1 1
OF/DE

41082

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR GREGORY William TRICKLEBANKTITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE Social STRUCTURAL INFLUENCES ON JOB SATISFACTION:AN EMPIRICAL COMPARISON OF HYPOTHESES DERIVED FROM MARXIAN
AND NEO-UNIONIST THEORIES OF CAUSE.UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ CARLETON UNIVERSITYDEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE M.A.YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1979NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE G. NEUBIRTH

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE 17/4/79 SIGNED/SIGNÉ G. TricklebankPERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE WIMFIELD COLLEGEOXFORD, U.K.

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

SOCIAL STRUCTURAL INFLUENCES ON JOB SATISFACTION;
AN EMPIRICAL COMPARISON OF HYPOTHESES DERIVED FROM
MARXIAN AND NEO-WEBERIAN THEORIES OF CLASS

by

Gregory W. Tricklebank, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

January 12, 1979

© 1979 Gregory William Tricklebank

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis:

"Social Structural Influences on Job Satisfaction:
An Empirical Comparison of Hypotheses Derived from
Marxian and Neo-Weberian Theories of Class"

submitted by Gregory W. Tricklebank, B.A.,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts.

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
Chairman, Department of
Sociology

Carleton University

January 12, 1979

ABSTRACT

The thesis is an empirical comparison of the relative impact of two social structural formations on job satisfaction. These formations are social class in the Marxian sense and socio-economic status as developed by certain neo-Weberians. Data from the University of Michigan's 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey is explored using analysis of variance and multiple regression techniques. It is concluded that both structural formations have an impact upon differences in job satisfaction but that the theoretical significance of this impact differs in each case.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank the members of my advisory committee, Professors Neuwirth and McRoberts, for their helpful comments and criticism and for keeping faith in my project when others might have given up. My appreciation is also due to Professors McFarlane and Nosanchuk whose teaching and encouragement throughout my graduate career have contributed immeasurably to whatever merit the thesis may have. In addition, I am indebted to Bruce Winer of Carleton University Computing Services for his assistance with some difficult programming problems. Finally, my thanks to Loretta Warden and Ann Franklin who typed the final draft and particularly to Carol Davis who produced and organized typescript at several crucial stages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I	
The Marxian Concept of Alienation	4
Chapter II	
The Neo-Weberian Hierarchy of Rewards	12
Chapter III	
Class, Status and Job Satisfaction	19
Chapter IV	
Analysis of Data	26
Chapter V	
Summary and Conclusions	46
References	51

INTRODUCTION

The most general definition of work in sociological terms (as opposed to physiological definitions, ie. expenditure of physical energy) is "that which involves the exercise of effort toward some defined end" (Kahn, 1972: 165).¹ Defined as such, at least some work is necessary for human survival. Though evaluated differently within various cultures at various times, work is a universal human activity.²

By contrast with the universality of work, the issue of job satisfaction is of particular and relatively recent importance. That is, only in respect of modern industrial societies do questions of job satisfaction have any significance. The reason for this lies in the change which work has undergone in the transition to 'modernity'.

Prior to industrialization, work was typically a family concern. There was no distinct separation of domestic and economic roles. This implies, for example, that father and son were related also as superordinate and subordinate in a 'work' (ie. economically productive) context. By the time industrialization

---

¹ Other more restrictive definitions of work include "any purposive human effort to modify man's physical environment" (Udy, 1970: 3), "an activity which produces something of value for other people" (Upjohn Institute, 1973: 3), "the means of earning a living" (Parker, 1972: 18).

² One of the striking contrasts in the evaluation of work is that between the ancient Greeks who thought that all work was a curse fit only for slaves and the teaching of Protestantism wherein work was a solemn duty for all who were able (cf. Parker, 1972: 34-35).

was complete, roles associated with work had become distinct from those associated with domestic life. This typically included the physical removal of work from the home to the factory or office.³

By way of illustrating the fusion of domestic and economic roles in a typical seventeenth century London bakery, Laslett (1962: 86) describes the cost accounting for a loaf of bread.

