from one type of labor to another, the particular type of labor being accidental to them and therefore irrelevant. Labour, not only as a category but in reality, has become a means to create wealth in general and has ceased to be tied as an attribute to a particular individual. The state of affairs is most pronounced in the United States, the most modern form of bourgeoisie society.

In Volume I of Capital (1867), however, Marx does (1906:385,489) differentiate between "detail labourers" in manufacture and a "superior class of workmen," some of whom were scientifically trained. In Capital, Marx further explores the detailed subdivision of labor in manufacture, as well as the distinction between mental and manual labor.

Speier (1939:10) and Corey (1935:249-51) point out that like the craftsman during the industrial revolution, the clerk had experienced condition proletarianization, from a respected quasi-managerial position in the nineteenth

century to a reduced position by this century. By the time Speier (1939) wrote, rather than being managerial, clerical work was fully dependent both in employment situation and conditions.⁴ He rather anticipatorily saw the proletarianization process complete in the 1920s. In the 1930s, during what Corey (1935:16) saw as the decline of capitalism, the second crisis of capitalism struck, the crisis of employment, with the concomitant degrading of the conditions and position of salaried employees to those approaching workers'.

In examining the employment crisis of the middle class during the depression Corey (1935:140n) described a "'new' middle class," which he held was no longer a class in the true sense, but an aggregation of salaried employees.⁵ While anticipating later trends, Corey claimed that by the mid 1930s most large offices were essentially "white collar factories." In the midst of the depression, Corey (1935:250) described a "proletarianizing tendency" even for managerial employees. In 1935, even accepting a "middle class" as "usually and broadly defined, including all salaried employees and professionals" (274), only a quarter

4. Braverman (1974:293) holds that the position of a clerk used to be a managerial not a clerical one.

5. In what he held was Marx's view, Corey (1935:140n, 261) described the traditional middle class as "independent small enterprisers."

of the labor force was "middle class," and three-fifths was wage-workers, almost a 15% increase in the working class from 1870 to 1935.⁶

The three most significant signs of the sinking level of white collar workers are the mechanization of their work based on specialization, the insecurity regarding unemployment, and their increasingly being drawn from strata "considered inferior in social esteem" (Speier, 1934:122). Closely tied to these are the change in the sexual composition of white collar labor, with the increase in number of women. Speier (1939:122) notes that accompanying general proletarianizing of salaried work has been a shift "quantitatively" in favor of women, at the same time as a shift "qualitatively" in favor of men. While the number of women has increased, men have tended to be the ones who have retained the authoritative and high level positions in the white collar sphere. While the clerical occupations have tended to be filled by women, as Speier noted (1939:122), the men remaining in these occupations have tended to retain the authority positions previously associated with the male "confidential clerk." Like the clerks of old, men in high

6. Besides referring to the "new proletariat," a "new working class" group identified 30 years before the theory became current, Corey (1935:155,251) also discusses the change in the role of technicians, "almost independent professionals" like engineers, chemists, architects and draftsmen.

clerical positions have retained the more distinctive and managerial aspects of of the work, though they too have tended to lose real authority.

The theme that the filling of white collar jobs by women is an indication of the proletarianization of previously high-level clerical and sales position is a persistent one in the literature. Crozier (1971:15) maintains that "the feminization of office jobs is certainly one of the fundamental phenomena in the evolution of the occupational structure..." But he differentiates the impact on men and women, claiming that "the proletarianization of white-collar employees does not have the same meaning at all for women, and not heads of family, who comprise the

7. Speier (1939:12) also discusses issues of rationalization of organizations and the growth of hierarchy. Durkheim (1933:353 ff) identifies abnormal forms of the division of labor which do not produce the organic (formal) solidarity of normal division of labor (nor mechanical solidarity based on similitude); these include the "anomic" division of labor which fosters antagonism of labor and capital as well as industrial crises, and "forced" division of labor tied to class war. Weber (1968:I:63-202) in Economy and Society presents the sociological categories of economic action such as rationality (formal vs. substantive), economic and technical (and social) division of labor; his (III:956-1005) classic discussion of bureaucracy explores administrative tasks in the office (bureau), bureaucracy's technical superiority, and the process of increasing bureaucratization; see "the iron cage." Schumpeter's (1942:131) discussion of the demise of entrepreneurial function in the rationalized corporation touches upon various levels of proletarianization. Mills (1951) on "the enormous file," "managerial demigurge," government and business bureaucracy and hierarchy suggests similar phenomena.

majority of the group" (15). In fact, Crozier maintains that the proletarianization process, mirabile dictu, did not seriously affect either men or women; for women, entering clerical jobs was a type of advancement, and men tended to retain what authority positions were still involved in the occupations. Freedman (1975:52n), too, noted that one of the first aspects of condition proletarianization of office workers was the displacement of male by female labor, which reduced the value of labor power and accompanied a loss of status.

Braverman (1974) explores the "degradation," deskilling and fragmentation, of the labor process, as capitalism develops. Braverman sees two general processes at work. First, is the application of technology and machinery to work, which reduces the skill levels of skilled craftsmen. Second is the application of scientific management (or managerial technology) to the control of the labor process which fragments skills and removes control for the worker. Braverman discusses how the application of the "Babbage Principle" of fragmenting work into unequally paid parts to reduce the labor costs, assists in both the deskilling process and in reducing the wage bill to capitalists.

In extensive comments on studies of white collar labor, Braverman (1974:326,319) emphasizes the "mechanization of the office" and the "office as manual labor," with

factory-like conditions. He (1974:291) places among the "growing working class occupations" jobs in clerical, sales and service work. Drawing on a host of other studies, Braverman points to Speier's (1934) description of "unskilled and semi-skilled" white collar workers underscoring both divisions within and similarities between white collar and blue collar labor. In mentioning that keypunching as a "semi-blue collar" job, Braverman (1974:332,347) highlights the routinization of office work into a factory-like process. While less willing to consider managerial and professional labor under a working class designation, Braverman finds aspects of working class conditions at each level. Braverman (1974:297) also finds that in terms of income and skills required on the job there is little difference between most white collar and blue collar employees. He challenges the assertions that the increase in the size of professional and technical occupations indicate an increase in skill levels in the labor force.

Freedman (1975:52) notes that the development of labor markets reduces the price of labor by erasing the distinctions between skills levels. She (1975:51-3) affirms capital's need to cheapen the value of labor power, to drive down wages through deskilling, in order to assist the process of accumulation. Her emphasis is on the reduction

of labor to common conditions which occurs at different time in different sectors of society. Industrial labor was proletarianized by machinery and the division of labor long before the impact of scientific management and technology began to impact in the office sector as it started to increase dramatically in size (52n).

Oppenheimer (1973:213) discusses the "proletarianization of the professional." He sees lower white collar labor as essentially fully proletarianized: "The clerical and sales strata of white collar life have long since been 'proletarianized'" (213). Hence, any further proletarianization must come in the relatively better situated professional labor, a position which Larson (1977) seems to support.

One of the recurring examples of the change in long term occupational situation is the proletarianization of the clerk (Braverman, 1974:249-51) of the 1800s from a respected managerial position and occupation to a reduced position in this century. As Speier noted (1939:10), once the clerk was a person destined for entrepreneurial independence, with a dependent situation only an interim position (17); the typical course of his career was "apprentice-assistant-boss." Klingender (1935) noted that once clerks had been a quasi-managerial position, but by the mid 1930s, they had taken on subordinate roles. This shift

was less obvious in that period, however, since clerk still worked in close contact with managerial persons and continued to assume a "middle class ideology."

Singleman and Wright (1978:9,29) explore the differences in predictions made by post-industrial theorists like Bell (1973) and Kerr (1974), and those of some Marxists. The post-industrial theorists hold that there is a constant upgrading of the skill and training levels of jobs as technology develops; Marxists hold the contrary position that there has been a decline in the level of skills and responsibility along with more routinization as capitalism develops. In pursuing the question of whether automation upgrades skills, Squires (1979:64-74) reviews the studies on skill levels and technology and concludes there is no clear evidence either way for overall upgrading or decline (a de facto challenge to the upgrading thesis). Squires (1979:73) and Braverman (1974) conclude that the increase in size of various occupational categories (e.g. white collar) which seem to indicate that higher skill levels are required is misleading because of the changes and decline in quality in the contents of the various jobs within the growing categories.

Singleman and Wright (1978) focus on two key segments of the labor force in exploring their thesis. Most important are what Wright (1977) calls "semi-autonomous"

employees, working people who have a lot of decision making power and freedom on the job. Those employees who are not semi-autonomous, Wright (1977) define as "workers," essentially proletarianized labor. Singleman and Wright (1978:i) predict that the percentages of semi-autonomous employees should be falling while the percentages of workers should be rising over time. In analyzing overall changes Singleman and Wright (1978) determine that in fact there has been a slight increase in both semi-autonomous employees and in workers in the the labor force overall for the decade of the 1960s. This is prima facie evidence that both proletarianization and deproletarianization are occurring.

Contradictory tendencies.

Speier (1939:9) mentions that Marx, in fact, made two predictions about the change in the class situation of white collar labor. Best known is the prediction in the Manifesto (Marx and Engels, 1977:222) of the proletarianization of the middle class. But in Theories of Surplus Value II, Marx (Speier, 1939:9) predicted the expansion of the "middle classes" whose existence aided the "upper ten thousand."⁸ Dahrendorf (1959:45-50), too, challenges, the deskilling thesis, questioning the rate of labor-process

8. See Urry (1973:177), and Nicolaus (1967:44-45) for similar points; Loren (1977) challenges the conclusion.

proletarianization. Bell (1973), Kerr (1974) and other post-industrial theorists see a process of upgrading labor.

Even Freedman (1975:52-3), while supporting the proletarianization thesis, sees the process proceeding at different rates with certain aspects counteracting or retarding the main tendency. The accumulation process has two tendencies, as Braverman (1974:53) notes: the polarization of a few skilled, salaried (and managerial) employees at the top and the reduced situations of most at lower levels.

Related is the tendency to concentrate planning functions in a few persons, and execution in the larger number. At one point this was a distinction between mental (white collar) and manual (blue collar) labor, but now the distinction exists within nonmaterial, white collar work as well. Bowles and Gintis (1978) question the homogenization thesis and instead hold to a concept of "heterogeneous labor." The differentiation within labor is a part of the division within the working class. The various occupations are not homogenized but polarized, with some skilled jobs distinguished from the larger group with lesser skills. In essence, stratification is occurring within the working class.

It is not clear that the same kinds of fragmenting processes which occurred in manufacture pertain to

administrative (white collar) labor. The labor of industrial workers produces commodities and profits, while white collar administrative labor is used to decrease realization costs, the expenses of selling and accounting. The addition of more industrial labor under proletarianized conditions provides a capitalist with more profit. But the addition of more white collar labor, even if proletarianized, increases realization costs. In the case of production, it may be to the advantage of the capitalist to add employees and increase the rate of surplus value through control and fragmentation of labor. In clerical and sales work, it is more advantageous to have fewer people with more skills to reduce realization costs. This does not argue that there is a class difference between productive and unproductive labor, only that there are different dynamics of fragmenting industrial and white collar labor.

The new working class theory, particularly in its European variants, joins these debates on proletarianization. While embourgeoisement theories tend to focus on the upgrading of industrial workers, including machine operators, most new working class theories emphasize the downgrading of technicians who work with rather complex machines and of white collar employees. But both are essentially discussing the convergence of physical conditions between white and blue collar groups. In

sometimes designating skilled workers and technicians as white collar and sometimes blue, these new working class theories blur the white collar-blue collar division of labor. For instance, Mallet and Blauner describe new working class technicians, including skilled workers, as essentially blue collar while the American version sees the main new working class as white collar. The distinctions in conditions and functions are disappearing.⁹

The reasons for defining certain groups as new working class is instructive in this regard. In the sense that self-employed white collar persons or their jobs were previously not in working class position, they are new members of the working class, experiencing simple proletarianization. Similarly as their conditions were once

9. What is happening to the white collar/blue collar distinction, and what is the collar color of a particular job, are secondary questions. Also important are what the new conditions produce. Some variants of the new working class theory stress the loss of status of educated workers, a type of proletarianization. Others stress that even seemingly improved conditions produce discontent. Ironically, both embourgeoisement and new working class theorists tend to agree on the merging of conditions of white collar and blue collar labor but differ on the expected consequences. In embourgeoisement theories better conditions produce workers integrated into middle class mainstream. In the new working class theories (e.g. Mallet, 1975:22,52), improved conditions for better prepared blue collar technicians produce discontent, through "conflictual participation" not integration or embourgeoisement. Rising educational levels produce rising expectations for jobs which are personally involving that come in conflict with over structured work situations.

more autonomous and skill-related, their lowered status is a new situation, like condition proletarianization. Their technical skills (and sometime supervisory functions) are being eroded as in intermediate proletarianization. In new working class theories, white collar employees experience decline in their conditions of employment as their work comes more and more to resemble blue collar jobs. Technical employees are new members of the working class in new conditions. In other words, technical labor are simultaneously experiencing simple, intermediate, and condition proletarianization.

Empirical Evidence On Simple Class Proletarianization

Census of Population Data.

The Census of Populations provides data on simple proletarianization, movement from self-employment to wage employment. Census figures on self- vs. wage and salary employment exist for each decennial period since 1940. Using these data it is possible to examine the change in the percentages of ownership to non-ownership. An increase in wage-employment (i.e. employees) indicates simple proletarianization.

Using Census of Population data (and Current Population Survey (CPS) in non-Census year, 1975), a time series was developed on the percentages of white collar occupations, at

the various levels, in working class position for 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970, and from the Current Population Survey (CPS) for 1975. These data are presented for 1) the entire white collar sector, 2) upper and lower white collar, and 3) the main white collar occupations.

From 1940 to 1975, the percentage of all white collar employees who are working for wages and salaries has grown from 79% to 91%. (This 11.7% increase is even greater in proportional terms, 14.8%.) In the upper white collar level, the increase in working class membership has been even greater; the total increased by 25.2%, almost 40% proportionally. (See Appendix 4.1 for trends in self-employment among doctors, lawyers and architects.)

TABLE 17
WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS IN WORKING CLASS POSITION,
LABOR FORCE, 1940-1975

OCCUPATION	1940	1950	1960	1970	1975	%40-75
WHITE COLLAR	79.2%	81.5%	85.5%	89.5%	90.9	+11.7
UPPER WC	62.1	67.4	77.1	84.6	87.3	+25.2
PROFESSIONAL	81.6	86.5	87.9	90.0	92.2	+10.6
MANAGERIAL	44.4	48.7	62.6	73.4	80.2	+35.8
LOWER WC	94.8	94.4	93.2	94.1	94.8	0.0
CLERICAL	98.4	98.2	97.5	97.2	97.5	-0.9
SALES	89.1	87.2	84.5	86.0	87.4	-1.7
TOTAL LF	76.9	81.0	86.7	90.1	90.3	+13.4

NOTE: Data 1940 to 1970 are from Census of Population, 1975 from the CPS. Percentages for 1970 and after exclude "employees of own corporations" from the self-employed, i.e. they are considered employees. Corresponding percentages for 1970 based on the Census and including employees of their own corporations as self-employed, are slightly greater: (from top to bottom) 91.9, 89.2, 91.9, 81.6, 95.4, 97.5, 88.9 and 91.6.

At the lower white collar level there has been virtually no net change in the period 1940 to 1975. After a small apparent decline in working class membership there has been an increase again in the 1970s. There appears to be small declines in clerical and sales percentages but these figures have been so high (about 95%) to begin with, that they had essentially reached a limit by 1940. Oppenheimer's (1973:213) conclusions that lower white collar proletarianization has already been almost fully effected is probably true, and the relevant question is whether there has been simple proletarianization of upper white collar labor. The conclusion seems to be that white collar labor, particularly in the upper sector, is increasingly in wage
10 and salary employment.

10. Loren (1977) estimates the proportion of the entire labor force in various class situations from 1940 to 1970 using Marxist categories. His estimates are similar to those based on Census data for the entire labor force under the operationalizations used here. Loren's estimates are for the entire labor force, not the white collar sector. Since white collar labor constitutes today roughly half the labor force (though over time there have been changes in the "collar" color of the labor force,) figures for the entire labor force are a proxy for white collar alone.

Intermediate Proletarianization

Based on the analysis in Chapter Two most supervisors are considered in the working class. However, it is instructive to examine the trends within the separated group of supervisory and nonsupervisory (CWC) employees to see the change in each. Singleman and Wright (1978:9), as well as the post-industrialist theorist like Bell (1973) whom they review, suggest that there should be an increase in supervisors over time. Two sources of data allow an examinations of the supervisors and nonsupervisory trends. Government surveys of employment by industry offer rough approximations for the white collar sector as a whole. Data from national sample surveys of the labor force offer more detailed views.

Government Surveys of Industry.

Intermediate proletarianization trends can be viewed through government surveys of employment by industry. Government surveys of industry allow an initial distinction within the employment category between supervisory and nonsupervisory employees. Incorporating Census data for self-employment and various calculations of labor force totals, it was possible to divide employment in the relevant industries into three class categories: self-employment, supervisory employment and nonsupervisory employment.

While these surveys are for industries and are not divided by occupations, because certain industries in the services sector have high percentages of white collar jobs (cf. Table 4, Chapter Three), it is possible to approximate the changes in white collar occupations by using those industries as proxies. For instances, 72.8% of service industry jobs are white collar; in finance the figure is 91.9%. (See Chapter Three for details on service industries chosen and white collar percentages.) By using the white collar concentrated industries, it was possible to make an approximation of the class categorical compositions for the white collar sector as a whole for the years 1968 to 1977, and examine relevant trends as presented in Table 2.

The conclusions from the data are mixed. In each service industry there appears to be an increase in supervisory labor, indicating a general intermediate deproletarianization of white collar labor. In services and trade, however, there is an increase in the proportion of nonsupervisory employment, indicating a proletarianization process. In most cases, there is a decline in self-employment, suggesting this as the source for increases in both supervisors and employees, and hence a simple, if not intermediary, proletarianization.

Singleman and Wright's (1978:22) prediction that certain service related industries would be experiencing

proletarianization appears to be supported by these data. Linear regressions over time of the supervisory and employees percentages in the services industries indicate tendencies for both supervisory and employee percentages to increase.¹¹ Both intermediate proletarianization and deproletarianization may be occurring simultaneously.

TABLE 18

CLASS CATEGORY PERCENTAGES IN
WHITE COLLAR CONCENTRATED INDUSTRIES

	SERVICE SECTOR			SERVICES			FINANCE		
	S-EM	SUPR	EMP	S-EM	SUPR	EMP	S-EM	SUPR	EMP
1968	12.1	9.6	76.9	16.1	6.7	76.1	7.1	19.0	73.4
1969	12.0	9.8	77.0	16.0	7.3	75.8	6.8	18.9	73.8
1970	11.6	10.1	77.1	15.3	7.8	76.1	6.4	19.3	73.7
1971	10.9	10.5	77.4	14.2	8.1	76.9	6.3	19.8	73.4
1972	11.1	10.4	77.3	14.7	8.1	76.3	6.2	20.1	73.2
1973	10.7	10.5	77.6	14.1	8.2	76.8	6.7	20.6	72.2
1974	10.7	10.7	77.5	14.0	8.3	77.0	6.7	21.4	71.5
1975	10.6	11.0	77.4	13.7	8.5	77.0	6.7	22.0	70.7
1976	10.4	11.0	77.8	13.5	8.5	77.4	6.8	21.9	70.8
1977	10.5	11.0	77.8	13.7	9.0	76.7	6.8	22.1	70.5
CHANGE -	-	+	++	-	+	++	=	+	-

11. The definition of supervisory employees for the "private, non-agricultural labor force" focuses on production/nonsupervisory vs. non-production (supervisory) workers and includes working supervisors (who are production workers) in the nonsupervisory category, and sales and credit employees (who are nonproduction) among supervisors. This distorts the composition of the categories but they probably cancel each other out in terms of affect on overall size. (See Appendix 3.2 to Chapter Three for details on definitions.)

	TRADE				WHOLESALE			RETAIL		
1968	10.0	9.7	78.5	5.2	15.0	79.2	11.7	8.1	78.2	
1969	9.9	9.7	78.7	5.7	14.9	78.8	11.2	8.0	78.6	
1970	9.8	9.8	78.7	5.6	15.0	78.8	11.3	8.1	78.6	
1971	9.4	10.0	78.9	5.6	15.5	78.2	11.2	8.2	78.5	
1972	9.4	10.0	79.0	5.1	15.4	78.8	10.6	8.3	79.0	
1973	8.9	10.1	79.5	5.2	15.5	78.7	10.0	8.4	79.7	
1974	9.0	10.3	79.3	5.3	15.5	78.7	10.1	8.6	79.5	
1975	8.9	10.5	79.8	5.1	16.2	78.3	10.2	8.9	80.9	
1976	8.5	10.5	79.9	5.4	16.2	78.0	9.4	8.7	80.3	
1977	8.5	10.7	79.5	5.3	16.4	77.7	9.5	8.9	80.1	
CHANGE	-	+	++	=	+	-	-	+	+	

NOTE: Base figures for total include self-employment by industry from unpublished BLS data. Figures on supervisory and nonsupervisory (or production) employment are from Table C-2 of the Manpower Report of the President (1978) based on CPS data for private non-agricultural industries. In the calculations, figures for unpaid family workers were included in overall labor force size, thus slightly reducing the percentages. Figures from some industries are available from 1947, but unpublished self-employment data could only be obtained from 1968. ++ means increase significant at .05.

It is also possible to estimate the changes in size of various class categories within the relevant white collar occupations based on seven national sample surveys at various points from 1945 to 1977. Each of these studies contains the appropriate variables, including occupation, and self- vs. wage-employment to identify class position by occupational level. Moreover, each contains a supervisory variable, based on a question of whether a respondent supervises others on the job, by which distinctions can be made within the working class. Estimates were made of the percentages of the labor force in the categories of

independents, employers, supervisors and employees for various white collar occupations. Combining the figures of the various surveys produces a time series for labor force proportions from 1945 to 1977.

The seven relevant surveys are:

TABLE 19
12
SEVEN NATIONAL SURVEYS IN TIME SERIES

- 1) Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, 1949. (OPOR #52, July 1945 data.)
- 2) Gerald Gurin, et al. American's View Their Mental Health (1957), 1960. (SRC 422, SSA 3503; Spring 1957; updated 1976)
- 3) Melvin Kohn, Class and Conformity, A Study In Values, 1969. (NORC 481, Spring 1964 data; updated 1974).
- 4) Robert Quinn, et al. Survey of Working Conditions, 1969-70; 1973. (SSA 3507, ISR; 1969-70 data.)
- 5) Robert Quinn, et al. The Quality of Employment Survey, 1972-3; 1975. (SSA 3510; 1972-3 data; update 1977)
- 6) Joseph Veroff, et al., The Study of Modern Living, 1976. (SRC 576; 1976 date; update of 1957)
- 7) James Davis, et al., General Social Survey, 1977. (NORC 9006, April 1977 data.)

12. Another possible data source, Morgan, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1975, (Wave 8, SRC 7439, 1975 data), though a large sample ($N > 4000$), is not used in the time series because it samples household heads. (Unweighted it is unrepresentative.) Since it asks questions on supervisory authority, the PSID can divide managers, with real authority from supervisors with nominal authority. A followup to Kohn (1964) done in 1974 only has members of the first sample who could be located 10 years

Time series based on the national sample surveys.

A time series was developed showing the progression in the relative sizes and proportions of the classes of ¹³ independents, employers, ¹⁴ supervisors and employees from 1945 to 1977 for white collar occupations using the seven national sample surveys. As with government surveys above, supervisors here are a proxy for authorized employees, and (nonsupervisory) employees a proxy for workers. This is not a fully adequate approach, because an increase in supervisors overall may mask an increase in the proportion of nominal supervisors, expanding the size of the category while suppressing indications of intermediate proletarianization. Similarly, an increase in the proportion of employees might mask an increase in the percentage of authorized employees, which would indicate a

later. This small group is representative of the full population since as men get older they tend to move up and for the small sample size. Roper's (1947) study of 3000 factory workers in 16 industries does not include self-employed or white collar workers, but identifies foremen. Almond and Verba (1963) ask supervision and self-employment questions of only a small sub-sample ($n=49$).

13. In some surveys, employers are designated as such (i.e. they employ); in others, they are defined as self-employed who supervise, an operationalization which overstates the size of the employer category. In the industry data above, no distinctions were possible among the self-employed.

14. The PSID provides data for distinguishing empowered from nominal supervisors from 1975 to 1979. However, since the emphasis here is on class defined for individuals, and because the 1978 and 1979 data were only recently available, these distinctions were not examined here.

deproletarianization.

A number of differences among the surveys had to be overcome in order to make relevant comparisons among the surveys. First, some of the surveys differ in the population bases they use. For instance, Centers (1945)¹⁵ uses the labor force of white males. The General Social Survey (1975) includes white and black, men and women. A common base had to be chosen from the studies for proper comparison. The largest common group in each study was the population of employed males in civilian occupations. The employed male subgroup, however, is not representative of the entire population, e.g. women and the unemployed, since men tend to have higher class positions than the excluded groups. Another problem is that the surveys differ in the sample size and hence the reliability and confidence limits of the results. This could be overcome by weighting the results by the square root of the sample size. Despite these problems, these data are the best available and are suggestive of answers to the questions on the change in class compositions over time.

The respective class-category percentages for each year and various white collar occupation for males are included

15. Because the six other surveys include both white and black males, and the percentage of black males was small in 1945, the Centers data are included in the series on males.

in Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 20

CLASS CATEGORIES FOR MAJOR WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
 (AND TOTALS), EMPLOYED MALES, 1945-1977
 (OCCUPATIONS WEIGHTED TO CPS PERCENTAGES)

YEAR	INDEPENDENT	EMPLOYER	SUPERVISER	EMPLOYEE	N	CPS%
------	-------------	----------	------------	----------	---	------

TOTAL (ALL OCCUPATIONS)

1945	15.6%	10.0	9.2	62.7	1144	100%
1957	10.0	9.0	23.8	57.2	908	
1964	8.3	9.3	29.3	53.1	3082	
1970	7.1	8.9	40.0	44.0	996	
1973	3.9	9.5	38.2	48.3	1270	
1976	5.7	8.7	35.9	49.7	691	
1977	4.7	9.5	31.3	54.4	499	

WHITE COLLAR

1945	7.3	19.5	20.7	53.1	341	29.7
1957	6.8	18.9	30.7	44.0	323	35.7
1964	5.1	13.6	43.2	38.2	790	38.4
1970	6.7	16.4	50.0	26.9	406	40.8
1973	3.6	15.6	49.2	31.5	505	39.7
1976	4.2	14.6	48.8	32.4	290	41.9
1977	2.1	17.0	41.1	39.9	204	40.8

UPPER WHITE COLLAR

1945	11.6	34.0	27.9	27.4	197	17.0
1957	10.0	27.6	34.8	27.6	210	23.1
1964	5.1	16.5	51.7	26.9	790	25.9
1970	7.8	22.8	55.3	14.1	279	28.0
1973	3.7	19.3	60.8	15.2	346	27.2
1976	4.9	19.8	51.8	23.4	203	29.4
1977	2.1	20.6	45.4	31.9	142	28.5

LOWER WHITE COLLAR

1945	1.3	0.0	11.1	87.6	146	12.7
1957	0.9	2.7	23.0	74.3	113	12.6
1964	5.1	7.8	26.3	60.9	396	12.5
1970	4.2	2.5	38.3	55.1	127	12.7
1973	1.4	7.6	24.2	66.8	160	12.6
1976	2.6	2.6	41.6	53.3	87	12.6
1977	2.1	8.5	31.0	58.4	61	12.3

TABLE 21

CLASS CATEGORIES FOR INDIVIDUAL WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS,
 EMPLOYED MALES, 1945-1977
 (OCCUPATIONS WEIGHTED TO CPS PERCENTAGES)

YEAR	INDEPEND	EMPLOYER	SUPERVISR	EMPLOYEE	N	CPS%
PROFESSIONAL						
1945	10.6%	7.1	19.9	62.4	141	6.8
1957	4.2	10.9	21.8	63.0	89	9.8
1964	5.2%	8.2	41.6	45.2	365	12.0
1970	3.5	3.5	68.8	24.1	138	13.9
1973	2.1	7.4	68.4	22.2	181	13.6
1976	1.6	7.4	47.5	43.4	104	15.0
1977	1.1	11.0	41.8	46.2	73	14.6
MANAGERIAL						
1945	11.8	51.9	33.2	3.2	187	10.2
1957	14.3	39.7	44.4	1.6	121	13.3
1964	5.0	23.6	60.4	11.1	424	13.9
1970	12.0	41.6	42.2	4.2	141	13.6
1973	7.2	31.2	53.2	8.4	173	13.7
1976	8.4	32.8	56.3	2.5	99	14.4
1977	3.1	30.8	49.2	16.9	69	13.9
CLERICAL						
1945	-	0.0	-	-		
1957	0.0	0.0	17.4	82.6	62	6.9
1964	0.5	0.0	33.5	66.0	215	7.0
1970	0.0	0.0	44.6	55.4	71	7.1
1973	0.0	0.0	31.3	68.7	91	6.6
1976	2.6	0.0	43.6	53.8	45	6.5
1977	0.0	0.0	44.0	56.0	30	6.3
SALES						
1945	-	0.0	-	-		
1957	1.8	5.5	29.1	63.6	51	5.7
1964	10.5	17.1	17.7	54.7	181	5.5
1970	9.4	5.7	30.2	54.7	56	5.6
1973	2.9	16.2	16.2	64.7	75	5.9
1976	2.6	5.3	39.5	52.9	42	6.1
1977	4.3	17.4	17.4	60.9	31	6.0

Intermediate proletarianization and national survey results.

A number of statistical analyses were applied to the survey data on males to discover underlying trends. First, the results were plotted against year to indicate general movements over time. For most white collar levels there appears to be an increase in the percentages of supervisors and a decline in the percentage of employees, followed by a decline in supervisors and increase in employees. These results suggest an intermediate deproletarianization before 1970 followed by an intermediate proletarianization in the 1970s. (See Appendix 4.2 for the details of the plots and regressions.)

A number of regression procedures were explored in order to find a proper fit for data. To begin with, the percentage of white collar employees in each of four subclasses, independents, employers, supervisors and employees were regressed against time (year). The regression were weighted by the square root of the sample size (N) to compensate for differences in sampling errors from different size samples. As in the Census data, overall percentages of self-employed were generally dropping; in most cases, independents declined; employers overall stayed about the same, though in some cases (e.g. lower white collar) they increased. (As working class is the focus,

regressions on self-employment data are not discussed here.)

Using least squares linear regressions, trend lines for supervisors and employees were obtained for each occupational subgroup for males for the entire period 1945-77.

TABLE 22
DIRECTIONS OF CHANGES FOR CATEGORY PERCENTAGES
SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES, 1945-77
(MALES)

	SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES
WHITE COLLAR	++	--
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	++	(-)
PROFESSIONAL	++	--
MANAGERIAL	+	(+)
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	++	--
CLERICAL	++	--
SALES	(+)	(-)
TOTAL	++	--

NOTE: A regression equation with positive slope is indicated by a plus (+) sign, a negative slope by a minus (-) sign. Those coefficient significant at $p \leq .05$ are indicated by ++/--; at $p \leq .10$ by +/-; at $p > .10$ by (+)/(-) ($n=7$, $df=5$, one-tailed test).

For the major supervisory occupational groups of total, white collar, and upper white collar, the slopes were positive and significantly different from zero. For all of the employee groups but managers, the slopes were negative,

though only total, white collar, lower white collar (including clerical) slopes were significantly different from zero at $p \leq .05$. This suggests that between 1945 and 1977 (male) supervisors have risen in absolute percentages, while employees percentages have fallen. This indicates deproletarianization. But linear regression, by summarizing an overall trend only, misses the possibility of non-linear trends indicated by the scatterplots.

A more detailed examination of the data and plots indicated that there might be a change occurring in the directions of the trends around 1970. While from 1945 to 1970, supervisory employees appeared to be increasing, after 1970 the percentages of supervisors appeared to be dropping and the percentages of (nonsupervisory) employees growing. Linear regressions were run for the years 1945 to 1970 and 1970 to 1977 on the data for men. For 1945 to 1970 all the supervisory slopes were positive and those for the large groupings e.g. white collar, were significant. The slopes for male employees for 1945 to 1970 were all negative (except for managers), and total, white collar and lower white collar were significant.

TABLE 23
 DIRECTIONS OF CHANGES FOR CATEGORIES PERCENTAGES
 SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES, 1945-70, 1970-77
 (MALES)

	1945-70		1970-77	
	SUPERVISOR	EMPLOYEE	SUPERVISOR	EMPLOYEE
WHITE COLLAR	++	--		--
UPPER WC	++	(-)		(-)
PROFESSIONAL	+	-		--
MANAGERIAL	(+)	(+)		(+)
LOWER WC	++	--		(-)
CLERICAL	++	--		(+)
SALES	(+)	(-)		(-)
TOTAL	++	--		--
				++

NOTE: ++/-- means significant at $p \leq .05$; +/- at $p \leq .10$;
 (+)/(-) at $p > .10$ ($n=4$, $df=2$, one-tailed test).

From 1970-77, the trend appeared to be reversing to a decline in supervisors and an increase in employees. Slopes for all male supervisory categories except managers and clericals were negative. Those for employees (except clerical and lower white collar) were positive. While only the slopes for total and professional supervisors and total employees were significant at .05, slopes for white collar and upper white collar employees were significant at .10. The data for 1970 to 1977, while not without their problems, suggest intermediate proletarianization by the decline in the supervisory percentages. The general growth in employee

categories tends to support this, though not always significantly. This apparently suggests that intermediate proletarianization of white collar employees started around 16 1970 and continued through the decade. These trends for the white collar occupations seem to support the proletarianization thesis, though they are not unambiguous.

Intermediate proletarianization in the 1970s.

While longer term (1945-77) data are only available for men alone, a short time series for the entire labor force exists for the 1970s, allowing an examination of intermediate proletarianization during the entire labor

16. To further examine the trend, a number of non-linear regressions were run on the seven data points. While log, exponential and power curves did not more adequately fit the data than the linear regressions, in some case second order (quadratic) regressions did prove a more effective fit. In the case of supervisory employees the parabolas were convex (closed) to the origin, indicating initial rising in the proportions of supervisors and then falling. The parabola for the employees was concave (open) to the origin indicating initial decline in the proportions of employees followed by a current rise. These data are evidence for intermediate proletarianization now in progress. In most cases, the proportion of explained variation in the percentage of supervisory employees (R^2) was higher for the quadratic regressions, and the standard errors of estimate around the regression line were smaller for the quadratic regressions. However, this is in part an artifact of adding one more term to the regression equation. While the signs on the slope for the coefficient on the second order terms were in the right directions (e.g. negative for supervisors and positive for employees) to be indications of intermediate proletarianization, none of them were significant at .05. Hence the double linear regressions, which produced significant slopes, evaluate the trends more correctly.

force for that period. The data appear below:

TABLE 24

CLASS CATEGORIES FOR MAJOR WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
 (AND TOTALS), NATIONAL SURVEYS, TOTAL LABOR FORCE, 1970-77
 (OCCUPATIONS WEIGHTED TO CPS PERCENTAGES)

YEAR	INDEP	EMPLOYER	SUPERVISER	EMPLOYEE	N	CPS%
------	-------	----------	------------	----------	---	------

WHITE COLLAR TOTALS

1970	5.2	10.1	43.4	41.3	732	47.8
1973	3.2	9.0	41.4	46.4	988	47.7
1976	3.5	8.5	39.9	48.0	617	51.3
1977	2.1	9.9	38.9	49.1	463	50.9

UPPER WHITE COLLAR

1970	8.0	18.5	53.9	19.5	381	24.9
1973	4.9	15.4	57.6	22.1	500	24.1
1976	5.7	14.6	49.4	30.3	315	26.2
1977	2.1	15.2	48.7	34.0	231	25.4

LOWER WHITE COLLAR

1970	2.1	0.9	32.1	65.0	351	22.9
1973	1.5	2.5	24.8	71.2	488	23.6
1976	1.3	2.1	30.1	66.5	302	26.2
1977	2.3	4.5	29.1	64.2	231	25.4

ALL OCCUPATIONS

1970	5.4	6.3	36.1	52.2	1531	100%
1973	3.9	7.1	34.1	54.9	2168	
1976	5.1	6.2	31.4	57.3	1202	
1977	3.7	6.9	31.1	58.2	910	

TABLE 25

CLASS CATEGORIES FOR INDIVIDUAL WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS,
 NATIONAL SURVEYS, MEN AND WOMEN, 1970-77
 (OCCUPATIONS WEIGHTED TO CPS PERCENTAGES)

YEAR	INDEP	EMPLOYER	SUPERVISER	EMPLOYEE	N	CPS%
PROFESSIONAL						
1970	4.0%	2.7	62.9	30.3	215	14.1
1973	1.9	4.4	62.2	31.5	288	13.9
1976	2.3	4.1	45.8	47.8	187	15.5
1977	1.9	7.1	44.6	46.3	133	15.2
MANAGERIAL						
1970	13.2	39.1	42.2	5.4	165	10.5
1973	9.0	30.2	51.3	9.4	212	10.3
1976	10.5	30.0	54.6	4.8	128	10.6
1977	2.3	27.1	54.8	15.8	93	10.3
			++	+		
CLERICAL						
1970	0.8	0.0	33.4	65.8	257	16.8
1973	0.6	0.0	26.9	72.5	357	17.3
1976	0.5	1.9	31.3	66.3	226	18.8
1977	0.6	2.5	34.2	62.6	174	19.1
SALES						
1970	5.6	3.4	28.5	62.5	215	6.1
1973	3.9	9.4	19.1	67.7	130	6.3
1976	3.8	2.9	26.5	66.8	77	6.4
1977	6.8	10.5	13.5	69.2	58	6.4

The results in these tables and from linear regressions of the percentages over time (See Table 63) tend to indicate that for the full white collar labor force during the 1970s there has been an intermediate proletarianization. For supervisors in all occupational categories except managerial

and clerical, the regression slopes were negative. Though only total and white collar (including professional) slopes were significantly negative, the agreement of signs suggests that supervisors have probably declined in the 1970s for each of the levels of the white collar labor force, supporting the proletarianization thesis. Using a non-parametric sign test for six out of eight signs (negative slopes) in agreement produces significance at $p \leq .05$. The slopes for total, white collar and upper white collar (including professional) employees were positive and significant, similarly suggesting increases in the employee categories among upper white collar labor and hence proletarianization there. For lower white collar and clerical employees the slope was negative but close to zero and not significant, probably indicating no change within these categories. These data tend to support the intermediate proletarianization thesis for white collar labor in the 1970s, though not without questions. The directions and significance of changes are summarized in Table 26.

TABLE 26

SUMMARY OF DIRECTIONS OF CHANGES,
 SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES PERCENTAGES,
 TOTAL LABOR FORCE, 1970-77

	SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES
WHITE COLLAR	--	++
UPPER WHITE COLLAR	(-)	++
PROFESSIONAL	--	++
MANAGERIAL	++	(+)
LOWER WHITE COLLAR	(-)	(-)
CLERICAL	(+)	(-)
SALES	(-)	+
TOTAL	--	++

NOTE: ++/-- indicates significant increase or decrease at p $\leq .05$; +/- means p $\leq .10$; (+)/(-) at p $> .10$ (n=4, df=2, one-tailed test).

Condition Proletarianization: Comparing Studies Over Time

Imputed Estimates of Proletarianization, 1960-1970.

Singleman and Wright (1978) examined condition
¹⁷ proletarianization between 1960 and 1970. Previously Wright (1977:4) developed the category of "semi-autonomous

17. Wright (1977:27) finds that most lower white collar employees in clerical and sales jobs are in the working class. In fact, the percentage of lower white collar employees who are in nonsupervisory members of the working class (54.5%) is greater than the percentage of upper blue collar workers (32.1%) in the same position. He (1977:12) concludes that "crafts occupations are ... much less proletarianized ... than clerical white collar occupations," a result tied to the inclusion of foremen in the craft category.

"employee" as someone who had "a lot" of freedom and decision-making on the job. "Workers" were the residual category of employees who were neither supervisors nor semi-autonomous. Changes in the size of the semi-autonomous and worker categories between 1960 and 1970 would suggest whether or not condition proletarianization had been occurring.

Singleman and Wright (1978) estimated class category sizes for semi-autonomous employees and workers in 1960 and 1970 by applying class proportions from the "Survey of Working Conditions" to Census occupation and industry figures. While they did not have class category data for 1960 and 1970, they did have Census data on the shifts in occupation and industry compositions. They imputed class structure data for the decennial years by applying the class structure found in the SWC for each of the eleven occupation within 37 major industries to the corresponding industry-specific occupations in both 1960 and 1970. This assumes that there was no change in the class compositions for various occupations within industries between the two dates (which is contrary to the proletarianization thesis). It was possible to explore aggregate changes by summing the industry-specific figures for the given years and examining the overall results. For the entire labor force, there appears to have been small increases in both the categories

of semi-autonomous employees and workers (as well as supervisors) between 1960 and 1970, and declines in both employers and independents in the same period. This suggests both deproletarianization and proletarianization.

Singleman and Wright (1978:33) decomposed the changes in the class structure into industry-shift effects and class-composition shift effects. Industry are shifts between industries, and class-composition shifts are due to changes in class structure within industries. They (1978:19) discovered that within industries there was a large class composition shift effect; semi-autonomous employees were declining and workers (but also supervisors) increasing, an indication of proletarianization. The class-composition changes were masked, however, by a shift from industries like manufacturing which were already heavily proletarianized (i.e. with a high proportion of workers) to service industries which were much less proletarianized. Wright and Singleman (1978:22) hypothesize that as time goes on, the rate of growth of service industries will decline and the rate of proletarianization continue both within and between industries, producing net proletarianization for the rest of the century.

Since they assume no change in composition within industry-specific occupations, the conclusion of Wright and Singleman (1978) that there is evidence for

13

proletarianization is all the more surprising. Their estimates, however, are only approximates since the semi-autonomous category is merely generally specified by the choice of the two variables (decision-making and freedom), and the category of worker is a residual of non semi-autonomous employees. The estimates are based on data by industries, moreover, and are not examined for specific occupational categories. Also, these data are for the period 1960 to 1970, and do not describe what has happened in the 1970s.

In Chapter Three operationalizations were created for the categories of "authorized employees" and "workers" using SWC data from 1970. Using questions on job conditions, it is possible to develop somewhat similar specifications for these categories in other studies in the time series, e.g. Gurin (1957), Veroff (1976), Quinn (1970, 1973). However, since not all of these studies contain the same questions, it was not possible to create comparable estimates of the sizes of the authorized employees and workers categories for each year. It is possible, however, to find the suggestions of trends by using pairs of studies separated by a number of

18. Wright and Singleman (1978:13,16) discuss the details and limitations of this approach in the body and appendices of a paper presented at a Conference on the Labor Process at SUNY-Binghamton in May 1978.

years, when the same questions were asked at the different points in time. Unfortunately, only two pairs of studies fit these criteria well, and there are limitation with those groups.

Gurin (1957) and Veroff (1976).

One pair of similar studies on which to apply the specifications (created using the SWC) for evidence supporting or challenging the proletarianization thesis consist of Gurin's Americans View Their Mental Health (1957) and what is essentially a replication of that survey, Veroff's Study Of Modern Living (1976). Each study contains the supervisory variable for at least a small subsample (290 and 703), as well as questions on the conditions at work. Though the variety of questions asked in these studies is more limited than in the SWC, the pair offers an initial opportunity to examine whether the percentages of authorized employees decreased and the percentages of workers increased over time. Using discriminant analysis, it was possible to develop a set of discriminating variables for these studies and approximate the size of the author and worker categories at the two points in time.¹⁹

After operationalizing the authorized employee and

19. For Gurin (1957) and Veroff (1976) the best discriminators were years on the job, having a supervisor, the degree of supervision, and the good aspects of the job.

worker situations for each year (1957, 1976), the percentages for each occupational level in each subclass were calculated. The proportions were compared for significant differences.

TABLE 27

COMPARISONS OF RESULTS FOR 1957 AND 1976,
MAJOR WHITE COLLAR CATEGORIES (AND TOTAL),
GURIN V. VEROFF, WEIGHTED N

	INDEP	EMPLR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
WHITE COLLAR							
1957	6.2%	14.8	34.9	19.8	15.4	9.0	103
1976	4.2	14.6	48.8	15.6	10.7	6.0	290
DIFFR	-2.0	-0.2	13.9	-4.2	-4.7	-3.0	
SIGN.	---	---	***	---	---	---	
UPPER WHITE COLLAR							
1957	9.6	22.8	42.0	14.0	3.9	7.7	76
1976	4.9	19.8	51.8	10.0	9.2	4.2	203
DIFFR	-4.7	-3.0	9.8	-4.0	5.3	-3.5	
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---	
LOWER WHITE COLLAR							
1957	0.0	0.0	21.7	30.7	36.5	11.4	36
1976	2.6	2.6	41.6	28.6	14.3	10.4	87
DIFFR	2.6	2.6	19.9	-1.8	-22.2	-1.0	
SIGN.	---	---	***	---	***	---	
TOTAL							
1957	9.4	8.9	26.2	24.5	16.6	14.4	290
1976	6.4	9.0	35.4	20.2	16.7	12.2	703
DIFFR	-3.0	0.1	9.2	-4.3	0.1	-2.2	
SIGN.	---	---	***	---	---	---	

NOTE: Differences significant at $p \leq .05$ are indicated by ***.

TABLE 28

COMPARISONS OF RESULTS FOR 1957 AND 1976,
 INDIVIDUAL WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS,
 GURIN V. VEROFF, WEIGHTED N

	INDEP	EMPLR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
PROFESSIONAL							
1957	0.0	11.8	44.1	26.5	5.9	11.8	28
1976	1.6	7.4	47.5	18.9	17.2	7.4	104
DIFFR	1.6	-4.4	3.4	-7.6	11.3	-4.4	
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---	
MANAGERIAL							
1957	16.7	31.0	40.5	4.8	2.4	4.8	39
1976	8.4	32.8	56.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	99
DIFFR	-8.3	1.8	15.8	-4.0	-1.6	-4.0	
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---	
CLERICAL							
1957	0.0	0.0	25.0	31.3	37.5	6.3	20
1976	2.6	0.0	43.6	28.2	15.4	10.3	45
DIFFR	2.6	0.0	18.6	-3.1	-22.1	4.0	
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---	
SALES							
1957	0.0	0.0	17.6	29.4	35.3	17.6	16
1976	2.6	5.3	39.5	28.9	13.2	10.5	42
DIFF	2.6	5.3	21.9	-0.5	-22.1	-7.0	
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---	

NOTE: Differences significant at $p \leq .05$ are indicated by ***.

These results indicate that in the 1957/1976 comparisons all authorized employees groups declined and almost all worker groups (except for clerical) also declined. Thus, there is evidence of both proletarianization and deproletarianization. But none of

the differences in the author or worker categories are statistically significant at the .05 level because of the small sample sizes. An equally plausible interpretation is that there have been no significant changes in the levels of these subcategories from 1957-1976. However, using a non-parametric sign test indicates that the probability that all signs on the authors categories and virtually all on the worker categories would be so organized by chance is extremely low ($p < .01$). This suggests that, over all, from 1957 to 1976, authors decreased but so did workers. Again this suggests both deproletarianization and proletarianization.

Quinn (1970 vs. 1973).

Comparison of two similar studies was also possible using the "Survey of Working Conditions" of 1970 and what is essentially a follow-up, the "Quality of Employment Survey" of 1973. As in the case of examining intermediate proletarianization from 1970 (rather than 1945) to 1977, the central focus here is not what has happened over the long term alone, but what has happened more recently i.e. in the 1970s. The various class categories, including "authorized employees" and "workers," were operationalized in both studies following similar procedures to those used for the SWC in Chapter Three.²⁰ Only variables shared by both

studies were used in the discriminant analyses. As the sample sizes here are larger, the possibilities of statistically significant differences is greater. The results here indicate what was occurring in the early 1970s.

Comparisons of the SWC and QES indicate both an increase in the size of authorized employees and worker categories in the white collar sectors. In some cases, these results are statistically significant.

-
20. The best discriminators for both SWC and QES were years on the job, having (or not having) a boss, (not)/belonging to a union, (not)/being allowed to make decisions, (not)/having the opportunity on the job to develop abilities, and be creative, and (not)/having repetitious work.

TABLE 29

COMPARISONS OF RESULTS FOR 1970 AND 1973,
 MAJOR WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS (AND TOTAL)
 SWC VS. QES, WEIGHTED N

INDEP	EMPLOYR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
WHITE COLLAR						
1970	5.2	10.1	43.4	16.3	15.1	9.8 732
1973	3.2	9.0	41.4	20.0	15.9	10.5 988
DIFFR	-2.0	-1.1	-2.0	+3.7	+0.8	+0.7
SIGN.	***	---	---	--*	---	---
UPPER WHITE COLLAR						
1970	8.0	18.5	53.9	9.4	6.7	3.5 381
1973	4.9	15.4	57.6	11.5	6.2	4.5 500
DIFFR	-3.1	-3.1	+3.7	+2.1	-0.5	+1.0
SIGN.	---	----	---	---	---	---
LOWER WHITE COLLAR						
1970	2.1	0.9	32.1	23.9	24.3	16.8 351
1973	1.5	2.5	24.8	28.7	25.8	16.7 488
DIFFR	-0.6	1.6	-7.3	+4.8	+1.5	-0.1
SIGN.	---	---	***	---	---	---
TOTAL						
1970	5.4	6.3	36.1	18.6	18.3	15.3 1531
1973	4.0	7.1	34.1	22.2	19.7	12.9 2068
DIFFR	-1.4	0.8	-2.0	+3.6	+1.4	-2.4
SIGN.	***	---	---	***	---	***

NOTE: *** means significant at $p \leq .05$; --* means significant at $p \leq .10$; --- means not significant.

TABLE 30

COMPARISONS OF RESULTS FOR 1970 AND 1973,
INDIVIDUAL WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
(SWC VS. QES, WEIGHTED N)

INDEX	EMPLOYR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
PROFESSIONAL						
1970	4.0	2.7	62.9	13.8	11.1	5.4 215
1973	1.9	4.4	62.2	15.6	8.6	7.3 288
DIFFR	-2.1	1.7	-0.7	+1.8	-2.5	+1.9
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---
MANAGERIAL						
1970	13.2	39.1	42.2	3.5	0.9	1.0 165
1973	9.0	30.2	51.3	5.9	2.9	0.6 212
DIFFR	-4.2	-8.9	9.1	+2.4	+2.0	-0.4
SIGN.	---	-**-	-**-	---	---	---
CLERICAL						
1970	0.8	0.0	33.4	21.0	25.5	19.3 257
1973	0.6	0.0	26.9	26.6	29.2	16.6 357
DIFFR	-0.2	0.0	-6.5	+5.6	+3.7	-2.7
SIGN.	---	---	-**-	---	---	---
SALES						
1970	5.6	3.4	28.5	31.9	21.0	9.7 94
1973	3.9	9.4	19.1	34.5	16.3	16.9 130
DIFFR	-1.7	6.0	-9.4	+2.6	+4.7	+7.2
SIGN.	---	---	---	---	---	---

NOTE: *** means significant at $p \leq .05$; -**- means significant at $p \leq .10$; --- means not significant.

The data seem to suggest that authors have increased in the early 1970s. While only for the total labor force is the increase in authors significant, each category in white collar labor shows some increase in authors' percentages. A non-parametric sign test on the pattern of (all) positive

signs indicates a very low likelihood of such a pattern of increases by chance ($p \leq .05$).

However, there are no statistically significant differences among workers, though white collar workers have increased slightly (0.7%) overall. The distribution of signs for changes in category percentages, however, shows an equal number of increases and decreases. The probable conclusions is that authors increased in the early 1970s,
²¹ while workers stayed approximately the same. This suggests deproletarianization of white collar labor in the early 1970s.