In the year 1619 the bakers of London applied to increase the price of bread. They sent in support a complete description of a bakery and of its weekly costs. Thirteen people there were in such an establishment: the baker and his wife, four paid employees who were called journeymen, two maid-servants, two apprentices, and the baker's three children. Food cost more than anything else, more than raw materials, and nearly four times as much as wages. Clothing was charged up, too, not only for man, wife and children but for the apprentices as well. Even school fees were included in the cost of baking bread for sale.

To avoid any misunderstanding over the issue, it is not claimed that 'satisfaction' was any greater or less in the pre-industrial phase. The point to note is that the separation of the work role from other roles creates the possibility of satisfaction or dissatisfaction which is more distinctly related to work as its source. This is in marked contrast with the 'paternalistic' family enterprise described by Laslett (1962: 86-93) wherein the 'love relationship' amongst workers is equally subject to the unhappiness caused by "...jealous husbands and resentful wives, tyrannical fathers, [and] deprived children" (1962: 88).

One of the striking features of modern industrial societies, then, is the dependency of most people upon a relatively

³ cf. Smelser (1976: 150) for a concise discussion of structural differentiation which he refers to as "...the establishment of more specialized and more autonomous structural units".

distinct work role in order to secure the goods and services deemed necessary for life. However, despite the above noted 'functional separation', the work role may, in addition to having an instrumental purpose, be a major source of self-esteem or abasement. It has been suggested, for example, that through his job, modern man gains whatever sense of mastery he has over himself and his environment and a sense of producing something of value to somebody else (Upjohn Institute, 1973: 4-5). Where modern jobs are routinized and fragmented, this sense of 'mastery' and 'value' may be reduced to nil.

This development of the modern job as a distinct and virtually universal social role with uncertain personal implications for the worker has prompted a great deal of interest in job satisfaction as an indicator of the 'quality of life'. Most important sociologically, however, is the impact of various elements of the social and occupational structure.

In the following chapters this will be discussed from two perspectives. Chapter I will explore the consequences of the class structure in terms of the Marxian concept of alienation. Similarly, Chapter II will explore the consequences of a neo-Weberian hierarchy of rewards. Finally, these ideas will be drawn together as they bear upon the issue of job satisfaction and the implications of the discussion will be explored in a secondary analysis of the University of Michigan's 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey.

CHAPTER I

THE MARXIAN CONCEPT OF ALIENATION

The Marxian view holds that the historical change in the occupational structure is determined by the internal logic of capitalist development resulting, inter alia, in a certain degree of alienation. This alienation forms the basis of the capitalist class structure which, at a later stage, is a reciprocal influence upon the alienation of the worker. These points require elaboration before pressing on to the further question of how this structural condition of alienation might be experienced subjectively by the worker.

Marx began his analysis with the economic fact of the division, under the capitalist mode of production, between capital and labour. Alienation, in the first instance, is another name for this division. Private property, as the reification of this division, is the direct result. Hence the formation of the two great classes of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie (owners of capital) and the proletariat (suppliers of labour power).⁴

The struggle between these two classes reflects the essential antithesis of capital and labour. In its relation to capital,

---

⁴ In his historical writings, Marx recognizes the existence of strata; groups such as the peasantry and petit bourgeoisie which, although delineated by the same criteria, do not form true classes since they do not form collective actors with a historical mission to perform. Instead, these strata are destined to become allied with the principle classes in respect of the struggle manifesting the inherent contradiction of capital and labour.

labour is 'alienated' from its human agent, the worker. He is dependent upon the capitalist for survival; but the capitalist, on pain of his own extinction from falling profits, is constrained to support not the whole human being, but only the socially necessary labour time for the maintenance and reproduction of labour power. The central impact of the capitalist class structure is to strip social relations of all that is not necessary for the reproduction of capitalism itself. That is, the worker loses his social identity as anything but a supplier of labour power. Likewise, the capitalist loses the value of all property except in so far as it constitutes undifferentiated capital (Marx, 1964).