21. Only studies containing the same variables are compared above, because valid comparison can only be made between categories operationalized in the same way. However, it is possible to compare studies with different variables used in the operationalizations of authors and workers if the results are seen as suggestive and not conclusive. In order to add another year to the comparisons of changes in percentages and extend the trend beyond mid-decade, the data for men for 1970 and 1973 (which could not be compared to QES 1977 because of the change in the supervisory variable) were compared to those for men for 1976 in the "Study of Modern Living" (Appendix 4.4). The 1976 figures support the conclusions that authors have increased and workers have not changed in the 1970s. All the author differences are positive (and for men alone about the same magnitude as for combined totals) except for managers. While for male workers the changes tend more toward increases than for the total populations, suggesting proletarianization, they tend to support a conclusion of no significant change in workers in the 1970s.

It would be possible to do a similar comparison for the entire labor force for 1970, 1973 and 1976, but because its results would only be suggestive, this procedure was not done. These three studies share two common variables as significant discriminators, having a supervisor and job tenure, so it is conceivable to operationalize and compare categories for each year. However, since these are only two

Despite the statistical insignificance, the pattern of changes in category percentages for white collar occupations are worth examining. Besides the slight increase overall (0.7%), for white collar, upper white collar percentages show a 1% increase and sales workers a 7.2% growth. There appears to be growth in workers in the upper white collar levels, and no growth in lower white collar. The data are no clear enough to test Oppenheimer's (1973) suggestion that lower white collar jobs are fairly well proletarianized and any significant proletarianization to occur in the future must be in the upper sectors. In fact, the largest (7.2%), though statistically insignificant growth, is in clericals of the lower white collar sector. In any case, the results indicate that there is both a proletarianizing tendency and a deproletarianizing tendency occurring simultaneously. Due to the absence of conclusive data, the overall trends are
22
not yet possible to determine.

The comparisons of the Gurin-Veroff (1957-76) and the SWC-QES (1970-73) studies suggest a pattern of rise and fall similar to those discovered in the various analyses of data

variables and not generally descriptive of what a worker might be, this procedure was not pursued.

22. For men, too, there appears to be a growth in workers in upper white collar jobs. In particular, there is a statistically significant increase of 5.3% in workers among professionals. For women the trend toward more workers is more prevalent in the clerical levels. Women appear to be experiencing a deproletarianization (improvement in upper white collar jobs.) See Appendix 4.4 for tables.

on intermediate proletarianization. The linear trends based on regression over all the years appear to suggest that supervisors and authors have increased over the long term. But trends detected by linear regression obscure rises and falls over time as well as change in the rates of change. The more current trend for the 1970s is a general increase in authorized employees, but there are also decline in supervisors and increase in workers in some categories. The figures and significance tests suggest that both a proletarianization and deproletarianization are occurring at the same time.²³ Perhaps, as Singleman and Wright (1978:22) suggest, the proletarianization trends are just beginning to make themselves felt in the 1970s.²⁴ Or perhaps as Bowles and Gintis (1978) suggest, polarization is occurring.

23. Along with an increase in authorized employees, in some cases, there is a decrease in the supervisory category. To the extent that a decline in supervisors is tied to an increase in the category of nonsupervisory authors, this may indicate a real decline in authority overall and suggests a proletarianization tendency.

24. The "Quality of Employment Study" for 1977 (a counterpart to QES, 1973, and SWC, 1970) also could not be used to compare percentages of authors and workers over time because of a significant flaws from changing the supervision variable. The earlier studies (1970, 1973) asked respondents if they supervised anyone on the job. The 1977 version asks if supervising is a major part of the job. (The principal investigator has been written about including the earlier question in later waves.) The General Social Survey, begun in 1972, only includes the supervision and self employment questions in 1977, and the variety of questions is limited. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics, whose respondents are household heads (and wives in 1976), only added the supervision question in 1975.

Some Tentative Conclusions

The proletarianization question has been examined at four levels: review of the literature, simple-class proletarianization, intermediate proletarianization, and condition proletarianization within the CWC. The literature suggests that the same forces which have proletarianized blue collar labor affect white collar labor essentially similarly. There exist, however, differences in administrative from production labor, and countervailing tendencies within white collar labor.

The questions of simple proletarianization were addressed using Census data on the increase in the number of employees working for wages and salaries. The overall trend is that simple proletarianization has been occurring in the white collar sector as a whole. This trend is particularly clear in the upper white collar sector of professional and managerial employees. In the lower white collar sector there has been a net stability over 35 years. In part this is because even 40 years ago the lower white collar sector had experienced almost complete simple proletarianization, going from self-employment to wage-employment. However, within the sales sector, and to a lesser extent within clerical workers, there has been a small net decline but not a meaningful change in wage employment, since these jobs

have essentially experienced simple proletarianization.

On the level of intermediate proletarianization within the working class between supervisory employees and members of the CWC, there are also indications of intermediate proletarianization at least in recent years. While supervisory employees increased from 1940 for about 30 years, there is indication now that this trend has reversed in the 1970s and that particularly in the upper white collar sectors supervisors have decreased as employees in the CWC have increased. Linear regressions on the trends since 1970 suggest that there has been an intermediate proletarianization tendency in the last decade.

Finally, the data on condition proletarianization of the central working class are mixed in their indications. There is evidence for both deproletarianization and proletarianization. On the one hand, it appears that authorized employees have decreased since the late 1950s (proletarianization), but increased in the 1970s (deproletarianization). Workers, too, have apparently decreased since the end of the 1950s, but stayed about the same in the 1970s, so that the seeming deproletarianization may have leveled off in recent years. The data are limited and the trends rather contradictory, and it is yet to be proven whether the net overall trend in white collar labor is toward proletarianization or deproletarianization (or

perhaps polarization). Singleman and Wright (1978) postulate a possibly accelerating proletarianization of the labor force overtime, as previously deproletarianized industries become more structured. Further study in the coming decade may establish the direction of the trends.

C H A P T E R V
WHITE COLLAR CLASS AND EDUCATION

Introduction

There are many significant connections between white collar class and education, particularly, higher education. White collar work often suggests the image of professionally-trained occupations, and many white collar jobs today require some form of post-secondary education. Teachers and professors, moreover, are white collar occupations. This chapter explores a number of these ties between education and white collar class.

The chapter does not, however, attempt to explore a full theory of white collar class and education. Instead, it is to suggest the ties that exist and to provide examples of the usefulness of applying to education the class perspective outlined in earlier chapters on white collar work as a whole. It examines three area. First is a review of two theories tieing higher education and class. Second is an examination of the class situation of teachers and professors. Third is a preliminary investigation of the links between levels of education and jobs. The chapter, in essence, indicates the value of the topic of white collar class for the analysis of education.

While many studies e.g. Squires (1979) discuss issues of education and class, their analysis is typically based on a model of social stratification (or socioeconomic status) rather than on a model of class as defined here. It is not the goal of this chapter to examine education and socioeconomic stratification, though education is often used as part of the definition of such stratification. Rather the chapter applies a positional definition of class, one related to ownership, to the study of various aspects of education. Hence this work adds to the small body of studies exploring relationships between positional class and education. This work complements that which Wright (1977) has done on positional class and income inequality. Wright, for instance, provides evidence of the value of positional class as an explanatory variable in his study of income return to education. Wright (1977) discovered that the return to education is higher for employers than for managers, and higher for managers than for employees.

The first section of the chapter explores the developments of two theories of class and college students in universities. These theories were some of the early attempts to link higher education with job training, focusing on upper white collar jobs. The theories of student syndicalism and of the new working class as higher educated labor were historical developments of the New Left

in universities in the middle 1960s. In this country, the conceptions were developed as theoretical background for organizing campus activism. They also provide insights in retrospect into why activism occurred. While too narrowly focused in their 1960s applications to university students, their supercession lead to more generalized attempts to explore white collar class outside of the universities. Furthermore, based on extenions of these theories, initial political organizing was begun in the post-college professional population. Later, the lower levels of the higher educational system, particularly community colleges, were included in the analyses.

The second major section of the chapter explores the class situations of two groups of educated labor with particular relevance to education, teachers and professors. Applied here is some of the same analysis used in the exploration of white collar labor as a whole.

The third major section explores more specific connections between education and white collar jobs. This is a partial exploration of the growing stratified system of higher education and the class structure in relation to the white collar labor force. Higher education has become a stratified system from community colleges and vocational schools at the bottom to elite universities at the top. While each college level has its own internal

stratification, there are certain parallels between the kind of college one attends and the white collar job he or she enters. In essence, there is a tracking from school to job.

Student Syndicalism and the New Working Class Theory

During the later 1960s, two theories of social action emerged from the New Left, both of which focused on the movement itself and its members. The first approach was called "student syndicalism." The second explored the analysis and organization of the "new working class." Both dealt with issues directly affecting members of the New Left but tied them to wider societal concerns.

The New Left as a movement often provided support for other movements whose central concerns and actors were outside of the New Left. For example, the civil rights and anti-Vietnam War movements involved social struggles of black Americans and the Vietnamese people, which members of the New Left assisted. Even war-related issues like the draft and defense-research, which the New Left was active in opposing and which did affect members of the New Left, had their main impact on others. Student syndicalism and the new working class analysis, on the other hand, as approaches to theory, organization, and class, are to be distinguished for their essential focus on members of the movement itself. In this way, they represented theories of self-analysis.

self-interest, and self-action for the New Left. In essence, they were theories of class.

In the middle 1960s, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was involved in community organizing in a number of poor and black communities including Newark and Chicago through the Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP). In 1965, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) called on the national black community to organize itself. This heralded the emergence of "Black Power" as an issue and approach, while ushering the white New Left out of community organization as a focus. In a related development around 1966, the SDS began a "return to the campus," from which, as at Berkeley two years before, the movement has drawn its strength. The task became organizing other students for action around their own concerns.

First articulated in mid 1966 (Sale, 1973:278), the phrase "student power" would be heard on various campuses around the country. The student power movement was soon embodied in a theory of "student syndicalism," articulated in August 1966 by Carl Davidson at the SDS National Convention in Clear Lake, Iowa. Briefly tried at Wisconsin, Penn State, (Davidson's alma mater) and Nebraska (where he was teaching), the emphasis, while manifestly on university reform issues like grades which touched students directly,

was more concerned, at least in theory, with related political issues (O'Brien, 1968:17; Sale, 1973:283-4). Student Syndicalism alluded to labor syndicalism with its emphasis on industrial democracy and worker control (Davidson, 1966; Sale, 1973:248). Similarly, student syndicalism stressed issues of democracy in the university and the importance of students' having a voice in the decision which affected their lives. Also emphasized was how the socialization process at universities, abetted by grades and social regulations, trained people to move into the various institutions of society and run them smoothly (O'Brien, 1968, 16). In this context the issue of manpower training in the university was broached indirectly. It would be made clearer in reference to the Selective Service System's channelling of manpower through the draft and draft deferments (Wallerstein, 1971:195).

By 1967, the need for a broader theory of social action and social organization began to manifest itself among members of the New Left (Sale, 1973:310). In early 1967 Gerry Tenney, Dave Gilbert, and Robert Gottlieb had developed a position paper on the new working class theory, loosely based on insights of Antonio Gramsci, Serge Mallet and David Barzelon. The major theoretical statement of the New Working Class theory in America was the 60 page document, "Towards a Theory of Social Change in America,"

was issued at a conference of the Radical Education Project (REP) at Princeton University in February 1967.¹ It was known colloquially as the "Port Authority Statement," a New York geographic allusion to SDS's original charter of 1962, the "Port Huron Statement," which it was supposed to update. The paper attempted to provide a new basis and analysis for New Left activities and political action five years after the founding Port Huron document.

Based in an economic analysis of the structural components of the "capitalist mode and class nature" of American society, including the new and changing aspects of technology, the paper attempts to develop the rudiments of a theory of social change. It tied analysis of structural features to guidance for praxis, practical activity guided by theory for changing society.

The paper has four sections. First is a long description of American capitalism, including an examination of the concentration of wealth and power in the economic

1. Gottlieb, Tenney, and Gilbert were graduate students at the New School for Social Research in New York who developed the document both as a paper for Norman Birnbaum (1969;xvii) and as a position paper for an SDS/Radical Education Project conference at Princeton University on February 17 and 18, 1967. Dated January 23, 1967, and entitled "Towards A Theory of Social Change in America," its fourth section, "Praxis," was published in "New Left Notes" of February 13, 1967. Sections One to Three were summarized in "New Left Notes" of May 22, 1967 as "Toward a Theory of Social Change in America." A copy was obtained from Robert Gottlieb.

order. Second is an examination of the trends in American capitalism to the middle 1960s, including technological, planning and labor force changes; touched upon here are issues of imperialism, student politics and the communications industries.

The third section of the paper concerns an "agency for change" in an analysis of class in America. Simply put the paper presents a four class model: ruling class, petty bourgeoisie, working class and underclass. The working class is composed of the new working class, middle sectors, and the traditional working class.

The paper divides the new working class into three subclasses. First are technical and professional workers, such as engineer. Second are "higher level industrial workers" in manufacturing and research production, who are distinguished from blue-collar workers by their level of education and specialization. Third are "social service workers," such as teachers, social workers, lawyers, doctors, artists, and performers, playing a central role in social organization and development. The "social service workers" were "the unifying aspect of the new working class" (50).

This class was a working class both in that it was central to production and social control, and because it lacked control over its own labor. "The paper anticipated

that the majority of college students would join one of the three "subgroups" of the new working class (Bacciocco, 1974:187-8). The middle sectors of the working class were clerical and sales workers. The fourth major sector was the traditional blue collar working class. The fourth and final section of the paper, "Praxis," ties the analysis of American society and class structure to a theory of social change.

The advances in the document were several. First, the paper presented a class analysis based in the structure of concentrated corporate wealth and the technological changes in capitalism. Second, the theory dealt not only with students, but also with college-educated skilled labor in professional, technical and service-sector jobs. It stressed that students were workers in training for jobs in the strategic sectors of the political economy. Third, it based its analysis, not only of class but also of the agencies of change, i.e. praxis, in the development of capitalism.

In a February 18, 1967 speech at the Conference of the Radical Education Project (REP) at Princeton University, SDS Secretary Greg Calvert (Sale, 1973:340) stressed that the new working class analysis was part of the New Left's learning to understand and fight battles involving its own interests and in pursuit of its own freedom. Carl Davidson (1967) lay

the basis for organizing around new working class idea in two version of his pamphlet on "the multiversity as the crucible of the new working class." The first appeared in fall 1967 and a reprinted version, "New Radicals in the Multiversity, An Analysis and Strategy for the Student Movement," came out in May 1968.

Davidson (1969) disavowed the specific idea of student power in the New Left Notes in late summer 1969. Though Calvert discussed the new working class idea as late as Spring 1969, the theory and its development had been essentially dropped by late 1968. Expansion of interest in war-related issues, and opposition by the Progressive Labor Party to any concept of an (old working class) proletariat which included anyone other than industrial workers doomed the theory to early extinction.

Compared to support for issues of race and black community, the Vietnamese struggle and imperialism (cf. Smith, 1974; Hedges, 1975), or the industrial working class and traditional class analysis, the appeal of the theories of student syndicalism and the new working class during the late 1960s was limited. Both theories represented approaches to understanding and pursuing the interests of the New Left. They were, moreover, a beginning theory of class. And criticism of the new working class theory in particular was part of a wider debate between proponents of

domestic class analysis and advocates of anti-imperialism and support for the struggle of others.

According to Smith (1974:242-3), "throughout the first decade of its existence two tendencies within the student movement struggled with one another in partially conscious battle for hegemony with the New Left." These two "strands" (Gottlieb, 1977) or "latent polarities" (Smith, 1974:242-3) were described by Smith as "anti-imperialist" and "socialist." He saw the activism of students as the initial acts of students in their class struggle. The "reality of their existence was a class reality," based on the social transformation of the university (243). Denitch (1970:352) calls the wave of student radicalism "the inchoate early struggles of 'a class in the process of becoming.'" On the other hand, the anti-imperialist activites tend to be based in concern for others, or in "the politics of guilt and missionary activity" (Smith, 1974:246).

Calvert (Sale, 1973:340) described the difference between radicals and liberals by the distinguishing between fighting one's own battles and fighting for others. This conflict in approach was inherent in this still-born debate between old and new working class approaches. While never fully articulated or evaluated, the theories briefly raised issues of class and organization.

The ideas of the New Working Class was taken up in an

essentially cultural (i.e. superstructural) context in the early 1970s, when the political movement to which it had been attached had essentially died. Richard Flacks (1970, 1971), to an extent Herbert Gintis (1970) ("Revolutionary Youth") and John and Mary Rowntree (1968) ("Youth as a Class") represented this trend. The political new working class had become "young intelligentia,"² "educated labor," or a life-style groups like "youth."

When articulated in an activist period, the new working class theory was an ideology advocating political action. Later the theories were used by Karable (1974) and Miles (1971, 1974), Denitch (1970), Bowles and Gintis (1970, 1976) as the bases for explaining the now-dead activism of the earlier decade. One explanation for the activism, using the related new middle class thesis, was that students, used to having a say in the decisions affecting them from the upbringing in independent professional families, expected to have a voice in the decisions affecting their university lives. They found, instead, that decision making was far removed from them and that a series of *in loco parentis* regulations bound their social conduct. In essence, this analysis found student decision-making issues among the main

2. According to Jones (1980), the median age in the 1960s, never fell below 28, and among whites it was higher, challenging the youth theory.

causes (44%) of student unrest. This conclusion is borne out to a certain extent by empirical analyses which found that student power issues were among (Smith, 1974:244; Miles, 1971:99) the most prevalent stated causes of unrest.

Miles (1971, 1974) suggests that the "educational industrialization" of the universities and its impingement on students from "new middle class" backgrounds caused the unrest. Students experienced "anticipatory proletarianization" when their social relations at the university became more restricted than they expected, coming to correspond to the restricted social relations they would find in the outside work world (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Denitch (1970) echoes the proletarianization of the new working class explanation. Bowles and Gintis (1976:220) suggested that like other groups (e.g. blacks, and women) who were being integrated into wage labor status students resisted the decline in autonomy (or its anticipation) through protest. The change in social relations in the universities reflected changes in the structure of capitalism and in the social relations in the jobs which students would enter, hence the students experienced "anticipatory proletarianization" in Miles terms. For Bowles and Gintis (1976) this was an important struggle and significant political era, though based in part on a consciousness looking backward to unrecoverable times.

Extending from the new working class analysis was an approach to the organization of "radicals in the professions" (Sale, 1973:339). Discussed since 1963 (Bacciocco, 1974:171), this channel for adult radical energies began to take form in the U.S. in 1967. This was a natural next step in the focus on educated labor, now university graduated.

Essentially these groups were following German SDS leader Rudi Dutschke's theory of "the long march through the institutions" (Flacks, 1971) having come from university reform toward reform within the professional institutions. As students were seen as trainees for the new working class, radicals going into the professions were seen as potential cadres within the class, and some effort was given at organizing "middle class" professionals. Essentially, these were beginning attempts to go beyond student concerns alone and organize for a full ("adult") left (Gottlieb, 1977). This suggested developing bases in the institutions closest to people and building there for future action in adjacent institutions. It is akin to Andre Gorz's (1967) labor strategy of "revolutionary reforms" through which institutions are fundamentally, not marginally, reformed.

A number of efforts were made to organize new working class members who "graduated" from the New Left. Growing out of the SDS was a Radical Education Project (REP), a

separate organization founded in 1967 by Al Haber for movement education. Related was another group, "Radicals in the Professions," begun as a conference by the same name in Cambridge, Massachusetts in July 1967. Radicals in the Professions was an attempt to create a vehicle to continue efforts at democratic radicalism among movement "alumni" or "old guard" of the SDS.

The theory was pursued through the attempted development of organizations of radicals in professions such as the "Movement for a Democratic Society" (MDS), "an amalgam of radical city planners and architects" (Bacciocco, 1974:208), founded in New York City in winter 1967. Similar were "Teachers for a Democratic Society" (TDS), also established in New York and "Citizens for a Democratic Society" (Bacciocco, 1974:182). Both teachers and planners were prominent new working class occupations. "A number of social welfare workers and other professionals were planning to establish a radical organization by the end of 1968" (Bacciccio, 1974:208). Also in this spirit was the New University Conference (NUC) begun in 1968 by teachers and other radicals in the professions, but largely confined to graduate students and young faculty in universities. The "Union For Radical Political Economics" (URPE) was started in 1968. Radical Caucuses were started in many organizations. Besides URPE, most of the Radical in the

3

Professions groups were short lived.

Though the theoretical connections to the new working class analysis were limited, these were attempts to organized people who had gone from trainees (student) to the new working class and the professions. Discussion of New Left-focused issues then, had brief moments from 1966 to 1969, lingering into the early 1970s. Student syndicalism was an approach to democracy on campus connecting student concerns and larger issues of socialization and politics (Sale, 1973:295-6). The new working class theory represented a theory of ongoing self-action by the New Left. Like student syndicalism, the new working class analysis was a theory of political action and organization for the New Left. In its narrower sense, it encompassed students as workers in training. In some cases the implication was that students were member of the working class. In its broader sense the class referred to technical, professional, educated industrial, and social service workers in strategic parts of the political economy. Both suggested a theory of class, upon which to based class consciousness of interests and oppression, and on which to channel further political action.

3. See Teodori (1969) for article by Marge Piercy and Bob Gottlieb on the Conference on Radicals in the Professions, and Gottlieb (1977) on the SDS reunion.

Simply put, the New Left lacked a coherent theory of self and of action. As Keniston (1968) and Lasch (1979) note, too, there is a need in any organization which hopes to achieve its goals to create channels for continuing involvement, and organization continuity, as members grow older. The inability to do so was another fundamental weaknesses of the New Left. The New Left faltered, then, at least in part, in its failure to sustain a focus in class or to devise channels for future involvement.

The Class Situation of Teachers and Professors

This section explores the class situations of two educational occupations, school teachers and professors. It applies to these educational groups the same operationalizations used in analyzing class categories for white collar occupational levels as a whole. Basic class level distinctions (e.g. nonworking vs. working class) are made clear. However, because of small sample sizes, analysis within the central working class of nonsupervisory employees can only be approximate.

Those few teachers who are independents or employers are not in the working class. Teachers who are supervisors or employees are in the working class. As was the case in Chapter Three, teachers who are supervisors are outside of the central working class of employees. Teachers in the

central working class are subdivided into authorized employees, normal employees and workers.

The following table indicates the class situation of white collar labor who have had at least some higher education. It clearly indicates that the majority of college educated white collar labor is in the working class. In fact, almost half (43.5%) of college educated labor and more than half of lower white collar labor are in the central working class of nonsupervisory employees.

TABLE 31

CLASS SITUATION OF COLLEGE EDUCATED WHITE COLLAR LABOR,
MEAN YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED,
21 to 37, PSID, 1976

---WORKING CLASS (WC)---
-EXPANDED CWC--
--CWC--

	INDEP	EMPLOYR	MANG	SUPER	EMPLEE	ECWC	WC
PROPL	2.6%	6.3	12.2	32.6	46.3	1	78.9 91.1
PRFL	2.3%	7.1	12.1	32.6	45.8	1	78.4 90.5
TECH	5.1%	0.0	12.5	32.3	50.1	1	82.4 94.9
MANG	5.0%	20.6	52.0	12.9	9.5	1	22.4 74.4
CLER	0.0%	1.4	7.1	21.3	70.2	1	91.5 98.6
SALES	4.5%	4.4	14.8	10.7	65.6	1	76.3 91.1
WC TOTL	3.0%	8.7	21.0	23.9	43.5	1	67.4 88.4

Before turning to the empirical class examination of teachers and professors, a brief exploration of different class definitions of teachers is important. The Ehrenreichs (1976:11,38), focusing on teachers' supervisory and social control functions, assign all teachers to a nonworking class category called the Professional/Managerial Class (PMC). Essentially they argue that, as types of social supervisors, teachers are not in the working class. Wright (1977) places supervisors outside the working class. However, Wright (1977:8-9) and Kallenberg (1980:738n) put (non self-employed) teachers in the working class since even teachers who supervise do not actually control the labor power of other employees. Wright and Perrone (1977:36) hold that "with very few exceptions (such as teachers who hold administrative jobs as well as teach), teachers should be classified as workers not managers, since they do not supervise labor power." This is because, "from the point of view of Marxist theory, the supervision of students and the supervision of labor are qualitatively different kinds of social relationship, and teachers should not be placed in the same position as managers" (Wright, 1977:8-9). "The

4. Another interesting question is the class situation of students. Since most are non-owners of the means of production, they would be in the working class, even if they are not employed. A similar analysis might be applied to the unemployed, the retired and housewives. If they are owners, of course, they would be nonworking class.

central issue here is that teachers (in most circumstances) are not engaged in the exploitation of labor power. While they do control the activity of students, they do not control the labor of direct producers (workers)." Only about one-fourth of teachers supervise employees (Wright, 1976:140).

By aggregating into one category all types of supervisors, Wright fails to distinguish between teachers who actually supervise employees and teachers who supervise students. While this study agrees with the conclusions that all supervisory teachers are in the working class, it considers that teachers who supervise students are distinct from non-supervisory teachers, but this is not a class distinction. In this study, all supervisors are in the working class, (but not the central working class.) In part, this is because the distinguishing feature of supervisors is the additional authority which supervision gives, not the control over other employees. Supervision of students is an indication of authority which other employees lack. Hence the distinction in this thesis is different from Wright's.

American new working class theories (Gottlieb 1977; et al.) theories include teachers among social service workers who unite the new working class. Teachers are, in fact, the largest new working class occupation (more than 2 million in

1970), and obviously many members of the New Left have gone into teaching in schools and colleges. Teachers for A Democratic Society was a successor group to the new working class New Left.

Since most teachers are not in profit making institutions, they are not economically exploited. Yet interestingly, in Capital Volume I Marx (Wright, 1976b:15n) includes some teachers in private employment among the productive and hence exploited members of the working class.

If we may take an example from outside of the sphere of material production, a schoolmaster is a productive worker when, in addition to belabouring the heads of his pupils, he works himself into the ground to enrich the owner of the school. That the latter has laid out his capital in a teaching factory, instead of a sausage factory, makes no difference to the relation.

The image of the teacher, and more so the professor, is someone who has a great deal of autonomy. Wright (1977:5) holds that

...perhaps the clearest example [of a semi-autonomous employee] would be an assistant professor in an elite university. Such positions generally do not involve any significant control over the apparatus of educational production as a whole, but most assistant professors would have a fair amount of control over what they teach, how they teach it, and what kind of research they do, etc.

Bowles and Gintis (1976:204), however, give good evidence why most teachers do not fit into an autonomous category. They propose, first, that "it is easy to imagine teaching as relatively, unalienated labor. On the one hand, the teacher is in direct contact with his or her material and has at least a modicum of control over his or her work" and some social usefulness. On the other hand, Bowles and Gintis (1976:204-5) suggest that

...the teacher's job has undergone subtle change. The educational efficiency binge of the 1920s led to the application of business management methods to the high schools. The concentration of decision-making power in the hands of administrators and the quest for economic rationalization had the same disastrous consequences for teachers that bureaucracy and rationalization of production had on most other workers. In the interests of scientific management, control of curriculum, evaluation, counseling, selection of texts, and methods of teaching was placed in the hands of experts. A host of specialists arose to deal with minute fragments of the teaching job. The task of thinking, making decisions, and understanding the goals of education were placed in the hands of high-level administrators. Ostensibly to facilitate administrative efficiency, schools became larger and more impersonal. The possibility of intimate or complicated classroom relationships gave way to the social relations of the production line.

Data from various surveys provide the opportunity for a limited examination of the class situation of teachers and professors in the 1970s. Because of small sample sizes, the results are not representative, only suggestive. The following Table examines the simple class position of teacher in 1970.

TABLE 32
CLASS POSITIONS OF EDUCATION OCCUPATIONS
CENSUS DATA, 1970

OCCUPATION	ALL		MALE		FEMALE	
	SE	WW	SE	WW	SE	WW
TEACHERS	3.1%	96.9 1.8		98.1	3.5	96.4
EL & 2ND	0.0%	100.0 0.0		100.0	0.0	100.0
OTHER	25.6%	74.1 20.7		79.1	27.1	72.6
PROFESSORS	0.0%	100.0 0.0		100.0	0.0	100.0

Working in relatively large institutions, the vast majority of teachers are wage and salary paid and hence in the working class. All professors and all elementary and secondary teachers are in the working class. The only departure is for teachers outside of the basic institutions, such as pre-kindergarten teachers and adult education teachers, among whom there is a significant (i.e. between 20% and 25%) amount of self-employment. Due to the nature

of Census data, it is not possible to tell whether self-employed teachers are employers or not.

Using data on household heads from the PSID (1976) it is possible to divide teachers into self-employed, managers and supervisors, and employees. The sample sizes are large enough to be fairly representative, though using household heads overrepresent males.

TABLE 33
CLASS CATEGORIES FOR EDUCATIONAL LABOR
PSID, 1976

	INDEP	EMPLOYERS	MANAGERS	SUPERS	EMPLOYEES	N
TEACHERS	0.0%	0.0%	5.2% (21.1%)	19.5% (78.9%)	75.3%	2420
PROFESSORS	0.0	0.0	17.1 (31.1%)	37.8 (68.9%)	45.1	858

NOTE: % means percentages within the combined managerial/supervisor category.

The PSID indicates that three-quarters of all teachers (75.3%) and almost half of all professors (45.1%) are in the central working class. On the other hand, about one quarter of all teachers (21.7%) and more than half (54.9%) of professors supervise others. The wording of the PSID asks about supervision of employees, indicating that this is not merely supervision of students. (Professors, of course, may supervise paid graduate assistants and staff.) About

one-fifth (21.1%) of teachers are managers with a say in pay and promotion of employees. About one-third (31.1%) of professors have such authority.

TABLE 34

FULL CLASS SITUATIONS OF TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS,
QES, 1973

	INDEP	EMPLYR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
TEACHERS	1.9%	0.0	60.2	19.9 (52.5%)	9.5 (25.1%)	8.5 (22.4%)	97
TEACHER N.E.C	0.0%	0.0	59.6	21.8 (54.0%)	10.3 (25.5%)	8.3 (20.5%)	89
COLLEGE/ SOCSCI.	0.0%	0.0	65.0	21.8 (62.3%)	0.0	13.2 (37.7%)	21
COLLEGE	0.0%	0.0	64.6	17.6 (49.7%)	0.0	17.8 (50.3%)	16

NOTE: % means proportion calculated within the employee category composed of the aggregate of authors, normal employees and workers. COLLEGE/SOCSCI includes college professors and social scientists.

Perhaps most interesting is the full class situation of teachers and supervisors. The smaller categories for teachers include not only school teachers but music and art teachers. The larger college category, as in PSID, includes professors, social scientist and college officials. Here the sample sizes are too small (e.g. for teachers, N=97) to make general conclusions. There are, for example, no employers among this sample of teachers, though there are a

few independents. The important point is that there are individual teachers in various class categories, including workers.

TABLE 35

CLASS CATEGORIES FOR TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS,
PSID (1976) VS. QES (1973)

	INDEP	EMPLOYER	SUPER	EMPLOYEES
TEACHERS				
PSID	0.0%	0.0	24.7	75.3
QES	1.9%	0.0	60.2	37.9
PROFESSORS				
PSID	0.0%	0.0	54.9	45.1
QES	0.0%	0.0	65.0	35.0

Roughly 60% of all teachers are supervisors, higher than in the PSID (24.7%). Since the PSID asks about supervising employees while the QES asks about supervising others on the job, it appears that over half the supervisors in the QES are referring to students when they affirm that they supervise.

Within the central working class most (52.5%) teachers are authorized employees suggesting a reasonable degree of autonomy. About a fifth of teachers (22.4%) are workers, indicating great limits on their independence. There are

differences in percentages but basic similarities for men and women. A larger percentage of women are supervisors, however.

About two-thirds of professors in the QES sample are supervisors, slightly more than in the PSID, but close to the percentages for teachers. Most interesting is that in this small sample about the same percentages are authorized employees as workers. About 20% of all working class college teachers are workers. The male and female distributions are different. Again the sample sizes are small, but more men tend to be supervisors than women. Women college professors ($n=2$) are all workers, an interesting if not statistically significant results.

TABLE 36

FULL CLASS SITUATIONS OF TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS
QES, MALE, 1973

	INDEP	EMPLR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER	N
TEACHERS	0.0%	0.0	85.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	36
TEACHNEC	0.0%	0.0	82.9	5.7	5.7	5.7	32
COLLSOC	0.0%	0.0	77.8	16.7	0.0	5.6	16
COLLEGE	0.0%	0.0	73.3	20.0	0.0	6.7	14

NOTE: TEACHNEC means teachers, not elsewhere classified.
COLLSOC means college professors and others social scientists.

TABLE 37

FULL CLASS SITUATIONS OF TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS,
QES, FEMALE, 1973

	INDEP	EMPR	SUPER	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER N	
TEACHERS	3.0%	0.0	45.5	28.8	12.1	10.6	61
TEACHNEC	1.9%	0.0	60.2	19.9	9.5	8.5	57
COLLSOC	0.0%	0.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	5
COLLEGE	0.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2

White Collar Class and Education

This section explores a number of aspects of the relationship between education, particularly higher education, and white collar class. Tied to this analysis is the fact, demonstrated in Chapter Three that most white collar employees are in the working class. Even so, many people entering white collar work come from higher education. Conversely, despite working class situation, many white collar jobs require college education.

When examined as institutional hierarchies, the system of higher education and the white collar job structures are both stratified systems (cf. Karabel, 1972). At the top of the higher education system are elite universities; at the bottom are post-secondary institutions, including community college and technical training institutes. At the top of the white collar sector are professional and managerial,

with a proportionally greater number of self-employed jobs. At the bottom of the white collar hierarchy are clerical and sales jobs which are largely working class in position and conditions.

The comparision of the two institutional spheres show some parallels between higher education and white collar jobs. Particularly for e.g. upper white collar sector there corresponds a sector of higher education. It is not argued here that higher education is always technically necessary for producing the skills for many white collar jobs. On the contrary, Berg (1971) demonstrates that there is an oversupply of people with adequate schooling for various white collar jobs. Yet, increasingly, the levels of required education increase so that not just secondary education, but post-secondary education is required for white collar jobs. Post secondary, technical or community college education is required for even many clerical and sales jobs, where high school education used to suffice. Though in some instances persons with less schooling are more productive on routine jobs, the predominant trend appears to involve increasing credential requirements.

These parallel hierarchies, however, are not essentially class hierarchies, where the relevant proportions of ownership is concentrated at the top and wage-employment at the bottom. In other words the parallel

is essentially intra-class and secondarily inter-class. Deriving from this is the conclusion that most higher education today trains people for working class jobs. While there is a great diversity among white collar jobs and within the higher education system, this diversity is stratification within basic class unity.

Despite rising credential requirements, it should be clear that the necessity of higher education and rising credential requirements are merely requisites for remaining in the working class, at times at a more privileged position, at times just to remain at an equally good position. The essential point is that increased education does not bring about a change in class position. Higher education does not produce inter-class mobility, only intra-class mobility. People do not graduate from the working class by graduating from college. Going to college is pursuing an escalating requirement in order to maintain place. While there are differences in prestige, technical activities and educational requirements, there are not clear differences in class position between educated lower white collar workers and the majority of blue collar workers.

Higher Education and White Collar Jobs: Some Parallels

Karabel (1972) suggest that the stratified system of higher education parallels the stratified hierarchy of white

collar occupations, particularly professional and technical jobs. This section briefly examines two kinds of parallels between higher education and white collar work. First, it examines to what extent the stratification of high school and college education parallels the stratification of upper white collar jobs, in particular, professional and technical work. This is done overall and in a class perspective. Second, it examines briefly whether there is a correspondence between the social relations of education and the social relations on the job.

The source of data for this test is the PSID for 1976, whose large sample sizes allow appropriate comparisons. The study allows for a distinction between supervisors and managers among employees who supervise others. For purposes of this analysis, managers (supervisors who have a say in their employees pay and promotion) are included in the nonworking class. (Independents are left out of the analysis since they do not supervise employees.) Nonworking class groups can be supposed to have more authority than supervisors and employees. Since the PSID is restricted to household heads, who tend to be males (though there are female household heads in the sample), there is a bias in the analysis, but the results are valid enough for first examination. Based on the assumption that the stratification of higher education became clear about when Burton Clark

(1960) wrote about it, and that persons should be in the job market after college age, the sample was restricted to persons who are 21 today or were at least 21 in 1960 (hence 37 in 1976). A second examination is done of persons in the labor force since 1970, restricting the sample to people 21 to 27, and suggesting appropriate differences in younger members of the labor force.

A simple model can be examined in viewing the relationship between higher education and white collar labor. In this model, it is expected that most people in professional jobs will have come from upper college and post-college study and that people in technical (e.g. technicians) jobs will have come from lower or community college. While the PSID codings are not detailed enough to examine specific occupations e.g. technicians, in detail, the data permit a first examination. This section explores the overall connection between higher education and professional and technical work first. Then it views the

4. For this analysis technicians are distinguished from all other professional, technical and kindred jobs. Technical jobs include what the PSID classifies as technicians (airplane pilots and navigators, designers, draftsmen, foresters and conservationists, embalmers, photographers, radio operators, surveyors, medical, dental, testing and other technicians.) Professional jobs include all other professional and technical jobs (physicians and dentist, other medical and paramedical, accountants and auditors, teachers, professors and social scientists, architects, chemists, engineers and social scientist, public advisors, judges and lawyers.)

connections in a class perspective, examining the differences between nonworking class and working class groups.

Among professionals, almost ninety percent (89.8%) in the larger sample come from upper college or post-college education. This is hardly surprising. This relationship holds for both the larger, older sample, and the smaller, younger (91.6%) sample. However, in the younger sample, there is a larger concentration from upper college education (54.5% vs. 42.8%) going into professional jobs, and a smaller one from above college education (47.0% vs. 37.1%).

Technicians in the older, larger sample, tend to come from upper college (37.6%) and high school (34.5%), more than community college (21.2%). But there appears to be a greater concentration from community college in the younger, smaller sample (31.1%), greater than upper college (20.5%) but lower than high school (39.9%). There is an apparent shift not only to community college education but to lower education as a whole for technicians. The following tables indicate the educational origins and occupational destinations for technicians and professionals for the older and younger samples.

TABLE 38

EDUCATIONAL ORIGINS FOR TECHNICIANS AND PROFESSIONALS,
 AGES 21 TO 37
 PSID, 1976

	TECH	PROFL	TECH	PROFL	TECH	PROFL
	ALL		NON	W-C		W-C
ELEMENTARY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HIGH SCHOOL	34.5	3.8	0.0	6.6	39.0	2.5
LO COLLEGE	21.2	6.4	43.1	8.3	20.0	6.2
UP COLLEGE	37.6	42.8	56.9	44.9	33.5	43.2
COLLEGE +	6.6	47.0	0.0	40.1	7.5	48.1

TABLE 39

EDUCATIONAL ORIGINS FOR TECHNICIANS AND PROFESSIONALS,
 AGES 21 TO 27
 PSID, 1976

	TECH	PROFL	TECH	PROFL	TECH	PROFL
	ALL		NON	W-C		W-C
ELEMENTARY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HIGH SCHOOL	39.9	3.8	0.0	12.7	44.4	1.9
LO COLLEGE	31.1	4.6	36.5	7.7	30.5	4.5
UP COLLEGE	20.5	54.5	63.5	44.0	15.6	55.5
COLLEGE +	8.5	37.1	0.0	35.6	9.5	38.2

These results are not greatly different in a class perspective, distinguishing nonworking class professionals from working class members. Slightly more (44.9% vs. 42.8%) professionals come from upper college for both nonworking class and working class members (43.2% v. 42.8%) slightly more for both come from post college (48.1% vs. 47.0%). For the younger sample, there is a shift to upper college and away from above college. More than half (54.5% vs. 47.8%)

of the younger professionals come from upper college, and about a third (37.1% vs. 47.0%) come from above college. In the class perspective, about the same concentration came from upper college for both older and younger group (44.9% vs. 44.0%) but fewer nonworking class members came from upper college (35.6% vs. 40.1%) to professional jobs in the younger sample. For the working class in the younger sample results are most distinct. More than half (55.5%) come from upper college (vs. only 43.2% for the older sample). But less than 40% (38.2%) come from above college into professional jobs (vs. 48.1%).

For technicians from a class perspective, the results show a slightly different pattern. For the nonworking class members, there is an apparent movement away from lower or community college education (43.1% in the older sample to 36.5% in the younger.) The increase is in upper college education for technicians from 56.9% in the older sample to 63.5% in the younger. The pattern is different for the working class samples. There is an increase in the percentage coming from community college education into technicians positions (20.0% to 30.5%) and a significant decrease from upper college (33.5% to 15.6%). There is also an increase in high school education for technicians, from 39.0% to 44.4%. Interestingly some working class technicians have college education or above (7.5% and 9.5%)

while no nonworking class technicians do. For the nonworking class technicians there is an increase to upper college levels but for working class there is an apparent decrease. However, for the working class there is some increase from the highest educational levels. While in the overall and working class levels there is an increased concentration in community college for technicians, this is not an unambiguous trend.

Correspondence in Social Relations

Bowles and Gintis (1976) suggest that there is a correspondence between the social relations of the classroom in school and the social relations on the jobs people enter. Restricted social relations in high schools and community colleges prepare people for restricted social relations of clerical and sales jobs. More autonomous learning environments in college and graduate school prepare people for professional and managerial environments in which they make decisions.

A second simple model is suggested here. In this model it is possible to approximate both the social relations of the classroom and the social relations of the job. Social relations of the classroom are approximated by level of schooling reached (i.e. years in school). This is because persons with upper college or postcollege education will

have tended to have experienced more independent educational environments along the way than persons with lower college (community colleges) and high school educations. While there are clearly exceptions to this rule, e.g. someone spending two years at an elite college, or 4 years at a state university in a vocational program, the proxy has prima facie validity.

The social relations of the job can be approximated by class category membership. Members of the nonworking class (employers and managers) can be expected to have more independent social relations on the job than members of the working class (supervisors, employees). (Strictly speaking, many of these managers are in the working class, but for the test of social relations, the extent of their power over employees puts them with employers in terms of social relations.) In essence, this assumes that there is more authority for Employers and Managers than for supervisors and employees.

In this model the mean years of education for nonworking class (i.e. employers and managers) upper white collar labor should be higher than mean years for working class (i.e. supervisors and employees) upper white collar labor. The mean years of nonworking class lower white collar labor should be higher than mean years for working class lower white collar labor. And mean years of

nonworking class upper white collar labor should be higher than mean years of working class lower white collar labor.

TABLE 40
COMPARISONS OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE JOB
AGES 21 TO 37
PSID (1976)

	NONWORKING		WORKING	(TOTAL)
UPPER WHITE	14.53	<	15.50	15.10
LOWER WHITE	13.77	>	13.36	13.42
TOTAL WHITE	14.41	<	14.57	14.52

N=27,250 Means designated < or > are different at .05

TABLE 41
COMPARISONS OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE JOB
AGES 21 TO 27
PSID, 1976

	NONWORKING		WORKING	(TOTAL)
UPPER WHITE	14.68	<	15.40	15.20
LOWER WHITE	12.85	<	13.31	13.27
TOTAL WHITE	14.37	<	14.42	14.41

N=11,449 Means designated > or < are different at .05

The results agree with the predictions only in part. In the upper white collar level, while it might be expected that nonworking class members would have high mean

education, and hence had freer social relations, the mean education for working class members was actually higher. In lower white collar labor, however, the prediction holds true. Lower white collar nonworking class members have higher mean education (13.77), and hence freer social relations of the classroom, than lower white collar working class (13.36). And of course, nonworking class, upper white collar had higher mean education and freer social relations of the classroom than lower white collar labor (13.36).

In the younger sample (21 to 27), in both upper and lower white collar jobs, the working class members have higher education than the nonworking class jobs. Comparison of these and the above results suggest a decline in nonworking class education levels and increase in working class education. The important point is that over all, it appears that people in white collar working class jobs have experienced more independent social relations in the classroom and have gotten more education than nonworking class persons who supervise them. This suggests a growing contradiction.

While class analysis does not produce results expected by a simple prediction of a parallel path between higher education and upper white collar jobs, its use does raise an important issue. The analysis suggests that people in working class jobs, especially in upper white collar work,

have more education, and hence have probably come from freer social relations than the people who employ or control them. What this may suggest is that the people who employ or manage may want more obedience from their employees than the employees are prepared to give. This situation is particularly aggravated by the fact that the legitimacy of managements often is undergirded when their educational levels are as high or higher than their subordinates. This legitimacy may be undermined by the subordinates having higher educations.

These findings suggest that some of the analyses or predictions of the new working class theories may be valid. Upper white collar employees tend to have more education and freer socialization than their supervisors may lead them to greater dissatisfaction with their job structures and to more demands for autonomy and for democratization. While these results are far from conclusive, they suggest further research into this area.

Conclusions

This chapter has examined several connections between white collar jobs, education and class. First it explored the development of theories of white collar class, including student syndicalism and the new working class. Second, it examined the class situations of the educational

occupations, teachers and professors. Third it explored parallels between the stratified system of higher education and the upper white collar job hierarchy. An attempt was made to refine the analysis of these parallels by using a class rather than a stratification perspective.

There is some evidence here for both a parallel between the levels of higher education and the levels of white collar jobs, as well as between the social relations of education and the social relations of the job. But the results are contradictory, particularly from a class rather than a stratification perspective. It is possible, moreover, that data for a later period, or different methods of approaching the questions, might show different results.

There is more evidence that there is a correspondence in social relations of the classroom, but this is not strong. While the results were not as suggested, they did indicate an important contradiction on a class basis growing out of the higher educational levels of persons in the working class.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS: THE CLASS SITUATIONS OF WHITE COLLAR LABOR

Introduction

The class situation of white collar labor has been examined in this thesis through both theoretical and empirical evidence on two main and one subsidiary proposition. The main thrust of this thesis is that most white collar labor is in the working class, defined by non-ownership. Proposition One claims that a large part of white collar labor is in working class position, and that a significant part is in working class condition. Proposition Two claims that white collar labor has been coming into the working class at differential rates up the job hierarchy. The subsidiary proposition claimed a structural correspondence between higher education and white collar jobs.

Proposition One involved two issues of the class situation of white collar labor. First it held that most white collar labor is in the working class, specifically working class position. Following an examination of theories of class in general came an examination of theories of white collar class. A review of the theories indicated that white collar workers are best divided among the

capitalist and working classes, with the vast majority in the working class due to their nonownership of production, wage labor status, and exclusion from decision-making. Only those white collar members directly tied to the ruling and owning classes are in the "middle class."

The empirical analysis is based on data on the labor force as proxies for the entire population. These data for the 1970s suggest that most white collar labor is in the working class. And much white collar labor is in the central working class of non-supervisory employees.

The second part of Proposition One holds that much white collar labor is in working class condition. Preliminarily working class condition was described by the image of the classic proletarian on the job, and based on Wright (1977), designated by persons without significant autonomy and decision-making in work. A more detailed definition was derived empirically. While the absolute percentages of white collar labor in working class conditions are small, the relative proportions (%) of working class white collar labor who are in working class conditions is relatively large.

Proposition Two suggests that proletarianization of white collar labor has been occurring at different rates across the white collar sector. Proletarianization involves three related processes. First is simple

proletarianization, change in class position. There is clear evidence that simple proletarianization is occurring. Second is intermediate proletarianization of white collar labor in white supervisory employment declines and non-supervisory employment rises. There is evidence that there has been process is occurring in the 1970s, following a period of intermediate deproletarianization before the beginning of that decade.

Condition proletarianization of white collar labor is more difficult to examine. The literature of proletarianization is more specific to blue collar labor and simple proletarianization, but Braverman et al. do expect condition proletarianization to occur in the white collar sector. In the empirical section of Chapter Four on condition proletarianization, there is some evidence that, while condition proletarianization is occurring, condition deproletarianization is also taking place.

The subsidiary proposition connects education with theories of white collar class. In particular, theories of the new working class is a class theory of educated labor. Bowles and Gintis (1976) hypothesizes a correspondence between class and education. They suggest that there is a structural correspondence between the levels of higher education and white collar jobs. Initial data analysis suggests that the correspondence is greater for lower white

collar labor than for upper white collar.

Conclusions on the Literature and Class

In following a structural approach based on relationship of ownership and nonownership, the definition of class in this study is essentially an economic one. Economic-base delimits the dimensions and interests of class members. Non-ownership and wage-labor status unify the class on both real and conceptual levels. The unity is based in not owning capital.

By this definition, all employed persons who are non-owners, and hence wage-laborers, are members of the working class. In particular, they are in working class position. Split along class lines between owners and non-owners most white collar labor is in the working class. Only owners and high level managers are in the capitalist class. (Small owners and independents are petty bourgeoisie or petty producers.)

There are, of course, differences within the working class, white and blue collar. But these are not class differences for the most part. Factors besides ownership, such as market position and politics, do create distinctions. They are on a secondary level of analysis involving the social structure. While they do not determine class differences, secondary economic factors, as well as

political and ideological differences, do contribute to distinguishing among class fraction. Here are issues of social class, not economic class. In short, these factors produce social stratification. As Freedman points out, these distinctions are on the level of class fraction or strata within the working class, not separate class categories.

In essence, proposed here is a unidimensional theory of class divisions on the level of economic-base, and a multidimensional theory of within-class stratification based on secondary economic, political and ideological criteria. As Mallet suggests, a sociology of stratification within the working class is needed.

The conclusion that white collar employees are in the working class is challenged by traditional and Marxist analysts who consider white collar employees to be part of the "new middle class." In considering the distinction within the working class, this study holds, based on Freedman and Becker, that market position and political factors used in defining a new middle "class" identify fractions, or strata, within the working class. The new middle class should not be seen as a separate class but as a stratified constituent part of the diversified working class of modern capitalism. These differences are not on the determining, economic level. The new middle class is not

distinct as a class but is part of the working class for the most part. The major part of the "new middle class" is in the working class, but some of its parts are in the old middle (i.e. capitalist) class.

Productive, unproductive labor and exploitation.

White collar employees are placed in the "new middle class" for three types of reasons--economic, political and ideological. Poulantzas (1975) and Nicolaus (1967) represent the major proponents using these criteria for placing white collar workers in the new middle class. Poulantzas and Nicolaus put white collar workers in the "new petty bourgeoisie" for their performance of unproductive labor.

Poulantzas (1975) does hold that the economic sphere is determining of class position. In the economic sphere, however, he does not hold that relationship to ownership alone determines class. For Poulantzas and Nicolaus unproductive employees are in the new middle class. This new middle class ascription can be challenged on three levels.

In the first place, Poulantzas (1975:216) includes as unproductive some employees who are properly in the productive group. This mistake arises from using a restricted definition of productive labor. For him, to be

productive, one must produce material goods. But service workers can be exploited, and hence productive, if they work for someone who receives more for their labor than he pays in wages.

It is also a mistake to designate certain occupations, such as commercial clerks, as either productive or unproductive. Wright (1976b:15) demonstrates what he calls the "dual quality of social positions as both productive and unproductive" in the case of clerks in stores. They perform the last stages of production as well as realization.

As Marx, Smith, and Poulantzas point out, while commercial employees do not directly produce surplus value, they do help to realize this value in their commercial activities in the selling and record keeping process. It is here, in essence, that the sale is made and commodities are turned into money. Most white collar employees are indirectly exploited of surplus value and more directly of surplus labor. Marx (Smith, 1974:207) points out in Capital II that "as a wage laborer he works part of his time for nothing." Marx (Smith, 1974:206-7) describes this process as partial exploitation. While Poulantzas recognizes this distinction and the exploited nature of commercial employees, he holds that the unproductive state is the telling criterion in distinguishing working from middle class. He does not justify the claim that one form of

exploitation creates a class difference of one type of non-owner from another.

Secondary economic factors.

The economic sphere itself has two levels: the determining level of the mode of production and the secondary level of markets, etc. Market relations and work situation do make important distinctions within the working class. Questions such as relationship to the market are questions of class fraction or stratum. Higher salability of labor power does produce quite different levels of living and security; yet such differences are only along a spectrum; they are not differences in kinds such as are created by the ownership/non-ownership dichotomy. Differences in work situation--physical and social relations in work--provide for distinctions within the working sphere. They are not on the same order of magnitude as differences from owners who draw their livelihood from ownership of productive possessions and exploitation of workers. Employees are only able to maintain a living standard because they work. The differences within the white collar working class are ones of degree and not of a fundamental kind. Sociologists who posit otherwise are discussing objective bases of stratification, not principles for class distinctions.

Political and functional criteria for class: supervision.

A number of theories of class base the new middle class designation on political and functional factors as equivalent to economic-base factors for defining class. These neglect the determining role of production relations.

The question of whether supervisory employees are middle class or working class hinges on whether class assignment is based on relations to ownership of the means of production or performance of a function. In particular, the performance of the "function of capital" is used by Carchedi, et. al. as the defining characteristic of members of the new middle class. But function cannot determine class. Nor can performing the function of capital put one in the capitalist class.

The functional theories, such as those of Carchedi or Ehrenreich, stress the "global function of capital" or control functions. Inherent in the ideas of supervisors as new middle class is the idea that supervision is inherently a capitalist function. But a distinction must be made between socially necessary work of supervision and the managerial work involved in the extraction of surplus. While it is true that managers and some supervisors do perform a function once part of the role of the capitalist, this function is not inherently capitalist. Supervision is

an inherently necessary part of the production process on a large scale; it is a necessity to the smooth running of such production. It is, as Becker notes, a socially necessary use of labor-power, and as Marx and Freedman point out a performance of productive labor. While production need not be organized hierarchically, production of scale must be organized, and production with supervision is not inherently capitalist.

Supervision as necessary coordination.

As Becker (1973), Marx, Gorelick (1977) and others have pointed out, supervision is a necessary function in the coordination of production of scale. Smith notes that supervision is part of the increasingly collective and socially organized process of production resulting from the concentration of capital. Freedman concludes that "Marx clearly includes these 'supervisory' workers in the ranks of wage labor, assigning them the position of skilled workers, whose labor, 'like any other wage,' finds a definite market and price.'

The coordination of the labor process, which Carchedi calls the "collective function of labor," is "non-antagonistic" to working class membership. Coordination, or "administrative labor" as Becker terms it, is an essential function in the creation of value, i.e. in

the production process. There is no production of scale without coordination. This is clearly a function of supervision, but it is not a capitalist function per se. Managers will be assigned to a capitalist class position only when their relationship to ownership is a capitalist one. Freedman (1975:65) concludes that "it must be reemphasized here that middle-management is part of the working class." Though highly paid, such managers do not have sufficient financial assets to put them economically in the capitalist class.

Those supervisors who coordinate are assigned to the working class. It is not function--either in the technical division of labor or minor control of some form of capital--which determines class. Freedman suggests that the performance of different functions, or use values, place persons in different "fractions" within the same class, not into different classes (Freedman, 1975:43). There is again a stratification within the working class. Performance of the global function of capital, like all other functional, or use-value, questions, places one in a fraction within a class. Because supervisors perform control functions, too, they will be placed in a higher fraction of the working class.

Freedman (1975:74) emphasizes the distinctions between supervisors and other members of the working class,

moreover. "The requirements for foremen and supervisors arise out of the hierachization of the job structure. This structure must have its specific social agents whose job is the supervision and maintenance within fractions of the working class." Placing them outside of the working class, however, "is a confusion of class role with class membership." In value terms as wage labors supervisors are members of the working class, though they may have antagonistic functions.

Gorelick (1977:28) states that the focus on hierarchy in production is misplaced and misleading when attempting a class analysis. "Hierarchy is not class." Emphasis on hierarchy per se distorts the class relationships which are intimately tied to questions of exploitation. It is in the economic realm of exploitation and ownership that Gorelick (1977:30), like Freedman (1975), find the basis for class. "By magnifying hierarchy," authors reify it, and turn it from a form and mechanism of class rule, into a metaphor for class itself." Gorelick (1977:30) stresses this in light of the fact that "coordination, 'directing authority,' and the division of labor were for Marx -general social processes, which, under capitalism, took particular oppressive forms." Gorelick (1977:31) also stresses that class must be seen in its economic basis: The central fact of class is the creation of capital, "the process of production or the

production of surplus value."

Persons who do not supervise labor in production but who perform functions of social control, or social production are sometimes placed in a new middle class. These persons assist in the reproduction of hierarchic capitalist social relations outside of production. Analogously to the labor process, such persons as teachers, ministers, and psychologists, by assisting in the socialization and reproduction of society, perform necessary coordination functions for any society. On the other hand, they also assist in socialization to a specific hierarchically organized capitalist society and thus assist in social control which abets exploitation of labor by capital. The Ehrenreichs (1976) place such persons in the "Professional/Managerial Class."

There is, of course, a significant difference here: this is a non-economic and hence, non-determining aspect of society. Coordination and socialization are functions of any social system. Moreover, analogies do not determine class. It is, of course, even harder to distinguish the proportion of coordination vs. the proportion of control carried out in socialization. Yet placing teachers, social workers and others in services in the middle class because of control functions is erroneous. In essence, these people are non-supervisory employees, who do perform important

coordination functions, but do not control labor.

In his discussion of administrative labor, which includes supervisors as well as technicians, Becker (1974:444) stresses that such work is a socially necessary functions. In speaking about the "work of social administration, i.e. the coordination of social activity," he concludes that "all of this labor aids in the reproduction of social labor through its contribution either to production or to the coordination of production." Such labor is technically useful and reproductively necessary outside the confines of the capitalist mode.

In essence, objective conditions are secondary indications of working class situation, but they do not overdetermine the class status per se but indicate fractional positions within the working class. Wage and salary employees who lack significant control over their jobs are in working class conditions. While conditions themselves do not determine class, a large proportion of white collar employees are in conditions similar to blue collar workers, another indication of their joint class status. As Mallet noted, the situations of white collar and blue collar employees are merging, especially at the upper levels. Upper white collar labor approaches upper blue collar labor. Similarly, lower white collar and lower blue collar labor merge in characteristics.

On the level of conditions, it appears clear that there is a growing similarity between lower white collar "semi-skilled" jobs and lower blue collar jobs. Similarly, skilled white collar technicians blur with skilled blue collar technicians. At the level of the lower collar sectors and the "new working class" then the distinctions between white and blue collar conditions essentially blur. This is particularly clear for technicians, sometimes seen as blue collar (Blauner, 1964) and sometimes white (Census, 1970).

Ideological factors.

A criterion upon which analysts place most white collar employees in the new middle class are not for objective factors but for ideological reasons. Many traditional sociologists note that most white collar employees are wage workers and have similar conditions to those of blue collar workers. Yet because white collar workers are supposed to think of themselves as in the middle class or because there is more prestige, or social esteem, attached to white collar work, such jobs are placed in the new middle class. Poulantzas also feels that there is "secret knowledge," deriving from mental labor and working with information, which put white collar employees in the working class.

There are no structural basis for such claims. Nor can

the values and attitudes one holds affect the structural and economic constraints under which they find their class position. Similarly what class position a person thinks one has cannot change one's class position, though when it coincides with one's structural class position its abets the conditions for class conflict. White collar people, especially deskilled white collar workers in clerical and sales jobs, have no more expertise, nor "secret knowledge" than comparable blue collar workers. As Braverman has shown, many white collar jobs are increasingly removed of their skill and knowledge content, approaching, like many blue collar jobs, the positions of homogeneous, abstract labor. Many blue collar workers, particularly, skilled craftspeople, have much greater expertise and secret knowledge than most white collar workers, and for this reason, are called sometimes, an aristocracy of labor. Yet they are seen, properly, in the working class.

In fact, the argument that white collar workers are non-owners in similar conditions to manual employees, but think differently, is, on the economic level of class analysis actually an argument for placing white collar workers in the working class. The only distinctions are ideological ones, and arguments justified on ideological grounds do not involve class analysis but social and stratification analyses. Moreover, objective conditions do

not overdetermine class situation but define level or strata within classes.

Hence it is clear that by virtue of non-ownership, most white collar labor is in the working class. Criteria like political or market position do not create class but contribute to stratification within an increasingly complex working class of white collar workers.

White Collar Labor and the Working Class in the 1970s

Chapter Three uses various sources of labor force data to explore the proposition on working class position and working class conditions. Figures on the labor force are used as approximations for those in the general population. In most cases data are for individuals, and class situation for the population is derived from the aggregate of the individuals' class situations.

The data tend to uphold Proposition One that a large part of white collar labor is in working class position. A significant part of white collar labor in the working class is also in working class condition. A differential pattern of class membership exists for upper and lower white collar jobs, with lower white collar jobs more closely following the working class memberships predicted by the propositions.

TABLE 42
SUMMARY TABLE

WORKING CLASS CATEGORIES FOR WHITE COLLAR LEVELS, 1970

WORKING CLASS (POSITION)	ECWC (NME)	CWC (NSE)	WORKERS (CONDITION)
WHITE COLLAR			
INDIVIDUAL	90.9%	--	48.0%
HOUSEHOLD	(85.0)	65.1	35.0
UPPER WHITE			
INDIVIDUAL	87.3	--	30.3
HOUSEHOLD	(77.8)	49.7	22.4
LOWER WHITE			
INDIVIDUAL	94.8	--	66.5
HOUSEHOLD	(96.0)	88.0	64.0
<hr/>			
RANGES	80.2MANG	49.7UWC	4.8MANG
			1.0MANG (16.2 PROF)
	-	-	-
	97.5CLER	88.8UWC	66.3LWC
			18.4CLER (28.0CLER)

NOTE: NME means nonmanagerial employee, NSE, nonsupervisory. Sources for working class position, CPS, 1975; for household data, PSID, 1976; for individual CWC, SML, 1976; for workers, SWC, 1970. Comparable working class figures for white collar concentrated industries (1975) are 77.4% overall, ranging from 70.7% for finance to 80.9% for retail. Figures in parentheses are percentage (proportions) within NSE.

Working class position.

The data in Chapter Three strongly support the proposition that white collar labor is in the working class. Based on Census data for the 1970's, over 90% of all white collar labor is employed for wages and salaries and hence in working class position. Consistent with the trend of

differential results at higher and lower levels, the exact percentages range from about 80% of managers to almost 100% for clerical employees. As is the pattern for all working class categories, lower white collar labor shows a large proportion in working class position, 95% overall. Upper white collar labor, including managers and professionals (occupations which have concentration of self-employed) is just less than 90% in working class position.

The class situation of the Central Working Class (CWC) is examined from the class position of nonsupervisory employees. Though Chapter Two argued that virtually all supervisors are in working class position, examining the CWC without supervisors provides an additional insight into the class situation of white collar workers. The CWC can be examined through data derived from national surveys of the labor force during the 1970s. In 1976 about half of white collar labor was in the CWC. Again there is a range in working class membership from only 5% for managers to over two-thirds for both clerical and sales groups in the lower white collar sector. Upper white collar labor, where a large proportion of owners and managers (and males) are found, is only one third in the CWC.

Similar results are found when class is viewed from the basis of a household unit. In this approach, the head of household, or family, typically taken to be male in married

units, establishes class. Overall, the working class percentages from the household (vs. individual) data are lower, since male household heads as a group have higher class positions than women or men who are not household head. About one third of all white collar labor is in the CWC based on household data. This figure is between one-fourth and one fifth for the upper white collar sector. About two thirds of lower white collar labor are in the CWC, a similar percentages to individual data.

While all supervisors were excluded from the CWC, it was possible, using the "Panel Study of Income Dynamics" for 1976 to include within an Expanded CWC category those supervisors who supervise in name only, lacking power to hire and fire and overseeing few employees. The addition of nominal (vs. empowered supervisors, or managers) expands the CWC significantly so that almost two-thirds of the white collar sector are in the expanded CWC (ECWC). This figure is almost one-half of upper white collar labor. For the lower white collar groups, almost 90% are in the ECWC; evidently few supervisors in clerical and sales jobs have significant authority.

Working class condition.

The second half of Proposition One holds that much white collar labor is in working class condition. Working

class condition was defined as being a "worker," a category similar to the conditions expected for the classic proletarian on the assembly line. Wright (1977) operationalizes the category as someone who does not have significant autonomy and decision-making on the job. This group was operationalized based on the work of Oppenheimer (1973), et al., and using discriminant analysis on the "Survey of Working Conditions" (1970). The discriminant analysis suggests that a worker is someone who is closely supervised, has no opportunity for decision-making, to exercise authority, develop abilities or express creativity, experiences repetitious work, has a brief job tenure and does not belong to a union. (A nonsupervisory employee with the opposite traits would be an "authorized employee" or "author.")

A significant group, though not large in absolute terms, of white collar labor is in working class conditions. Overall, about 10% of white collar labor are "workers," nearly one-fourth of CWC white collar employees. The range is from 1% for managers to almost a fifth for clerical employees. For each group, the proportion (%) of CWC members for each occupation is high: from 18.5% even for managers to 28% for clericals. Not surprisingly only 3% of upper white collar labor are workers; still this is one in six of all UWC employees of the CWC. Moreover, one-in-six

of all lower white collar employees are workers, over one-quarter in proportional terms.

Conclusions on Proletarianization

Proposition Two claims that white collar labor was entering the working class at differential rates up the job hierarchy. This, in essence, is a question of proletarianization. The proletarianization question has been examined at four levels: review of the literature, simple (class) proletarianization, intermediate proletarianization and condition proletarianization within the CWC. The review of the literature suggests that the same forces which have proletarianized blue collar labor, should affect white collar labor essentially similarly; there exist, however, countervailing tendencies and differences in administrative from production labor.

The literature of proletarianization.

The review of the literature of proletarianization reflects the questions of various levels from simple to condition proletarianization. From the "Manifesto" to Mills, simple class proletarianization has been a expectation to be fulfilled. In part this is because that even 40 years ago the lower white collar sector had experienced almost complete simple proletarianization, going

from self-employment to wage- employment. As Mills (1951:xiv) noted, the crisis of property for the "old middle class" was lost before World War I. However, within the sales sector, and to a lesser extent within clerical workers, there has been a small net decline in wage employment but not a meaningful change, and these jobs have essentially fully experienced simple proletarianization.

Carchedi (1975b:392) provides important insights on the question of intermediate proletarianization from supervision to general membership in the CWC. While he holds that all labor moves from skilled to average, it is the process of "devaluation through dequalification" in which supervisors and administrative labor loses the global function of capital and joins the working class which is most relevant to intermediate proletarianization. This is part of the "proletarianization of the new middle class" (1975:65). He describes this as moving from employee to worker. Carchedi sees this process as almost completed among clerical employees. He (1975:65) sums up the process: "In short, proletarianization is the limit of the process of the devaluation of the new middle class' labour power i.e. the reduction of this labour-power to an average, unskilled level coupled with the elimination of the global function of capital." Hence this process has two parts, and for the new middle class, the global function of capital is lost and

then the labor power is devalued (1975:65).

As Carchedi points out, over time a greater proportion of the new middle class loses its control functions and its conditions become more similar to those of blue collar employees, whose conditions themselves are simultaneously being upgraded. Over time all labor experiences another forms of proletarianization. On the most basic level, there is the movement of skilled labor to average labor. But as Gorz (1967) points out in his earlier work, and Freedman (1975) confirms, much coordination is socially necessary labor.

Empirical results on proletarianization.

The questions of simple proletarianization were addressed relying on Census information on the increase in the number of employees working for wages and salaries. The overall trend indicates that simple proletarianization is occurring in the white collar sector as a whole. This trend is particularly clear in the upper white collar sector. In the lower white collar sector there has been a net stability over 35 years. On the second level, or intermediate proletarianization, of supervisory employees into the central working class, there is support at least in recent years. While supervisory employees increased from 1940 to 1970, it appears that this trend has reversed and that

employees in the CWC have increased. Double linear regressions on the various trends in supervisory labor suggest that there has been an intermediate proletarianization tendency in the last decade.

Finally, the data on condition proletarianization of the central working class are mixed in their indications. There is evidence for both deproletarianization and proletarianization. On the one hand, it appears that authorized employees have decreased overall, but increased in the 1970s. Workers have apparently decreased overall, too, but this apparent deproletarianization leveled off in recent years. The data are limited, and the trends contradictory, and it is yet to be seen whether the net overall trend in white collar labor is toward proletarianization or deproletarianization. Singleman and Wright (1978) postulate a possibly accelerating proletarianization of the population overtime, as hierarchy increased and previously undercontrolled industries become more structured. Further study in the next decade may establish the direction of the trends.

Education and the White Collar Working Class

There are several important ties between education and new theories of the class situation of white collar labor. Education has long been seen as the path to upward mobility.

Yet the evidence in Chapters 3 and 5 indicates that despite increasing levels of education, most white collar workers start in the working class and stay in the working class. They are merely getting more education to avoid downward mobility.

The new working class theories were an early attempt to develop a class analysis of educated labor. They explored in Europe the situation of technicians in continuous process industries, and in America students in universities. Explorations of the various formulations suggest that new working class theories were initial approaches to understanding and organizing white collar labor on the basis of common interests. While too narrowly focused, they did recognize the changes in class situation for highly educated labor in colleges. In class terms the students were moving from independents to members of the working class. In condition terms, this was a form of proletarianization, too. As Bowles and Gintis (1976) noted, their protests in the 1960s were in part generated by their integration into a situation of wage labor.

An examination of the class situations of teachers and professors finds that virtually all of each group are in some sector of the working class. About three-fifths of both teachers and professors in the working class are supervisor of some kind. More than half of these teachers,

however, supervise students rather than employees. Professors are more likely to supervise paid employees, including graduate students. Most teachers in the central working class are authorized employees, but a significant proportion (20.5%) are workers. About half of all central working class professors are authors and half are workers. Overall, most higher educated white collar labor is in the working class.

Karabel (1972) suggests a parallel between educational levels and the occupational levels for upper white collar labor. On the first level this is a form of nonclass stratification. Professionals virtual always come from upper college or beyond college education. Technicians come from college and high school, with only about a fifth from community colleges. Working class technicians tend to have come from community colleges and high school, reflecting a general lowering of education levels for this group.

There is also a limited correspondence between social relations of the schools and jobs of upper white collar labor. Lower white collar employees and nominal supervisors do tend to come from more restricted educational environments. But for the upper white collar sector, the more education (and hence less educationally restricted) seem to go into more working class jobs, while the less educated are in owning and managerial positions. This might

tend to undermine the legitimacy of such upper white collar hierarchies, however, and lead to unrest.

Suggestions For Further Study

This thesis covers a number of structural areas in the class situation of white collar labor. Because of the limitations imposed by the necessity of analyzing in detail these central topics, numerous related topics, as the Introduction pointed out, could not be explored in this dissertation. The recognition of the limitations of this study suggest topics which bear further exploration elsewhere.

This study concentrates on white collar labor and the working class. It examines less closely the capitalist and intermediary class situations. More detailed analyses of managerial labor, ownership vs. control of corporations, the "managerial revolution," can be made than appear here. Nor does this study examined the socialist analog to the managerial questions, issues of the "new class" structure in socialist societies. These are topic for other studies. This work does not examine outside of its occupational framework the class situation of intellectuals. Nor does it examine the integration of state and higher education in the productive process, nor the specific position of technicians or research workers in strategic industries. These are

fruitful areas for further analysis. Also in considering essentially structural and objective factors, there are many topics on which it only touches in passing or not at all. One of the most clear is that it does not look at consciousness or subjective class identification of white collar workers. There is much to be learned from a comparison of the objective class situation in relationship to the subjective class identification of white collar labor. For instance, it is worth examining to what extent white collar workers see themselves in the working class and how this has changed over time.

The thesis also does not examine questions of political action. There are area of great interest surrounding the unionization of white collar job, as well as the relation of white collar labor to class conflict. A further exploration of activism among students and professionals, in the recent past, and as part of the "long march through the institutions" is also an area of interest. There is much to be gained from examining "radicals in the professions," radical caucuses in professional organizations, and professional insurgencies. Both individually and in the interrelation of class structure, consciousness and action, these topics are not explored in any detail.

A reexamination of the new working class theories is also called for. While most formulations of the theory were

too restricted in its focus on professionals and students in higher education, the concern for the changes in the class structure, the blurring of white collar and blue collar lines for technicians, and the idea of self-interest and organization being linked together are fruitful areas for more research.

Though the dissertation suggests that proletarianization is occurring at some levels for white collar labor, this questions could not be fully answered with the avaialble data and analyzes. Further studies could be carried out in this sphere. First, using the PSID for the six years 1975 to 1980, it would be possible to see what changes have occurred in the author and worker categories. It is not clear that appropriate variables exist for properly discrimination between the groups and for scaling, but this might be a possible avenue. Also, it might be possible to examine several years in the 1970s by using the same variables in different studies (e.g. tenure, whether supervised). This study chose to compare only repeated studies, and to insist upon certain denotative meanings for the discriminating variables. But using the SML (1976) along with SWC (1970) and QES (1973) might develop additional enlightening results.

Singleman and Wright (1978) have used an industry-shift method to examine change in class situation from 1960 to

1970. Their finding indicate that a within-industry class shift bodes for a possibly accelerating proletarianization of the entire labor force in future decades. Their approach might be used within the white collar sector alone to see if proletarianization has occurred in those occupations. Wright is beginning to collect data over time, too, which will help to answer the question. Unlike trying to find data from the past to see the trends until now, collecting future data, while taking longer, provides more precise answers.

In Conclusion

In sum, the propositions are upheld that there are close ties between white collar labor and the working class in its various dimensions. The first part of Proposition One, that a large proportion of white collar labor is in working class position, appears to be strongly supported by the data. The vast proportion of white collar workers are in the working class in terms of wage-labor status, employee situation, and dependent conditions of labor. Within each occupational sector, too, a large percentage is in the central working class of nonsupervisory labor. The second part of Proposition One, concerning working class condition, is supported but less strongly; there is a significant group of white collar employees whose conditions of work are

similar those those in industrial jobs. In fact, there is a blurring of conditions and class situations for white collar and blue collar jobs. The situations of technicians and teachers are just two examples. Upper white collar jobs like professionals and upper blue collar jobs like craftspeople tend to have greater autonomy and good working conditions. Lower white collar clerical and sales jobs and lower white collar operative and laborer jobs tend to become more regimented and similar in conditions. Along with service jobs, the lines are blurring.

Simple proletarianization and intermediate proletarianization of white collar labor appears to be occurring. Whether condition proletarianization is occurring cannot be conclusively stated. It would be expected from some theory and from some data, but the exact situation is unclear.

There are numerous ties between education and white collar class. Yet increasingly education is a vehicle for merely remaining in the working class, in a lesser or greater fraction. There is a general parallel between educational levels and occupational levels, but the social relations, particularly at the upper levels, do not correspond closely overall. This structural discontinuity be a basis for future unrest in the march through the institutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. 1963. The Civic Culture Study. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, Charles H. 1974. "Marxist Theory: Class and Revolution," Political Economy of Social Class. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Aptheker, Bettina. 1972. The Academic Rebellion in the United States. Secaucus: Citadel Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1971. "Does the United States Have a New Working Class?" Review of American Socialism, edited by G. Fischer.
- 1973. "White Collar Proletariat." in False Promises. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Bacciocco, Edward. 1974. The New Left in America, Reform to Revolution, 1956 to 1970. Stanford: The Hoover Institution Press.
- Barber, Bernard. 1968. "Social Stratification." Pp. 288-296 in David Sills (ed.), International Encyclopedia of Social Science. Vol. 15. New York: MacMillan.
- Bazelon, David. 1963. Power in America. The Politics of the New Class. New York: New American Library.
- Becker, James F. 1973. "Class Structure and Conflict in the Managerial Phase: I," Science and Society, 37:3 (Fall): 259-277.
- 1974. "Class Structure and Conflict in the Managerial Phase: II," Science and Society, 37:4 (Winter): 437-453.
- 1971. "On the Monopoly Theory of Monopoly Capitalism. Science and Society, 35:4 (Winter): 415-438.
- Bell, Daniel. 1973. The Coming Of Post Industrial Society. A Venture in Social Forecasting. New York: Basic Books.

----- 1960. The End of Ideology. On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Belleville, Pierre. 1963. Une Nouvelle Classe Ouvrière. Paris: R. Julliard.

Bendix, Reinhard and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1966. Class, Status, and Power. Social Stratification in A Comparative Perspective. New York: Free Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1956. Work and Authority In Industry. Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization. New York: Wiley.

Bernstein, Eduard. 1961. Evolutionary Socialism. New York: Schocken.

Birnbaum, Norman. 1969. The Crisis of Industrial Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blau, Peter and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Blauner, Robert. 1964. Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

----- 1960. "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society." Pp. 339-60. In Labor and Trade Unionism: An Indisciplinary Reader. edited by Walter Galeson and Seymour Martin Lipset. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Bookchin, Murray. 1971. Post Scarcity Anarchism. Berkeley: Ramparts Press.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. "Marx Theory of Value and Heterogeneous Labor, Critique and Reformulation." (Mimeo, Amherst, Massachusetts).

----- 1976. Schooling In Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Braverman, Harry. 1974. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

- Bridier, Manuel. 1966. "New Working Class or New Bourgeoisie." International Socialist Journal. January/February.
- Budish, Jacob. 1962. The Changing Structure of the Working Class. New York: International Publishers.
- Bukharin, Nikolas. 1969. Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology. New York: International Publisher [1921].
- Burnham, James. 1941. The Managerial Revolution. New York: John Dey.
- Burris, Val. 1979. "Capital Accumulation and the Rise of the New Middle Class." Mimeo. Dept. of Sociology, University of Oregon.
- Calvert, Greg. 1967. "In White America: Radical Consciousness and Social Change." Guardian. March 25.
- Calvert, Greg and Carol Nieman. 1971. A Disrupted History: The New Left and New Capitalism. New York: Random House.
- 1968. "Internationalism New Left Style." Guardian. June 8 to 22, 1968.
- Carchedi, G. 1975. "On the Economic Identification of the New Middle Class." Economy and Society. 4:1 (February).
- 1975b. "Reproduction of Social Classes at the Level of Productive Relations." Economy and Society. 4:4 (November).
- Centers, Richard. 1949. The Psychology of Social Classes. A Study of Class Consciousness. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- 1945. "Survey No. 52," Office of Public Opinion Research," Princeton University, July 1945.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1969. American Power and The New Mandarins. New York: Pantheon.

- Clark, Burton. 1960. "The 'Cooling Out' Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology. 65:6 (May): 569-577.
- Coleman, Richard and Bernice Neugarten. 1971. Social Status In the City. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coleman, Richard and Lee Rainwater. 1978. Social Standing in America: New Dimensions of Class. New York: Basic Books.
- Corey, Lewis. 1935. The Crisis of The Middle Class. New York: Covici, Friede.
- Count, George. 1925. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963." American Journal of Sociology. 70:286-302 (November).
- Coyle, Grace L. 1928. Present Trends in Clerical Occupations. New York: Women's Press.
- Coyner, Sandra and Martin Oppenheimer. 1976. "Scholars and White Collars: A Social History of the Great Debate." Paper delivered at the Meetings of the America Sociological Association. New York City. September.
- Croner, Fritz. 1954. Die Angestellten in der modernen Gesellschaft. Frankfurt a.M. and Vienna.
- 1937. The White Collar Movement in Germany Since the Monetary Stabilization. Columbia University Department of Social Sciences and the W.P.A. [Trans. 1938]. 1933.
- Crozier, Michael. 1971. The World of The Officer Worker. Translated by David Landau. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1965.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1959. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Davis, James R. 1975. The General Social Survey. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Davidson, Carl. 1966. "A Student Syndicalist Movement: Or University Reform Revisited." New Left Notes. September 9.

- . 1967. "Multiversity: Crucible of the New Working Class." Chicago: Students for a Democratic Society. Fall.
- . 1968. "New Radicals in the Multiversity." Chicago: Students for A Democratic Society. May.
- . 1967. "Student Power: A Radical View." New Left Notes, September 25.
- Denitch, Bogdan. 1970. "Is There a 'New Working Class'?" Dissent. January/February.
- Djilas, Milovan. 1958. La Nouvelle Classe Dirigeante. Paris: Plon.
- . 1957. The New Class. An Analysis of The Communist System. New York: Praeger.
- Dos Santos, Theotonio. 1970. "On the Concept of Social Class." Science and Society. 34:2 (Summer).
- Dreyfuss, Carl. 1938. "Occupation and Ideology of the Salaried Employee." Translated by Eva Abramovitch. New York: Works Progress Administration and Columbia University.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1933. The Division of Labor in Society. New York: The Free Press.
- Dutschke, Rudy. 1968. Der Lange Marshe. Munich, West Germany: Trikont-Verlag.
- Edwards, Alba. 1938 A Social-economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Edward, Richard C., Michael Reich and Thomas Weisskopt. The Capitalist System. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Ehrenreich, John and Barbara Ehrenreich. 1976. "The Professional/Managerial Class." Manuscript.
- . 1977. "The Professional-Managerial Class." Radical America, March-April.

- 1977.
"The New Left: A Case Study in Professional-Managerial Class Radicalism," Radical America, May/June.
- Flacks, Richard. 1971. "(On the New Working Class and) Strategies for Radical Social Change." Social Policy. March/April.
- 1970. "Young Intelligentia in Revolt." Transaction. June.
- Freeman, Richard B. 1976. The Over-educated American. New York: Academic Press.
- Freedman, Francesca. 1975. "The Internal Structure of the American Proletariat." Socialist Revolution. No. 26, 5:4 (October-December): 41-84.
- Gallie, Duncan. 1978. In Search of the New Working Class. Automation and Social Integration Within the Capitalist Enterprise. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Galbraith, John K. 1967. The New Industrial State. New York: New American Library.
- Geiger, Theodore. 1949. Die Klassengesellschaft im Schmelztiegel. Cologne and Hagan.
- Giddens, Antony. 1973. The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson.
- Gilbert, David, Robert Gottlieb and Gerry Tenney. 1967. "Toward a Theory of Social Change in America." ("The Port Authority Statement.") Unpublished Paper. New York City. January 23.
- Gintis, Herbert. 1970. "The New Working Class and Revolutionary Youth." Socialist Revolution. May.
- Goldthrope, John et al. 1967. "Affluent Worker and the Thesis of Embourgeoisement: Preliminary Findings." Sociology. 1:1 (January).
- Goldthorpe, John and David Lockwood, et al. 1969. The Affluent Worker in Class Structure. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- . 1968. The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1968. The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behavior. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Milton. 1958. Social Class in American Society. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gorelick, Sherry. 1977. "Undermining Hierarchy: Problems of Schooling in Capitalist America." Monthly Review 29:5 (October).
- Gorz, Andre. 1965. "Capitalist Relations of Production and the Socially Necessary Labour Force." International Socialist Review. August.
- . 1967. Strategy for Labor. Boston: Beacon.
- . 1972. "Technical Intelligence and the Capitalist Division of Labor." Telos No. 12. Summer.
- Gottlieb, Robert. 1977. "Monday Night [at the SDS Reunion]." Typescript. August 2?.
- Gottlieb, Robert and Marge Piercy. 1967. "Beginning to Begin to Begin," in Teodori (1969).
- Gough, Ian. 1972. "Marx's Theory of Productive and Unproductive Labor." New Left Review. No. 76 November/December.
- Gouldner, Alvin. 1979. The Future of Intellectuals and The Rise of The New Class. New York: Seabury.
- Gurin, Gerald, et al. 1957. American View Their Mental Health. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Guttman, Louis. 1965. "Facets of Job Evaluation," in Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Characteristics, edited by John Robinson. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Guttman, Louis et al., 1976. "Job Evaluation in the Israel Electric Corporation." (In Hebrew, described in Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, Research Report. Jerusalem, 1976-1977.)

- Halberstam, David. 1972. The Best and The Brightest.
New York: Random House.
- Hodge, Robert, Paul Siegel, and Peter Rossi. 1964.
"Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963." American Journal of Sociology 70 (November)
- Hodge, Robert, Donald Treiman, and Peter Rossi. 1965.
"A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige." In Bendix and Lipset (1966).
- Hodges, Donald. 1971. "Old and New Working Classes." Radical America. 5:1 (January/February).
- Hollingshead, August B. 1949. Elmstown's Youth.
New York: Wiley.
- Howard, Dick. 1969. "French New Working Class Theories." Radical America. 3:2 (March/April).
- 1975. "Preface" to Essays on The New Working Class. In Mallet (1975).
- Howe, Louise K. 1977. Pink Collar Workers. New York: Avon.
- Jenkins, G. D., et al., "Standardized Observation: An Approach to Measuring the Nature of Jobs." Journal of Applied Psychology. 60:171-181 (April).
- Jones, Landon Y. 1980. Great Expectations, America and the Baby Boom Generation. New York: Coward McCann and Georghegan.
- Kallenberg, Arne and Larry Griffin. "Class, Occupation, and Inequality in Job Rewards." American Journal of Sociology. 85: 4: 731-768.
- Karabel, Jerome. 1974. "The Decline of the American Student Movement." Unpublished Paper. Somerville, Massachusetts. January.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1980. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kautsky, Karl. 1971. The Class Struggle.
New York: Norton. [1891]
- Keniston, Kenneth. 1968. Young Radicals. Notes on Committed Youth. New York: Harcourt.

- Kerr, Clark. 1964. Industrialism and Industrial Man.
The Problems of Labor and Management in Economic
Growth. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klecka, William R. 1975. "Discriminant Analysis." In Norman Nie et al., Statistical Package For The Social Sciences. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Klingender, F. D. 1935. The Condition of Clerical Labor In Britain. London: Martin Lawrence.
- Kocka, Jurgen. 1980. White Collar Workers in America. 1890-1940. Beverly Hills: Sage Studies.
- Kohn, Melvin L. 1969. Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey [1977].
- 1976. "Occupational Structure and Alienation." American Journal of Sociology 82 (July) 111-129.
- Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler. 1973. "Occupational Experience and Psychological Functioning." American Sociological Review. 38:1 (February): 97-118.
- Larson, Magali Sephati. 1977. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lasch, Christopher. 1969. The Agony of the American Left. New York: Vintage.
- Lederer, Emil. 1912. "The Problem of the Modern Salaried Employees: Its Theoretical and Statistical Basis," in Die Privatangestellten in der Modernen Wirtschaftsentwicklung. Tübingen. [New York, 1937].
- Lederer, Emil and Jakob Marschak. 1926. "Der neue Mittelstand," in Grundriss der Sozialökonomik. Sect. IX, Pt. 1.
- Lenin, V. I. 1947. A Great Beginning. Reprinted in the Essentials of Lenin. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Lenski, Gerhard. 1966. Power and Privilege. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lockwood, David. 1958. The Blackcoated Worker: A Study In Class Consciousness. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- 1960. "The 'New Working Class.'" Arch. European Sociology. I:2.
- Loren, Charles. 1977. Classes in the United States. Davis, Calif.: Cardinal Publishers.
- Low-Berger, John. 1974. The New Working Class In Italy: Militancy and Class Consciousness. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Sociology. Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Lukacs, George. 1971. History and Class Consciousness. Cambridge: MIT Press. [1922]
- Lundberg, Ferdinand. 1968. The Rich and The Superrich. A Study in the Power of Money. New York: Lyle Stuart.
- Lynd, Robert and Helen Merrell. 1930. Middletown, A Study in American Culture. New York: Harcourt.
- 1937. Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harcourt.
- Mackenzie, Gavin. 1974. "The 'Affluent Worker' Study: An Evaluation and Critique." in The Social Analysis of Class Structure, edited by Frank Parkin. London: Tavistock Publications.
- 1977. "The Political Economy of the American Working Class: Review Article" [Braverman]. British Journal of Sociology. June.
- Mallet, Serge. 1963. La Nouvelle Classe Ouvrière. Paris: Editions du Seuil. 1964.
- 1975. Essays on the New Working Class. edited by Dick Howard and Dean Savage. St. Louis: Telos.
- 1975. The New Working Class. Translated by Andree and Bob Shepherd. Nottingham, England: Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation for Spokesman Books.

- Mandel, Jay. 1970. "Some Notes on the American Working Class." Review of Radical Political Economy. Spring.
- [Il Manifesto]. 1972. "Technicians and the Capitalist Division of Labor." Socialist Revolution. No. 9, 2:3 (May-June): 65-84.
- Marglin, Stephen. 1974. "What Do Bosses Do? The Origins and Functions of Hierarchy in Capitalist Production." Review of Radical Political Economics. Vol. VI, No. 2 (Summer).
- Marx, Karl. 1906. Capital, A Critique of Political Economy, edited by Ernest Unterman. New York: Modern Library.
- 1909. Capital, Vol. I. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole. Edited by F. Engels. Chicago: Charles Kerr.
- 1977. Karl Marx: Selected Writings, edited by David McLellan. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, Karl and Freidrich Engels. The Manifesto of The Communist Party. In Marx (1977), 221-245.
- Meiksins, Peter. 1980. The Social Origins of White Collar Work. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Sociology, York University. Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Miles, Michael. 1971. The Radical Probe. The Logic of Student Rebellion. New York: Atheneum.
- 1974. "Student Alienation in the U.S. Higher Education Industry." Politics and Society. 4:3:311-342.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1951. White Collar. The American Middle Classes. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mitzman, Arthur. 1970. The Iron Cage: An Interpretive History of Max Weber. New York: Knopf.

- Morgan, James. 1977. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics.
Waves VIII-X. Procedures and Tape Codes,
Interviewing Years, Supplements, 1975-77.
Ann Arbor: Institute for Survey Research.
- 1974. Five Thousand American Families.
Patterns of Economic Progress. Ann Arbor:
Institute for Social Research.
- National Opinion Research Center. 1964/1974.
"Study of Occupations," Survey 4171. April 1974.
- Nicolaus, Martin. 1967. "Proletariat and Middle Class in
Marx: Hegelian Choreography and the Capitalist Dia-
lectic." Studies on The Left, 7 (January-February).
- Nie, Norman, et al. 1975. Statistical Package For The
Social Sciences. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, James. 1968. "A History of the New Left, 1960-68."
Boston: New England Free Press. [Radical America,
May-December, 1968].
- O'Connor, James. 1973. The Fiscal Crisis of The State.
New York: St. Martin's Press.
- 1975. "Productive and Unproductive Labor."
Politics and Society. 5:3.
- Oppenheimer, Martin. 1973 . "The Proletarianization of the
Professional," Pp. 213-228. In Professionalization
and Social Change. The Sociological Review
Monograph, Vol. 20 (December). University of Keele,
England.
- 1972. "What is the New Working Class?"
New Politics. 15 (Fall) 29-43.
- 1970. "White Collar Revisited:
The Making of a New Working Class." Social Policy.
July/August.
- 1975. "Women Office Workers: Petty-
Bourgeoisie or New Proletarian?" Social Scientist.
Vol. 40-41 (November-December) Trivandrum, India.
- Ossowski, Stanislaw. 1963. Class Structure and The
Social Consciousness. London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul.

- Packard, Vance. 1959. The Status Seekers. New York: McKay.
- Page, Charles. 1940. Class and American Sociology. From Ward to Ross. New York: Dial.
- Parker, Richard. 1972. The Myth of The Middle Class. Notes on Affluence and Equality. New York: Liveright.
- Parkin, Frank. 1971. Class Inequality and Political Order. Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies. New York: Praeger.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1970. "Equality and Inequality in Modern Society, or Social Stratification Revisited." In E. O. Lauman, ed. Social Stratification. Research and Theory for the 1970s. New York: Bobbs-Merril.
- 1954. Essays in Sociological Theory. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- 1951. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1975. Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. London, England: New Left Books.
- 1973a. "On Social Classes." New Left Review. No. 78. (March-April): 27-55.
- 1973. Political Power and Social Class. London: New Left Books.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1976. "[Proletariat into a Class.] The Process of Class Formation. From Karl Kautsky's Class Struggle to Recent Controversies." Mimeo. University of Chicago. Dept. of Political Science.
- 1975. The Survey of Working Conditions, 1969-70. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Quinn, Robert P. et al. 1975. Quality of Employment Study, 1972-73. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Reich, Michael. 1972. "The Evolution of the United States Labor Force," in Edwards (1972).
- Reissman, Leonard. 1959. Class in American Society. New York: Free Press.

- Roper, Elmo. 1947. "The Fortune Survey. The American Factory Worker." Fortune Magazine, May-June.
- 1947. "Fortune Survey #58: The American Factory Worker." Roper Associates. January.
- Ross, George. 1978. "Marxism and the New Middle Class." Theory and Society. 5:2 (March) :163-190.
- Rossi, Peter et al. 1974. "Measuring Household Social Standing." Social Science Research. 3: 169-190.
- Rowntree, John and Margaret. 1968. "Youth as A Class." Anarchy. London, August.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. 1973. SDS. New York: Vintage Books.
- Schumpeter, Joseph. 1950. Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. New York: Harper and Bros. [1942]
- Singleman, Joachim and Erik O. Wright. 1978. "Proletarianization in Advanced Capitalist Societies: An Empirical Intervention into the Debate Between Marxist and Post-Industrial Theorists Over the Transformation of the Labor Process." Paper Presented to the Conference on the Labor Process. SUNY-Binghamton. May 1978.
- Smith, David N. 1974. Who Rules The University? An Essay In Class Analysis. New York: Monthly Review.
- Sombart, Werner. 1976. Why is There No Socialism In the United States? White Plains: International Arts and Sciences Press. [1906].
- Special Task Force to the Secretary of HEW. 1973. Work in America. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Speier, Hans. 1934. "The Salaried Employee in Modern Society," in Social Resarch, Vol. I. February.
- 1939. The Salaried Employee in German Society. Edited by Columbia University and Works Progress Administration. Translations of Die Angestellten in der deutschen Gesellschaft.

Stark, David. 1979. "Class Struggle and the Transformation of the Labor Process: A Relational Approach." Paper for Conference on New Directions in the Labor Process. SUNY-Binghamton, April 1978.

Stein, Maurice R. 1972. The Eclipse of Community. An Interpretation of American Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [1960]

Stodder, Jim. 1973. "Old and New Working Class. Socialist Revolution. Number 17, 3:5 (September-October): 99-110.

Stone, Katherine. 1975. "The Origins of Jobs Structure in the Steel Industry." In Labor Market Segmentation by Richard Edwards et al., Lexington: Heath.

Sweezy, Paul H. 1953. The Present As History. Essays and Reviews on Capitalism and Socialism. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Sweezy, Paul H. 1942. The Theory of Capitalist Development. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Szymanski, Albert. 1972. "Trends in the American Working Class." Socialist Revolution. 2:4 (July-August).

----- 1973. "Response to Stodder." Socialist Revolution. Number 17. 3:5 (September-October): 110-118.

Teodori, Massimo. Comp. 1969. The New Left, A Documentary History. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Thompson, E. P. 1963. The Making of The English Working Class. New York: Vintage.

Touraine, Alain. 1971. The Post-Industrial Society New York: Random House.

Treiman, Donald. 1977. Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective. New York: Academic.

Urry, John. 1973. "Toward A Structural Theory of the Middle Class." Acta Sociologica. 16:3.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1970. Census of Population. General Social and Economic Characteristics.

----- 1971. Vol. II. Subject Reports.
Occupational Characteristics. Table PC(2)-7A.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstracts of
The United States. Washington, D.C. Government
Printing Office. 1940-79.

U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1977. Handbook of Methods For Surveys and Studies.
(Bulletin 1910). 1976.

1977. "Maximum Wage and Minimum Hour Standards Under
the Fair Employment Standards Act."

1972. "Wages and Hours of Work of Nonsupervisory
Employees In All Private, Non-Farm Industries by
Coverage Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act."
Washington, D.C.

"Current Economic Survey." Monthly.

"Current Population Survey." Monthly.

"Employment and Earnings." Monthly.

1977. Employment and Training Report of the President.

"Monthly Report on Employment, Payroll and Hours."

Vanneman, Reeves. 1977. "The Occupational Composition
of American Classes: Results of Cluster Analysis."
American Journal of Sociology. 82:4 (January).

Weblen, Thorsten. 1965. "The Technicians and Revolution,"
in Engineers and the Price System in The Portable
Weblen, edited by Max Lerner, New York: Viking,
[1921].

Veroff, Joseph et al. 1980. The Study of Modern Living.
Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research. (Forthcoming.)

- Vidich, Arthur and Joseph Bensman. 1958. Small Town in Mass Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel and Paul Starr, eds. 1971. The University Crisis Reader. 2 Vols. New York: Random House.
- Warner, W. Lloyd. 1949j. Democracy in Jonesville. A Study of Quality and Equality. New York: Harper.
- 1960. Social Class in America. New York: Harper and Row [1949s].
- and Paul Lunt. 1941. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- and Leo Srole. 1945. The Social System of American Ethnic Groups. New Haven: Yale.
- 1947. The Social System of A Modern Factory. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 1942. The Status System of A Modern Community. New York: Harcourt.
- Weber, Max. 1968. Economy and Society. Edited by G. Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminster.
- Whalley, Peter. 1980. "The Proletarianization of the Engineer. Toward a Reformulation of the Issue." Paper for Meetings of the Society for the Study of Problems. New York City, August.
- Williams, Robin M. 1960. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Knopf.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1976. Class Structure and Income Inequality. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Sociology. University of California. Berkeley, California.
- 1976b. "Class Boundaries in Advanced Capitalist Societies." New Left Review. No. 98:3-42. (July-August).
- 1977. "Class Structure and Occupation: A Research Note." Madison, Wisc: Institute for Research on Poverty.

----- 1978. Class, Crisis and the State.
London: New Left Books. [Manuscript.]

Wright, Erik Olin and Luca Perrone. 1977. "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality." American Sociological Review. 42:1 (February): 32-55.

Wright, James D. 1976. The Dissent of the Governed. Alienation and Democracy in America. New York:
Academic Press.

----- 1978. "In Search of a New Working Class." Qualitative Sociology. 1:1 (May).

Zimbalist, Andrew, ed. 1979. Case Studies in the Labor Process. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Appendices

APPENDIX 3.1

Estimation of Class Category Sizes

Based on Government Surveys of Industry

Introduction.

There are three government-executed national surveys of employment by industry which can be used, in conjunction with other statistics on the employed civilian labor force, to estimate class category sizes in 1970 (and over time). Each provides data on supervisory and (non-supervisory) employment from which estimates of the respective percentages of supervisors and employees can be developed for, e.g. 1970. By combining these figures with Current Population Survey (CPS) data on self-employment, estimates can be made of the percentages of self-employed, supervisors and nonsupervisory employees in the labor force for the 1970s.

"Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Standards Under the Fair Labor Standards Act" (MWMH) (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1964-77) includes data on non-supervisory employment, for private industry since 1964, and for the entire civilian labor force (including

government and agriculture) from 1970-77. "Wages and Hours of Work of Nonsupervisory Employees in All Private, Non-Farm Industries by Coverage Status under the Fair Labor Standards Act," (W&H), (Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1972), conducted for the year 1970 alone, provides data on non-supervisory employment for private, nonfarm industries. The "Current Employment Survey" (CES), conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) of the Department of Labor, as the "Monthly Report on Employment, Payroll and Hours," develops figures on production/nonsupervisory workers and on persons "excluded" from these categories, who would be in the equivalent of supervisory employment, for all industries except agriculture and government. Figures for both nonproduction (supervisory) and production/nonsupervisory employment are reported in the published form.¹

1. These results are reported in the BLS report "Employment and Earnings," in Table C-2 "Production or Nonsupervisory Workers, and Nonproduction Workers on Private Payrolls, and Nonproduction Workers as Percent of Total Employment, by Industry Division, Annual Averages, 1947-76" in the Employment and Training Report of the President, 1977.

Methods of developing estimates of labor force size.

In order to develop from industry statistics estimates of class category sizes based on the proportion of self-employed, supervisors and employees in the employed labor force, it was necessary to develop a number of comparison base statistics for determining percentages. Most important was an appropriate figure for the total labor force on which to base percentages. In fact, the appropriate comparison figure is actually the total "labor force of jobs," since industry figures for supervisory and nonsupervisory employment typically report number of jobs, not number of people.

Labor force statistics are gathered in two major forms: by individual and by job (reflecting, to a certain extent, the differences between occupation and industry). Two major government surveys of employment develop the respective figures, the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the Current Economic Survey (CES), ("Monthly Report on Employment, Payroll and Hours"). The CPS is based on a household survey, includes all labor force members, and represents the individual-occupation approach. The CES, as well as MWMH and W&H, are known as "establishment" surveys, since they query firms and not individuals. The CES is based on a payroll survey, includes numbers of jobs (not people), and

represents the job-industry method.

Not included in the figures on employment by establishment are the self-employed, unpaid family workers, domestic service and, in the CES, agricultural workers. The establishment figures, however, in counting jobs, do include workers with more than one job for each job. Because, for example, CES includes all the jobs a person holds, its figure for private, non-agricultural wage and salary employment is higher by some 1.5 million than the comparable figure in the CPS, which measures people once regardless of number of jobs. For instance, in 1975 the CES figure for private, nonagricultural employment was 62.3 million, while the CPS figure was 60.8 million. The CPS overall total, which includes self-employed and agriculture, is higher than the establishment figure, which only includes non-agricultural wage and salary employees. In 1975 the total CPS figure of 84.8 million is higher than the 77.1 million CES estimate which excludes agriculture and self-employment (though in these figures government is included.) (Because of the noted omissions, e.g. agriculture, and in the case of supervisory figures, government, the CES does not directly provide a figure for total employment.)

TABLE 43
SIZE OF LABOR FORCE IN DIFFERENT ESTIMATES (IN MILLIONS)

SURVEY	CPS (HH)	CES (JOB) (PnAg)	MWMH (+CPS)
TOTAL	84.8	--	91.2
W&S	76.6	(77.1)	81.5
PnAg	60.8	62.3	--
Self-employed	--	--	8.7 (9.5%)
Supervisory	--	11.2	15.2 (16.9%)
Employee	--	51.3	66.3 (73.7%)

A total for labor force of jobs was created using the establishment estimate from e.g. MWMH, for wage and salary employment as a base. As the establishment figures lack data on self-employment, domestic service, and, in the CES, agriculture, figures for these categories were taken from the CPS and added to the CES base. Since the establishment survey includes multiple job holding, CPS figures (on self-employment, etc.) were further augmented by numbers of people whose second jobs involved self-employment, etc. Also, as the establishment survey includes workers 14 years and older, adjustments were made over the CPS statistics, which are based on 16 years and older. The CPS figures for agricultural employees, self-employed, dual job holders, and 14 and 15 year olds, were obtained from the relevant

editions of Statistical Abstracts and "Employment and Earnings" reports and added to the respective establishment totals to develop an total of labor force of jobs. Similar procedures were followed for developing labor force total used for the MWMH, W&H estimates, and, in modified form, for the CES survey of private, nonagricultural employment. (Figures for self-employment cannot be divided between employers and independents because no information is provided on whether one has employees or not.)

Definitions of supervisory and nonsupervisory employees in industry surveys.

Supervisors may be distinguished from non-supervisory employees in each of the three national surveys usable for this analysis of class categories. The definitions of the respective designations are different, hence their results differ. In the MWMH and W&H studies, based on the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) data, figures for nonsupervisory employment (i.e., employment covered by FLSA) are provided from 1964 for private industry. After 1970 data for both "exempt" (supervisor employment) and covered (nonsupervisory employment) for all industries are provided. In the FLSA publication, "Executives, Administrative, Professional and Outside Salesmen Exemptions Under the FLSA, 1975," "exempt," hence supervisory employees, are carefully defined. For

W&H, also based on FLSA, "nonsupervisory employees" are specifically defined (p. A-1). In the CES, both supervisory (nonproduction) and "nonsupervisory/production employees" are defined. (See BLS, Handbook of Methods For Surveys and Studies, Bulletin 1910, 1976, pp. 37,39).

MWMH identified "non-supervisory employees" as persons covered by the FLSA's wage and hour restrictions. Persons exempt from the Act's provisions, then, are considered supervisory. Included as supervisory are executives and administrative personnel (including academic administrators) as well as all professionals, including teachers. (Outside salespeople are also exempt, and hence supervisory.) Working supervisors and foremen must earn more than \$155 a week and spend more than 80% of their time on supervision to be included as supervisors. Even an administrative employee who supervises less than 80% of the time is classified as a non-supervisory employee. On the other hand, all teachers are excluded (i.e. exempt and hence supervisory) from the non-supervisory category, in which most would more logically fit.² (Similar definitions of non-supervisor to those in MWHM are used in the W&H survey for 1970.)

2. Wright (1977:8) classifies teachers, one of the largest single occupational groups, as non-supervisory employees, since supervision of students differs from supervision of employees. Similarly, the CES defines teachers as non-supervisory. Both the MWMH and W&H include teachers (as

The CES (BLS) survey counts production/nonsupervisory employees in e.g. manufacturing, (and persons "excluded" from these categories, and hence supervisors) and reports in Table C-2, both nonproduction (hence supervisory) and production/nonsupervisory (hence employee) figures. In CES, supervisory employees (e.g. in trade) include office, clerical, sales, production workers, and professionals, including teachers below the supervisory level (p. 37). Included with non-supervisory e.g. production workers (in manufacturing) are working supervisors in construction and industry, decreasing the size of the supervisory category in these industries. On the other hand, sales and credit employees (p. 37) in industry and commerce are defined as supervisory, inflating that figure. The two may roughly balance out. The CES figures, as they are only for private, non-agricultural industries, exclude supervisors in government and farming. Though some data exists from 1947 to date, only 1968 to 1977 included enough of these figures for the requisite industries for requisite years.

well as all other professionals) in the supervisory categories, thus inflating the figures.

TABLE 44
DEFINITIONS OF SUPERVISORS/NONSUPERVISOR IN VARIOUS SURVEYS

STUDY	SUPERVISORY	EMPLOYEES
MPR (1947-77)	"nonproduction" (C2) (CES) (production excluded)	"production" or "nonsupervisory"
	sales and credit employees in commerce and industry	office, clerical and sales professionals (e.g. teachers) below supervisory level (141)
		working supervisors in construction and industry
	(exemptions from FLSA) (calculated before 1971; provided after 1971)	(subject to FLSA)
MWMH (1970-77)	executives and admin. professionals (teachers)	"non-supervisory employees"
	working supervisors > \$155 and > 80% admin.	working supervisors < \$155 and < 80% admin.
W&H (1970)	(calculated) professionals (teachers)	"non-supervisory" (A1)

Conclusions.

Industry figures, augmented by CPS data, do provide the bases for estimates of the class category composition of the population in 1970. Comparisons among the different estimates are somewhat difficult, however, because of differences among the surveys in definitions of non-supervisory (and hence supervisory) employment as well as differences in which industries and occupations the

3. The relative sizes of the supervisory and employee categories might be enlarged or narrowed by reallocation (based on CPS data) of occupational groups within them. For instance, the CES study classifies teachers and professionals as non-supervisory employees, but these same groups are excluded (exempt) from the non-supervisory category in the MWMH study. Ironically, even for its inclusion of teachers, the MWMH category of non-supervisory employment, has a smaller overall percentage of employees: this points to problematic differences among data sets. While these sorts of discrepancies can be explained by more stringent definitions of supervisory (i.e. FLSA exempt) labor in the MWMH study, the differences in data need not be pursued here in detail nor do they detract from the conclusions. The more strictly defined MWMH study can be seen as an estimate of supervisors who have significant supervisory and administrative responsibilities, while the CES study include many nominal supervisors who exercise little authority. Neither of these studies include all supervisors, however, if the percentage estimates in the national sample survey data sets are indicative. For instance, while industry estimates indicate about 13% of the labor force is supervisor, the SWC (1970) suggests a figure of about 36%. However, the industry figures for self-employment, supervision and employees for 1970 of 11.7%, 13.1% and 72.2% are very close to the figures based on the 1975 PSID for self-employed, managers, and expanded central working class of 10.9%, 13.1% and 76.0% respectively.

surveys include. Those comparison statistics developed for total labor force size embody certain problems and fit rather irregularly with the data.

A summary of the overall class sizes for the 1970s based on the three governmental surveys is presented in the Table below.⁴ This covers all industries, whereas the estimates in the body of the chapter cover only white collar concentrated industries.

4. Only after 1970 does MWMH provide figures for supervisory (exempt) employees; before then, only figures for non-supervisory employment are given and the others must be calculated. For the MWMH years, 1970 to 1976, the total number of employees used for percentage purposes is about 5 million higher than the CPS/HH estimate which does not include dual job holding. (In most cases the percentages total to more than 100 because of double counting.) As the estimates are only to be approximate for the 1970s (and to show trends over time in the 1947-77 time series), and are consistent in method, the results are satisfactory if imprecise. The percentages for CES for the "overall" labor force represent only part of the labor force (i.e. they do not include government or agriculture), but percentages based on them are roughly comparable to figures based on the entire labor force. Because the W&H/ESA figures are precise, and are based on a large sample (1.4 million) of establishments, though not covering all labor force categories, they served as the basis for another estimate. For an industry like mining where figures for supervisors are not provided in W&H, an average of the figures from MWMH and CES was used; for agriculture and government, a figure from MWMH was used, weighted by the average proportion of availables in CES vs. MWMH (.90).

TABLE 45
CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES BASED ON THREE GOVERNMENT SURVEYS

REPORT (1970)	SELF-EMPLOYED	SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES
CES	9.1%	15.7%	74.4%
MWMH	9.9	13.7	75.0
W&H (.90)	9.8	21.6	67.4
AVERAGED	8.6	13.1	72.2
SWC (1970)	11.7	36.1	52.2
PSID (1975)	10.9	13.1	76.0

Two other estimates for 1970 were devised out of these three surveys. One is based on the W&H survey, filling in for missing industries (e.g. government) based on the most appropriate comparison figure from the other surveys; the other is based on an average of the other estimates. (Figures from two national sample surveys, SWC (1970) and PSID (1975) are included here for comparison; the SWC figures for, e.g. supervisors include all supervisors, while the PSID figure only includes empowered supervisors and assigns nominal supervisors to the expanded employee category.)

It appears that in 1970 about 70 to 75% of the labor force were (non-supervisory) employees (though some nominal supervisors were also included in this figure.) About 15%

of the wage and salary employees have more than a nominal amount of supervisory authority. Just less than 10% were self-employed. (Similar figures were developed from Appendix 4.3 for 1947 to date for the entire labor force, providing data for time series analysis.)

Application of procedures to the white collar sector.

The above procedures are used in this appendix for providing estimates of class sizes for the entire labor force. A modified procedure can be used for developing estimates for classes within the white collar sector. As the figures in the surveys are for industries only, it is not possible to directly explore the class proportions for various white collar occupations. Chosen instead as proxies for these occupations were those industries where there are a high (greater than 50%) concentration of white collar occupations within the sector. Specifically this includes certain service sector industries where the white collar proportions are highest, including finance, trade and services. The data on industries with high proportions of white collar and service labor are presented again in the following Table:

TABLE 46

INDUSTRIES WITH HIGH PROPORTION OF WHITE COLLAR AND SERVICES LABOR (1970)

	WHITE COLLAR	SERVICE	WC+SERV	LABOR FORCE
<u>INDUSTRY</u>				
SERVICE SECTOR	(72.8%)	(14.3%)	(87.1%)	42.8%
SERVICES	63.5	24.8	88.3	16.4
FINANCE, ETC.	91.9	3.8	95.7	5.2
TRADE	63.1	14.1	77.2	21.1
WHOLESALE	67.7	0.8	68.5	5.3
RETAIL	62.0	17.0	79.0	15.8

The procedures for estimates of class category compositions based on government surveys of industry (as well as on survey data) in the white collar occupations are explained in the body of Chapter Three.

APPENDIX 3.2

Selection of Characteristics For Defining WorkerIntroduction.

This appendix explains in more detail the procedures both for selecting the characteristics for defining worker and for choosing the cutoffs for the subclass categories of workers and authors. A number of attempts were made to determine which characteristics were best for defining worker before one was chosen. Similarly, a number of approaches to selecting the cutoff points for the class subcategories within employees (e.g. workers) were explored before the chosen one was established. This appendix explains both the other attempts at choosing worker-characteristics and provides details on the cutoff procedures chosen.

The procedures for determining the defining characteristics of worker began with a review of the relevant literature of worker dimensions and of attempts by Kohn et al. to develop metrics for rating persons on similar job dimensions. From these examinations came a first list of eight dimensions which appeared to be the characteristics with which to define worker. These were called the "apparent dimensions" of worker. They included autonomy,

decision-making, supervision level, complexity of work, conditions of work, overall situation, discrimination, and pace/press of work. Following this, a complete review was made of the variables in the "Survey of Working Conditions" and any variable which appeared to describe one of the dimensions of worker was listed under the relevant dimension. (These may be called the "apparent variables" of worker.) About 150 variables from the SWC appeared to be related to one of the eight dimensions defining worker. The Survey of Working Condition was chosen as a source of variables because, among the studies which included occupation, self-employment and supervisory variables necessary for basic class analysis, it contains variables which richly describe the conditions of employment. The SWC also contains a number of scales of quality of employment, and it was thought that one of these scales might turn out to be helpful in defining worker either as the metric itself or as one of the variables in the metric. Neither turned out to be the case.

Preliminary examination indicated that about 37 variables appeared most closely associated with the eight apparent characteristics of the concept of worker. At that point these variables were chosen for reanalysis. Simply using

1. The variables were V70, V75, V82, V89, V92, V93, V102,

these variables as the constituents of the metric was considered and recoding the 37 variables to a coding scale (1 to 4 toward more freedom) was begun. It was abandoned, on the suggestion of Sociologist Roberta Cohen that the existence of factor analytic techniques argued against simple and arbitrary choice of factors for scaling. A search was begun for a more sophisticated way of discriminating among the variables.

Factor analysis was begun using a quartimax rotation to try to develop out of the 37 variables a single factor for creating a metric. The quartimax rotation, which is supposed to concentrate on finding a single common factor (Nie et al., 1975: 434), failed to isolate such a single factor. In fact, at least two identifiable, major factors came out of the quartimax rotation. One had 5 and the other 4 variables with loadings above .55: high intellectual content (V412, V428, V630, V636, V637), and authority (V89, V45, V147, V148.) Moreover, four other factors had two high loading variables (.5+) and an additional near-high variables (.3+), threat of automation (V316, V546), hours control (V148, V610), physical stress (V543, V618), and time

V145, V147, V148, V186, V198, V249, V316, V412, V416, V428, V430, V446, V452, V543, V610, V612, V615, V616, V617, V618, V619, V622, V624, V626, V627, V629, V630, V636, V637, and V646. Each is attached to one of the eight initial characteristics of worker.

control (V430, V615).

While each of these factors is relevant to defining worker, factor analysis seemed the wrong procedure for two reasons. First, the quartimax procedure should have developed a single factor but did not; and second, it is unclear how large a value (.4, .5, .3) was needed for a factor loading to be "high." Also unclear was where the cutoffs for the various class categories like worker and author should be set.

A regression procedure suggested by Sociologist James R. Beniger of Princeton University seemed to overcome the first problem, and was explored after factor analysis was abandoned. Step-wise, ordinary least squares linear regression was used to isolate those variables which best distinguish employees (non-supervisory employees) from more empowered members of the labor force (supervisors and owners). Class categories were coded 0 for independents, 1 for employers, 2 for supervisors and 3 for employees. The class variable was recoded into a dummy variable where 0 stood for "employees" and 1 for the other categories ("authorities"). (For 1, N=769; for 0, N=764.)

Simply put, the procedure found those variables (and their order) which best predicted the distinction between (non-supervisory) employees and more empowered persons in

the labor force (e.g. self-employed and supervisors). This was to be done by regressing the dummy dependent variables on possible worker-describing independent variables.

Plans were made to implement the regression procedure on the list of 150 variables. But 150 variables turned out to be too many for step-wise regression using the SPSS (or other) statistical package. In order to pare down this list, Pearson's zero-order correlations were done between each of the variables and the recoded dummy variable. Only those variables which showed a correlation of above 0.1 with the dummy variable were retained. While this plan was flawed by using a dummy variable in the correlation, as a first means of data reduction it provided a way of excluding many variable which would probably not have been significant predictors in any case. The list was reduced to about 100 variables with adequate correlations.

The remaining apparent variables which seemed to represent a worker characteristics were then regressed in a step-wise linear regression against the dummy variable. By this method, a group of variables which were significant predictors (F significant at .05 or better) were identified. The variables chosen by the regression turned out to be the best predictors of difference between "employees" and "authorities.". Essentially the order of their entrance

into the regression equation indicated the most important factors in defining worker. In this method, the significant dimensions were distinguished from other apparent dimensions; the order indicated which were the most significant factors.

Interestingly, though perhaps not surprising considering how they were chosen from a review of the literature, the factors drawn from the regression turned out to be closely related to traditional definitions of worker (or the opposite) in various writings. For example, being supervised and having to plan ahead turned out to be most significant predictors, the first describing worker and the second authors. Again this process was flawed by using a dummy dependent variable in the regression, but again it served as an adequate form of data reduction.²

An interim list of about 20 significant predictors emerged. This list was reviewed for two concerns. First, variables which did not cover the entire labor force in 1 to 5 coding (e.g. ones which excluded the supervisors and the self-employed or had a very large number of missing cases)³ were generally excluded since their restricted sample size,

2. The running of the initial regressions was divided between Princeton University and Northwestern University Computer Centers, and the beginning lists of apparent dimensions for each of these two locations were slightly different. The differences were worked out at Princeton.

corresponding, in some cases, to the different class categories, might bias how good a predictor they could be.⁴

Also eliminated were duplicates where more than one variable described the same factor (e.g. two touched upon fringe benefits) and the one with the higher entrance level was retained. Also, variables which did not seem structural,

3. Prior to doing the regressions on the reduced lists, no answers and don't knows (8 and 9) were recoded as missing cases. For most variables these categories included only a small number of cases. In the scaling on the metric, however, the missing cases were recoded as the mean for the non-missing cases in order to produce a full complement (565) of employees.

4. Fortunately, most of the relevant variables covered the entire labor force within the 1 to 5 coding, or there existed a variable on the same dimension which fit this requirement. In some cases, rather than excluding variables which did not include a relatively small number of cases within the 1 to 5 coding, for example, the self-employed ($n=206$) were recoded to 10. The recodes of some variables which should have been excluded in the original running of the regressions with restricted universes, got into the list, in part because of ambiguities in the codebook on who was included in some of the recoded variables; and some were retained if their recoding could be accomplished simply, e.g. 0=10. On four of these variables which got into the final regression (V81,V145,V147,V148), 0 (206 cases of self-employment) was recoded as 10. Consistent with the direction of the coding, 10 for self-employed implied a higher value than the maximum coding (5) on the other values. While 10 may have been rather high, the 0=10 seemed most straightforward, and other recoding schemes (0=7, etc.) seemed overly arbitrary. In fact, only 206 (vs. 771 when supervisors were excluded, too) person needed recoding to a single value; other cases where the number of non 1-5 coded values were significantly greater were excluded rather than recoded; in fact, a more complicated recoding of missing cases was attempted but abandoned, after consultation with Professor Beniger, because it was overly complex and inappropriate for the regression procedure.

but merely associated with the relevant class distinction, like education and age, were eliminated. Following some rerunning of the regressions and further modifications, a group of 13 most significant predictors emerged.⁵

The SWC scales of "quality of employment" use the same recoding procedure (suggesting the coding here). About 50 variables at the end of the codebook are simply recodings of earlier variables in a consistent 1 to 4 (low to high) manner. This recoding made an important difference in some cases. For instance, Wright uses variables (V66, AUTONOMY) and (V71, DECISION-MAKING POWER) as his main predictors of "semi-autonomous" employee. Both were included here in the original stepwise regressions against the worker dummy. Only V627 (recode of V71) proved to be a significant predictor. V626 (recode of V66) did not prove to be a significant predictor. (This fact was first established in the runs with 100 variables and rechecked in a run specifically including the good predictors and V626). When run in their original codings (1 to 4, with 1 high and 4

5. Any variables in the list of twenty predictors not already so coded were recoded so that the numbering was in the same direction. Each variable was recoded 1,2,4,5 (10) where one (1) indicated a lower value and five (5) a higher value. This was done so that the coding would be in the same direction as the 0-1 dummy variable for worker, where 0 indicated lower, or employee class status, and 1 higher or empowered class ("authorities") status. Expected were low score on the metric for employees and higher for others.

low), both V66 and V71 turned out to be significant predictors. But this coding is contrary to the meaning of the variables and does not make sociological sense; a code of one should mean a low value, and four or five a high value. For this reasons, V627 (V71 recoded) was used (and V626 (V66 recoded) was not used as significant predictor. It was because autonomy turned out not to be a significant predictor that Wright's term "semi-autonomous" employee was abandoned in favor of "authorized employee" which touches upon the authority and creativity dimensions while indicating that the employees power is delegated.

TABLE 47
SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS FROM REGRESSIONS, SWC, 1970

VARIABLE NAMES	NUMBER	B-COEFFICIENT
HAVE IMMEDIATE BOSS	V81	.0531
JOB REQUIRES PLAN AHEAD	V636	.0435
ALLOWED TO MAKE DECISIONS	V626	.0433
JOB TENURE	V611	.0415
GIVEN ENOUGH AUTHORITY	V622	.0386
REPETITIOUS WORK	V624	.0281
INADEQUATE AUTHORITY	V148	-.0409
JOB REQUIRE BE CREATIVE	V631	.0235
NOT EXCESSIVE WORK	V415	-.0243
BELONG TO UNION	V319	.0145
OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP ABILITIES	V412	.0172
ACT AGAINST BETTER JUDGMENT	V145	-.0222
CAN'T INFLUENCE BOSS	V147	.0150
(CONSTANT)		-.2463
R ²		.3436

Because regression of a dummy variable violated the assumption of normality in the dependent variable, the regression approach was abandoned in favor of discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis is more robust (see Klecka, 1975: 435 n2) and allows for dichotomous dependent variables and relaxes the assumptions of normality in the independent variables.

The final selections were made by step-wise, discriminant analysis. This was an appropriate statistical approach because of its emphasis on distinguishing between categories by identifying salient dimensions. Discriminant analysis identified which variables (discriminators) best distinguished between "authorities" and "employees." The step-wise feature of discriminant analysis gave the order, from best to worst, among the discriminating variables.

In applying the discriminant analysis to the SWC, eight variables were found to be significant predictors at the .05 level or better. Each one indicates a substantive dimension for creating a metric on which workers and authors could be distinguished. In the order in which they emerged from the discriminant analysis, the variables were based on the following questions:

TABLE 48

QUESTIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATORS,
SURVEY OF WORKING CONDITIONS, 1969-70

1. Is there one person you think of as your immediate superior or boss--someone who is directly over you?
2. How much is this like your job? A job that allows you to make a lot of decisions on your own.
3. How much is this like your job? A job that requires you to be creative.
4. How many years and months have you worked for your present employer?
5. Are you being given enough or not enough ... for you to work your best? The authority to tell certain people what to do?
6. How much is this like your job? A job that requires you do things that are very repetitious?
7. As part of your present job do you belong to a union or an employees' association?
- (8. How true is this of your job? I have the opportunity to develop my own special abilities.)

Variables like having repetitious work indicate a worker dimension, while others such as being able to make decisions indicate authorized employee. As is mentioned in the main body of the thesis, only the first seven variables were used in developing a metric, since the eighth (8: V412) variable was not significant for 1973 data which are compared to the 1970 data in Chapter Four.

The following Table gives the coefficients for the standardized and unstandardized discriminant functions as well as for the classification function of the (employees) group, on which the metric was developed. The eigenvalue for the discriminant function is 0.42099 (significance 0.0) with a canonical correlation of 0.5443053.

TABLE 49

 DISCRIMINANT AND CLASSIFICATION COEFFICIENTS
 SWC, 1970

VARIABLE	DISCRIMINANT STANDARDIZED	DISCRIMINANT UNSTANDARDIZED	CLASSIFICATION (EMPLOYEES)
V81	0.50958	0.2729312	-0.1530554
V627	0.36151	0.2618751	1.116955
V611	0.34135	0.1879356	1.514144
V622	0.20925	0.1300526	1.201432
V624	0.19849	0.1452112	0.7982295
V631	0.31567	0.1977662	0.3271117
V319	0.12986	0.07010231	1.203486
CONSTANT	--	-4.135294	-11.43723

Using the coefficients (c's) from the classification function in the discriminant analysis (Nie, 1975:445), a metric was created on which each person in the relevant part (i.e. employees) of the SWC sample could be located. The focal group, of course, was nonsupervisory employees (members of the central working class). The CWC was to be subdivided into workers, authors (and normal employees).

Estimating the size of the author and worker categories involved making meaningful divisions of the employee group. Differences in the distributions of scores on the metric were used to differentiate between the groups. First, authors were distinguished from other employees based on a substantive assumption: those people who were "closer" in characteristics to supervisors than to other employees as a group were considered authors. The rest would be "general

employees," from whom workers would be distinguished in a later step.

The procedures for determining the cutoff points for authors and workers were based on the differences in distributions of scores for supervisory and nonsupervisory employees.⁶ Means and standard deviations were calculated for both supervisors and employees. The point (K) an equal number (N) of standard deviations (s) from the means (\bar{x}) of both the supervisors and employees represented a place of equal distance from the central tendencies of the two distributions. Scores above this "mid-point" (K) are closer to the central-distributional tendencies for supervisors, and hence place an employee in the author category. Scores below the point (K) are closer to the employee mean and hence assign people to the residual, "general employees" category. The general equation for the cutoff (K) between authorized and general employees is included below.

6. The rationale behind the "authorized employee" cutoff lies in the assumption that the scores for supervisors would reflect a greater level of authority (and thus be higher) due to the supervisory function than the scores for non-supervisory employees. (In fact, it turned out that 31 of 565 or 5.5% supervisors has scores which would have placed them in the worker category.) The means for the supervisory and employee categories were significantly different at the .000 level.

TABLE 50

CALCULATIONS FOR CUTOFF FOR
AUTHORS, NORMALS, AND WORKERS, SWC, 1970

$$K = \bar{x} (\text{supervisor}) - N * s (\text{supervisor}) \\ [\text{or } K = \bar{x} (\text{employee}) + N * s (\text{employee})]$$

where N is the equal number of standard deviations:

$$N = \frac{\bar{x} (\text{supervisor}) - \bar{x} (\text{employee})}{s (\text{supervisor}) + s (\text{employee})}$$

The actual equation for the SWC sample was:

$$14.168 - N * 4.651 = 10.125 + N * 4.802$$

where N is the equal number of standard deviations from the respective means.

$$N = (14.168 - 10.125) / (4.651 + 4.802)$$

$$N = 0.4277$$

K is the cutoff score for the category divisions, where K is evaluated by substituting N into the original equation:

$$K = \bar{x} (\text{supervisor}) - N * s (\text{supervisor}) \\ [\text{or } K = \bar{x} (\text{employee}) + N * s (\text{employee})]$$

$$K = 14.168 - (0.4277) (4.651) [= 10.125 + (0.4277) (4.802)]$$

$$K = 12.1788$$

7

Employees with scores above 12.1788 are "authorized"; those below are "general employees."

7. Although Wright designates all employees who are not "semi-autonomous" as workers, an examination of the various employees who were not "authorized" indicated that their situations differed widely enough that they should not all be called worker. (The mean for all non-supervisory employees is 10.125; the range is -2.471 to 23.759). The mean for non-authorized (i.e. general) employees (7.323) was

Within general employees, a distinction was made between "normal employees" and "workers." This was necessary because an examination of the distributions of scores for seemingly proletarian occupations like assembly line workers and independence-oriented occupations like lawyers suggested that it would be artifactual to assign all nonsupervisory employees as either workers or authors. The diversity in conditions of work was too great to classify all employees within only these two groups. So people with scores above the mean for general employees were designated "normal" because of the relationship to the norm between two extreme categories. People with scores lower than the mean, that is, below the norm, were designated "workers."

Using the above cutoff points, employees were divided among authors, normal employees, and workers. Applying the cutoffs, the percentages for the three employee subclasses in each occupational level were established through crosstabulation of occupation by the class categories.

calculated and those employees above this mean but below the authorized cutoff (12.1788) are considered around the norm. Employees below 7.323 are workers. While this solution is also not without flaws, its rationale is simple.
8. It is not absolutely clear that cutoff points on a continuous metric based on the same, but oppositely emphasized, characteristics are the best way to define worker vs. authorized employees. It may be that different characteristics should define worker vs. authorized

Alternative procedures.

A different procedure for setting the worker cutoff was preliminarily explored using the single factor scale of "occupational self-direction" developed by Melvin Kohn for his study of values, Class and Conformity.⁹ In attempting to choose the cut off points for the Kohn data certain occupations were examined. In specific, the scores on Kohn's scale of "occupational self-direction" were calculated for the non-supervisory employees in four occupations which seemed most likely to represent workers, and four (non-supervisory) occupations which seemed mostly like to represent authorized employees. In each case only (non-supervisory) employees were examined since workers do not supervise, and supervisory employees would tend to have higher scores. The occupations chosen to represent workers were non-supervisory assembly line workers, coal miners, textile operatives and steel workers. Chosen as

employees, and that a continuous metric should not be used. The metric approach is a valid one however and identified the categories simply and clearly. At some further point it might be good to return to factor analysis, or try cluster analysis in defining worker to see if, comparing the methods, different approaches produce significantly different results.

9. Kohn's research associate, Carrie Schoenbach, did computer runs for this thesis in Washington, D.C., since the data for the 1964 study are not in the public domain. As these runs were done in Washington, it was not possible to do the more sophisticated analyses on that data set.

representative of authorized employees were lawyers, dentists, architects and professors.

The scores of these occupations were calculated in search of defining levels for cutoffs. In the case of the Kohn data the original subsamples of eight occupations turned out to have too few cases for making valid distinctions. Then the scores for those occupations which both had the largest subsample sizes (30+) and seemed representative of either workers or semi-autonomous employees were then evaluated. This approach was abandoned, however, both for the Kohn data and the SWC data in favor of the statistical approaches ultimately used. In part this was because the statistical approach seemed more objective and rational; conversely, the occupation-score approach seemed more imprecise and subjective. Also the scores for any one representative occupation may in fact fall in a small area, but exactly where to draw a dividing point could not be discovered with any precision by this manner.

Another methods applied to SWC data for determining the cutoff points for workers were explored. One example involved positing that there existed a "hypothetical worker" and calculating a metric score based on this person's supposed answers to the relevant questions in the Survey. These procedures used scores based on regression, but

indicate how a similar approach might have been examined using discriminant scores. In essence, the metric score for each respondent was developed by giving the answers one would hypothesize that a true "worker" might give to the questions determining the scale and then calculating the total score.

The process was carried out with the regression results, but would be similar for discriminant scores. For instance, on the question in SWC on DECISION-MAKING (Q. 25(I), V627), a hypothetical worker would answer "Not at all" (1) or perhaps "Not much" (2) to how much his job allowed decision-making. Applying a value of 1 (in some cases 2 or somewhat higher if the coding went beyond 5) to each of the 13 variables in the regression equation produced a metric score of only .0599 for a hypothetical worker (vs. .2261 for the statistically chosen cutoff). Clearly this is too low for a cutoff point. Instead, it suggests a score within the worker category toward a lower limit for the score a worker might get. Similarly, the hypothetical score an authorized employee might get would be represented by a cumulative score made up of 4's ("somewhat") and 5's ("a lot") on the various questions. The hypothetical authorized employee score was .8154 (vs. .4518, statistically chosen), again too high for a cutoff, and representing an upper

boundary. Because of the arbitrary integer intervals for the values on any variable, the scores for the hypothetical "worker" and "authorized" employees turned out to be inappropriate for cutoffs, though, they did indicate the general areas for scores for the respective categories. A slight modification of this procedure, however, did prove more in line with the statistical cutoffs chosen. Using scores of 2 for workers and 4 for authorized employees on each respective variable developed cutoff scores of .2145 and .6753 tolerably within range of the statistically developed scores (.2261 and .4518).

The possible cutoff points were evaluated by comparing histograms of the scores for various class categories, most importantly, non-supervisory employees, to see the distribution of the scores around various points. The "selected occupations" approach and the hypothetical worker approaches using SWC data were also used as test of the validity of the points chosen. In particular, scores for a group of 15 occupations, mainly operatives and laborers e.g assembly line workers (automobile operatives), textile operatives, other operatives on assembly lines, laborers in iron works, etc. who were in the non-supervisory employee category were examined to see if the distribution of actual scores tended to validate the choice of regression cutoffs

at .4518 for authorized and .2261 for workers. In fact, 12 of 21 assembly line operatives, all apparel operatives and 15 of 45 members of the overall sample occupations turned out to be workers (another 17 were "normal" employees).¹⁰ Each of these examinations indicated that the cutoffs chosen were essentially valid and corresponded with reality as represented by the actual distribution of employee's scores.

Other possible cutoff points were estimated using histogram scores. In one case the overall distributions was somewhat bimodal, so a cutoff point was made at .30 which represented the point between the two modes. In another case, the categories of "authorized," "normal" and "worker" were chosen by examining the distributions; the concentration of scores toward the middle, between .15 and

10. Calculating the scores for all non-supervisory employees in the SWC, among occupations with the large numbers under the worker cutoff score (.2261) were clerical employees ($13/68=19.1\%$), assembly line operatives ($12/27=44.4\%$), sewers and stitchers (operatives) in manufacturing ($12/27=70.6\%$), salesmen and sales clerks in retail trade ($10/43=23.3\%$), truck and trailer drivers (operatives) ($9/41=22.0\%$), waiters and waitresses ($9/19=47.4\%$) and attendants in hospitals and other ($8/20=40.0\%$). While the figures for auto assemblers ($1/3=33.3\%$) are two small to be significant, the figures for other assembly line operatives (44.4% workers) tend to confirm its reputation as a classic proletarian job. Sewers and stitcher operatives in manufacturing, most of whom were women, seem to be the archetypal proletarian, as almost three quarters are workers. Also, almost half of service workers like hospital attendants and waiters and waitresses are workers.)

.55, defined "normal." The two other categories were the defined by the points below (.15) or above (.55) where scores seemed to congregate in the tail.

TABLE 51
DISTRIBUTIONS AMONG CWC CATEGORIES FROM HISTOGRAMS

	(CUTOFF AT .30)			(CUTOFFS AT .15, .55)	
	AUTHORS	WORKERS		AUTHORS	NORMAL
	> .30	< .30		> .55	.55-.15
WC	25.3% (60.9%)	16.2 (39.1)		11.3 (27.2)	24.1 (58.2)
UWC	17.1 (88.9)	2.2 (11.1)		9.4 (47.1)	9.8 (49.3)
LWC	33.5 (51.6)	31.4 (48.4)		13.4 (20.6)	39.7 (61.1)
TOTAL	28.0 (53.6)	24.3 (46.4)		10.8 (20.6)	31.1 (59.5)
					10.4 (19.9)

These division of between authorized employees and workers alone provided too great a distribution of authorized employees, more than 50% even in the lower white collar sector (51.6%). The division among the three seemed more reasonable but, by the nature of their being chosen from a histogram, they tend to cluster in the middle. Because it appeared more precise and rational, and had a valid rationale behind its development and divisions, the statistical approach above was preferably to these and

Wright's alternatives.

11. Distinctions can also be made within the other classes such as employer-owners, as well as among subclasses like supervisors. Since the self-employed would at least nominally be in the capitalist class, which is not the focus here, such divisions are not explored here. It is possible, however, and, in fact, important to distinguish between true members of the (big) capitalist class and small owners, essentially the big vs. petty bourgeoisie. Some people, for instance, "fall" into the self-employed category when they lose their jobs during economic downturns and find economic conditions worse as self-employed than as wage workers. On the other hand, true members of the capitalist class own a great deal of capital and employ or live off the exploitation of a large number of workers. About 1% (Lundberg, 1969:22) of the population owns about 50% of the productive assets, so considering most owners and independents (who compose about 10 to 20% of the labor force) as capitalists greatly exaggerate the true size capitalist class. Similarly, managers who own and control investment decisions should be distinguished from supervisors who have little or no authority. It is possible to distinguish both managers (whom Wright distinguishes based on whether they have power to hire or fire) and employers by number of employees overseen. Wright (1977:39ff.) suggests more thorough criteria for distinguishing among members of various classes and subclass categories.

APPENDIX 3.B
CROSS-SECTIONAL DATA TABLES

TABLE 52

CLASS CATEGORIES COMPARING LOREN AND CENSUS

SELF-EMPLOYED (CAPITAL./ PETTY PROD.)	WAGE PAID (WORKING CLASS)
---	------------------------------

1960

LOREN	13%	87%
CENSUS	12.2%	86.7%

1970

LOREN	12.2%	90%
CENSUS	7.8% (9.3%)	90.1%

NOTE: 1960 Census figures do not distinguish self-employed from employees of their own corporations. Figure for 1970 in parentheses (i.e. 9.3%) includes employees of own corporations.

TABLE 53

PERCENTAGES OF SELF-EMPLOYED DOCTORS, LAWYERS, ARCHITECTS,
CENSUS, 1970

DOCTORS	61.4%
(MALE)	64.2
(FEMALE)	29.8
LAWYERS/JUDGES	55.7
(MALE)	56.7
(FEMALE)	34.2
ARCHITECTS	36.8
(MALE)	37.1
(FEMALE)	28.9

TABLE 54

DIVISION BY CLASS POSITION FOR WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
CENSUS, 1970, CPS, 1975

MALES ONLY

TOTAL POPULATION

	1970	1975		1970	1975
	SELF EMPLOYED	WAGE PAID		SELF EMPLOYED	WAGE PAID
WC	(15.2%)	84.7	(12.4)	87.6	(9.9)
UWC	(18.5%)	81.4	(14.7)	85.3	(15.1)
PRO	(12.1%)	87.8	(10.0)	90.0	(9.0)
MGR	(26.8%)	73.0	(19.5)	80.4	(26.1)
LWC	(9.3%)	90.6	(7.1)	94.0	(5.1)
CLER	(2.4%)	97.5	(1.5)	98.4	(1.9)
SALES	(15.3%)	82.9	(13.2)	86.5	(13.1)
TOTAL	(12.3%)	87.4	(11.2)	88.5	(9.3)
MILLION		41.7		51.2	
				76.8	
					84.8

NOTE: Self-employed for 1970 include "employees of own corporation." Within columns, percentages are organized horizontally.

TABLE 55

WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS BY SEX, CPS, 1975

	MALE	FEMALE	NUMBER (MILLIONS)	% LABORFORCE
WC	50.0%	50.0	42.2	49.8%
UWC	67.7%	32.3	21.6	25.5
PRO MGR	58.7% 80.6%	41.3 19.4	12.7 8.9	15.0 10.5
LWC	31.5%	68.5	20.6	24.3
CLR SALES	22.2% 57.5%	77.8 42.5	15.1 5.5	17.8 6.4
TOTAL	60.4%	39.6%	84.8	100%

NOTE: Percentages add horizontally.

TABLE 56

PERCENTAGES OF MEN AND WOMEN
IN VARIOUS WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
CPS, 1975

	MALE	FEMALE	NUMBER (MILLIONS)	% LABORFORCE
WC	41.2%	62.9%	42.2	49.8%
UWC	28.6	21.9	21.6	25.5
PRO MGR	14.6 14.0	15.7 5.2	12.7 8.9	15.0 10.5
LWC	12.6	42.0	20.6	24.3
CLR SALES	6.5 6.1	35.1 6.9	15.1 5.5	17.8 6.4
TOTALS (%LF)	100% (60.4%)	100% (39.6%)	84.8	100%

NOTE: Percentages organized vertically.

TABLE 57

WHITES AND NONWHITES IN WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS
CPS, 1975

	WHITES	NONWHITES	LABOR FORCE
WC	51.7%	34.2%	49.8%
UWC	26.7	15.8	25.5
PRO	15.5	11.4	15.0
MGR	11.2	4.4	10.5
LWC	25.0	18.4	24.3
CLR	6.9	15.7	17.8
SALES	18.1	2.7	6.4
TOTAL LF	100% (89.3%)	100% (10.7%)	100%

TABLE 58

MEN AND WOMEN IN WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS,
BY RACE, CPS, 1975

	WHITE		NON-WHITE		LABRFC
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	
WC	42.4%	65.5%	25.0%	44.1%	49.8%
UWC	29.6	21.5	15.8	15.9	25.5
PRO	14.9	10.0	9.9	13.3	15.0
MGR	14.7	5.5	5.9	2.6	10.5
LWC	12.8	43.0	10.3	28.1	24.3
CLER	6.3	36.5	7.9	25.1	17.8
SALES	6.5	7.5	2.4	3.0	6.4
TOTAL LF	100% (61.1%)	100% (38.9%)	100% (54.5%)	100% (45.5%)	100%

TABLE 59
CLASS POSITIONS FOR TECHNICIANS
CENSUS, 1970

	TOTAL	MEN		WOMEN	
	SELF EMPLYD	WAGE PAID	SELF EMPLYD	WAGE PAID	SELF EMPLYD
TECHNICIANS	1.7%	98.2	2.0	97.9	0.7
Engineering	1.5%	98.5	1.6	98.4	0.9
					99.1
					98.9

TABLE 60
MAJOR CLASS CATEGORIES FOR TECHINICIANS
PSID, 1976

	INDEP	EMPLOYRS	MANAGERS	SUPRS	EMPLOYEES
TECHNICIANS	3.3%	0.0	8.0	31.0	57.8

TABLE 61
FULL CLASS CATEGORIES FOR TECHNICAL LABOR
FIRST ESTIMATES, SWC, 1970

	INDEP	EMPLYR	MANG	AUTHOR	NORMAL	WORKER
TECHNICNS	2.9%	0.0	44.4	37.9	2.4	12.5
ENGINR	5.9%	0.0	58.9	25.4	4.9	4.9
MEDICAL	0.0%	0.0	38.5	46.1	0.0	15.4
OTHER	0.0%	0.0	17.7	51.1	0.0	31.2

Note: Author, normal and worker estimates based on regression metrics.

APPENDIX 4.1

TABLE 62

SELF-EMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGES FOR
DOCTORS, LAWYERS AND ARCHITECTS
1940-1970

	<u>1940</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>
DOCTORS	78.9%	65.3%	64.7%	61.4%
(MALE)	78.9	66.7	66.7	64.2
(FEMALE)	57.1	43.2	37.5	29.8
LAWYERS/JUDGES	72.1	60.3	64.0	55.7
(MALE)	72.8	62.0	64.8	56.7
(FEMALE)	61.0	41.1	40.4	34.2
ARCHITECTS	52.9	40.5	42.2	36.8
(MALE)	52.9	40.5	42.2	37.1
(FEMALE)	--	--	--	28.9

APPENDIX 4.2
REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR 1945-77, SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES

TABLE 63

REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR 1945-77
SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES, MALES

<u>Supervisors</u>	<u>Employees</u>
WCS = -16.7 + 0.878YR T=4.63*	WCSEE = 80.2 - 0.646YR T=-3.32*
UWCS= - 7.9 + 0.850YR T=3.05*	UWCEE= 37.8 - 0.217YR T=-0.84
PROS= -40.0 + 1.30 YR T=2.53*	PROEE= 110. - 1.02 YR T=-2.26*
MRGS= 13.5 + 5.50 YR T=1.77>	MRGEE= -5.8 - 0.20 YR T= 1.07
LWCS= -19.9 + 0.723YR T=3.22*	LWCEE= 126. - 0.941YR T=-3.73*
CLS = -39.0 + 1.08 YR T=2.59*	CLEE = 141 - 1.12 YR T=-2.61*
SALS= 18.5 + 0.08 YR T=0.13	SALEE= 62.9 - 0.068YR T=-0.20
TOTS= -26.8 + 0.863YR T=5.08*	TOTEE= 81.2 - 0.437YR T=-3.01*

NOTE: * means significant at .05; < means .05 < p ≤ .10.
TOTS (Total) is for entire labor force.

TABLE 64

REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR 1970-1977
SUPERVISORS AND EMPLOYEES, BOTH SEXES

<u>Supervisors</u>	<u>Employees</u>
WCS = 86.3 - 0.614YR T=-15.7*	WCSEE = -32.1 + 1.06YR T= 5.08*
UWCS= 12.1 - 0.929YR T=-1.32	UWCEE= 126 + 2.06YR T= 5.06*
PROS= 272 - 2.95YR T=-3.27*	PROEE=-165 + 2.75YR T=3.17*
MGRS=-82.6 + 1.80YR T= 4.34*	MGREE=-51.1 + 0.81YR T=0.88
LWCS= 42.9 - 0.190YR T= -0.26	LWCEE= 78.7 - 0.157YR T=-0.21
CLRS= 21.2 + 0.135YR T= 0.17	CLREE= 103 - 0.485YR T=-0.53
SALS= 107 - 1.16YR T= 0.87	SALEE= 13.1 - 0.725YR T= 1.95<
TOTS= 88.6 - 0.749YR T=15.27*	TOTEE= 7.25 + 0.850YR T=49.3*

NOTE: * means significant at .05; < means .05 p ≤ .10.
TOTS (Total) is for entire labor force.

APPENDIX 4.3

TIME SERIES FOR TOTAL LABOR FORCE

While the emphasis for this study is on white collar labor, data were also developed for times series for the entire labor force. A long series from 1947 to 1977 was developed from the BLS establishment reports on monthly employment, payroll and hours for non-supervisory and production workers (PnAg/E&E) in private, non-agricultural industries. The more recent period, 1970 to 1977, may be examined for the entire labor force using Fair Labor Standards Act reports (MWMH). The two can be compared with the results of the other times series developed from survey data.

Using the BLS study known as the "establishment" survey, a time series was developed from 1947 to 1977 concentrating on the decade and mid decade years. While this series does not include agriculture and government, the figures do appear to be similar to those which might have been developed for the entire labor force. The definition of supervisor used in this report, however, is problematic since the figures include working supervisors in manufacturing and construction industries in the production workers category (See Appendix 3.1 to Chapter 3 for

details.) Due to the nature of this survey, which contains numerous exemptions from the non-supervisory (i.e. employees) category, and the need to construct total labor force figures, the percentages here are only approximate.

For the years, 1970 to 1976, the survey on "Maximum Wage and Minimum Hours" (MWMH) under the Fair Labor Standards Act provide companion estimates on supervisory and non-supervisory labor. The basic figures are much akin to the BLS surveys as they include only employees but not the self-employed.

TABLE 65
SUMMARY TABLES
CLASS TIME SERIES, 1970-1977

REPORT MWMH Year	Self Employed	Supervisor	Employee
1970	9.9%	13.7%	75.0%
1971	10.0	15.4	73.3
1972	9.7	15.5	73.5
1973	9.7	15.5	73.6
1974	9.5	16.3	73.1
1975	9.5	16.6	72.7
1976	9.3	16.9	72.8
1977	9.2	16.9	72.9

TABLE 66
SUMMARY TABLE
CLASS TIME SERIES, 1948-1977

PnAg/E&E	Self Employed	Supervisor	Employee
1948	13.8%	10.3	75.0
1950	13.7	10.6	75.1
1955	12.3	12.4	74.1
1960	12.8	13.8	72.2
1965	11.7	14.5	72.7
1970	9.1	15.7	74.4
1975	9.2	16.2	73.9
1976	9.1	16.0	74.2
1977	9.3%	16.3	73.8

Sources for Tables: Employment Standards Administration, Dept. of Labor, "Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Standards Under the Fair Labor Standards Act" (MWMH), 1971 to 1977 (September). "Production or Non-Supervisory Workers and Production Workers on Private Payrolls, and Non Production Workers as Percent of Total Employment, by Industry Division. Annual Averages, 1947-76." These data are for private, non-agricultural employees only. (Tables C-1 to C-3 of the 1977 Manpower Report of the President.) Data from BLS, "Monthly Report on Employment, Payroll and Hours." (Known as the "establishment survey" and reported in "Employment and Earnings," known as E&E.

Note: Figures for self-employment do not distinguish between employers and independents. Supervisory and employee figures are found in the cited reports; comparison figures for the labor force and self employed are found in or are developed from Statistical Abstracts, Manpower Report of the President, Handbook of Labor Statistics, and Employment and Earnings, based on the Current Population Survey (CPS). Percentages derived. The PnAg percentages for 1948 to 1955 based on estimates and not strictly comparable to later years. The data for 1970 in MWMH derived and not strictly comparable.

Both surveys show a general stability in the size of the employee category, with slight increases in supervisory employees, and a decline in self-employment. The figures in the BLS time series indicate a general stability since 1947 in the proportion of the labor force in the non-supervisory employee category: approximately 75%. There has been a significant percentage increases in supervisory labor from about 11% to 16%, while self-employment has dropped from about 13% to 8%. The general stability of the proportion of employees in the labor force is seen in the other times series, too. In other time series there appears to be indication of supervisor growth, probably at the expense of the self-employed.

While both time series indicate that, overall, the proportion of supervisory labor has increased, at the same time that employees have decreased, another trend may be hidden in these data. It appears to in both time series that the proportion of supervisory labor seems to be leveling off, while the proportion of non-supervisory employees may be increasing after a period of decline. This suggests that a net intermediate proletarianization may be occurring over time.

APPENDIX 4.4

TABLE 67

CHANGES IN CLASS CATEGORY SIZES OVER TIME
1970 TO 1973, MEN

TOTAL	INDEP	EMPLOYR	SUPERVR	AUTHOR	NORMAL	EMPLOYEE N
1970	7.1	8.9	40.0	17.2	14.2	12.6 996
1973	3.9	9.3	38.3	19.8	16.9	12.0 1272
DIFFR	-3.2	0.4	-1.7	+2.1	+2.7	-0.6
SIGN	***	---	---	---	---	---
WHITE COLLAR-MALE						
1970	6.7	16.4	50.0	12.8	8.0	6.1 406
1973	3.6	15.6	49.2	15.9	8.6	7.0 505
DIFFR	-3.1	-0.8	-0.8	+3.1	+0.6	+0.9
SIGN	***	---	---	---	---	---
UPPER WHITE COLLAR-MALE						
1970	7.8	22.8	55.3	6.8	4.5	2.7 279
1973	4.7	19.3	60.8	7.9	4.2	3.1 346
DIFFR	-3.1	-3.5	5.5	+1.1	-0.3	+0.4
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---
LOWER WHITE COLLAR-MALE						
1970	4.2	2.5	38.3	25.8	15.6	13.6 127
1973	1.4	7.6	24.2	33.2	18.3	15.3 160
DIFFR	-2.8	5.1	-14.1	+7.4	+2.8	+1.7
SIGN	---	***	***	---	---	---
PROFESSIONAL-MALE						
1970	3.5	3.5	68.8	11.3	8.5	4.3 138
1973	2.1	7.4	68.4	9.5	6.3	6.3 172
DIFFR	-1.4	3.9	-0.4	-1.8	-2.2	+2.0
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---
MANAGERIAL-MALE						
1970	12.0	41.6	42.2	2.4	0.6	1.2 141
1973	7.2	31.2	53.2	6.4	2.0	0.0 173
DIFFR	-4.8	-10.4	11.0	+4.0	+1.4	-1.2
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---
CLERICAL-MALE						
1970	0.0	0.0	44.6	17.9	16.1	21.4 71
1973	0.0	0.0	31.3	28.9	22.9	14.5 84
DIFFR	0.0	0.0	-13.3	11.0	+6.8	-6.9
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---
SALES-MALE						
1970	9.4	5.7	30.2	35.8	15.1	3.8 56
1973	2.9	16.2	16.2	35.3	13.2	16.2 75
DIFFR	-6.5	10.5	-14.0	-0.5	-1.9	12.4
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	***

TABLE 68
CHANGES IN CLASS CATECORY SIZES OVER TIME
1970 TO 1973, WOMEN

TOTAL	INDEP	EMPLOYR	SUPERVR	AUTHOR	NORMAL	EMPLOYEE	N
1970	2.4	1.3	28.7	21.4	25.9	20.3	534
1973	3.9	3.4	27.3	26.8	24.2	14.3	799
DIFFR	1.5	2.1	-1.4	+5.4	-1.7	-5.9	
SIGN	---	***	---	***	---	***	
WHITE COLLAR-FEMALE							
1970	3.3	2.2	35.3	20.8	24.0	14.5	326
1973	2.8	2.1	33.2	24.3	23.4	14.2	482
DIFFR	-0.5	-0.1	-2.1	+3.5	-0.6	-0.3	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	
UPPER WHITE COLLAR-FEMALE							
1970	8.5	6.9	50.1	16.3	12.7	5.6	102
1973	5.5	6.5	50.4	19.4	10.7	7.5	154
DIFFR	-3.0	-0.4	0.3	+3.1	-2.0	+1.9	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	
LOWER WHITE COLLAR-FEMALE							
1970	0.9	0.0	28.6	22.8	29.2	18.5	224
1973	1.5	0.0	25.1	26.6	29.4	17.4	328
DIFFR	0.6	0.0	-3.5	+3.8	+0.2	-1.1	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	
PROFESSIONAL-FEMALE							
1970	4.9	1.2	52.4	18.3	15.9	7.3	77
1973	1.6	0.0	52.8	24.8	12.0	8.8	115
DIFFR	-3.3	-1.2	0.4	+6.5	-3.9	+1.5	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	
MANAGERIAL-FEMALE							
1970	20.0	25.0	42.5	10.0	2.5	0.0	24
1973	17.2	25.9	43.1	3.4	6.9	3.4	39
DIFFR	-2.8	0.9	0.6	-6.6	+4.4	+3.4	
SIGN	***	---	---	---	---	---	
CLERICAL-FEMALE							
1970	1.1	0.0	29.1	22.2	29.1	18.5	186
1973	0.8	0.0	25.6	25.2	31.2	17.3	273
DIFFR	-0.3	0.0	-3.5	+3.0	+2.1	-1.2	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	
SALES-FEMALE							
1970	0.0	0.0	25.9	25.9	29.6	18.5	38
1973	5.1	0.0	23.1	33.3	20.5	17.9	55
DIFFR	5.1	0.0	-2.8	+7.4	--9.1	-0.6	
SIGN	---	---	---	---	---	---	

TABLE 69
CHANGES IN CLASS CATEGOPRY SIZES BASED ON
PERCENTAGES FOR 1970, 1973 AND 1976 FOR MEN
(1976 NOT FULLY COMPARABLE)

TOTAL	INDEP	EMPLOYR	SUPERVR	AUTHOR	NORMAL	EMPLOYEE	%
1970	7.1	8.9	40.0	17.2	14.2	12.6	996
1973	3.9	9.3	38.3	19.3	16.9	12.0	1272
1976	6.4	9.0	38.4	20.2	16.7	12.2	703
WHITE COLLAR-MALE							
1970	6.7	16.4	50.0	12.8	8.0	6.1	406
1973	3.6	15.6	49.2	15.9	8.6	7.0	505
1976	4.2	14.6	48.8	15.6	10.7	6.0	290
UPPER WHITE COLLAR-MALE							
1970	7.8	22.8	55.3	6.8	4.5	2.7	279
1973	4.7	19.3	60.8	7.9	4.2	3.1	346
1976	4.9	19.8	51.8	10.0	9.2	4.2	203
LOWER WHITE COLLAR-MALE							
1970	4.2	2.5	38.3	25.8	15.6	13.6	127
1973	1.4	7.6	24.2	33.2	18.3	15.3	160
1976	2.6	2.6	41.6	28.6	14.3	10.4	87
PROFESSIONAL-MALE							
1970	3.5	3.5	68.8	11.3	8.5	4.3	138
1973	2.1	7.4	68.4	9.5	6.3	6.3	172
1976	1.6	7.4	47.5	18.9	17.2	7.4	104
MANAGERIAL-MALE							
1970	12.0	41.6	42.2	2.4	0.6	1.2	141
1973	7.2	31.2	53.2	6.4	2.0	0.0	173
1976	8.4	32.8	56.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	99
CLERICAL-MALE							
1970	0.0	0.0	44.6	17.9	16.1	21.4	71
1973	0.0	0.0	31.3	31.3	22.9	14.5	84
1976	2.6	0.0	43.6	28.2	15.4	10.3	45
SALES-MALE							
1970	9.4	3.8	30.2	35.8	15.1	5.7	56
1973	2.9	16.2	16.2	35.3	13.2	16.2	75
1976	2.6	5.3	39.5	28.9	13.2	10.5	42