Alienation, then, is a structural characteristic of society under the capitalist mode of production. It seems clear from Marx's writing that capitalists are affected as well as workers. He states, "Production ... produces man as a mentally and physically dehumanized being. - Immorality, deforming, and dulling of 'the workers and the capitalists.'" (1964: 21, emphasis in the original).

However, it appears that workers and capitalists are related asymmetrically with respect to alienation. "... the non-worker does everything against the worker which the worker does against himself; but he does not do against himself what he does against the worker" (1964: 119). Unfortunately, the manuscript breaks off at this point, leaving no detailed analysis of the alienation of the capitalist class. The workers' alienation, however, is elaborated upon in terms of his relation to the pro-

duct and process of work. To quote Marx once more:

We have considered the act of estranging practical human activity, labor, in two of its aspects. (1) The relation of the worker to the product of labor as an alien object exercising power over him. This relation is at the same time the relation to the sensuous external world, to the objects of nature, as an alien world inimically opposed to him. (2) The relation of labor to the act of production within the labor process. This relation is the relation of the worker to his own activity as an alien activity not belonging to him; it is activity as suffering, strength as weakness, begetting as emasculating, the worker's own physical and mental energy, his personal life indeed, what is life but activity? - as an activity which is turned against him, independent of him and not belonging to him. Here we have self-estrangement, as previously we had the estrangement of the thing. (1964: 111-112, emphasis in the original).

An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labor, from his life activity, from his species being is the estrangement of man from man. ... In fact, the proposition that man's species nature is estranged from him means that one man is estranged from the other, as each of them is from man's essential nature. (1964: 114, emphasis in the original).

The condition of being propertyless, then, reinforces alienation on the worker's side in three ways. First, the product of labour is taken over by the capitalist who exercises, through it, an 'alien power' over the worker. Second, the process of labour, the activity which defines man's essential nature, is alienated in that it is directed by and for someone else; that is the capitalist. And third, the worker is alienated from society in that he is related to other men as to commodities just as his own activity, labour, is a commodity under the capitalist mode of production.⁵

It is a basic assumption of Marx's view that work, as a

⁵ cf. Jordan (1971: 17-18) for a more complete summary of the meaning of alienation.

creative activity done in cooperation with others, gives man his character as a human (ie. social) as opposed to merely an animal being. Hence alienated labour, which can be neither cooperative nor creative, is by definition dehumanized. This is most notably a consequence of the technical division of labour which is carried to an extreme under the capitalist mode of production. This strongly suggests that alienated labour, the structural condition of capitalist society, might have subjectively experienced consequences for the individual in terms of job satisfaction. This, however, is to anticipate.

Some of those who have explored the individual consequences of alienation in the Marxian sense have chosen as the dependent variable, not job satisfaction, but a generically similar concept to which they have applied the term 'alienation'.⁶ The terminological confusion is obvious where the same term is used for both cause and consequence. Here, to avoid such confusion, the term 'alienation' will be used in inverted commas when it is meant to denote the consequences of the structural relations of production (alienation in the Marxian sense) as explored by modern 'alienation' theorists.

For these modern theorists then, the term 'alienation' has undergone important modifications which remove it from Marx's original intent, but which can be interpreted as a consequence of alienation in the Marxian sense. The most important of these

⁶ 'Job satisfaction' and 'alienation' (in the modified sense elaborated below) are generically similar in that they are both species of affect.

modifications has been to conceive of 'alienation' as a multi-dimensional feeling state or psychological effect which intervenes in the relation of social structure and behaviour (Seeman, 1972: 469). The several dimensions of 'alienation' can include a sense of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, cultural estrangement, self-estrangement and social isolation (Seeman, 1972: 472-473). Furthermore, there is a correspondence between three of these dimensions of feeling state, powerlessness, self-estrangement and social isolation, and Marx's structural concept of alienation, which can be expressed as hypotheses in the following terms.

1. Man feels a sense of 'powerlessness' to the extent that he does not control the object world which he produces.
2. Man feels a sense of 'self-estrangement' to the extent that his 'essential' activity (work) is not his own but, rather, is directed by and for someone else.
3. If man feels estranged from work, he will feel 'isolated' to the extent that work is the essential 'species' activity.

Despite the aforementioned modification of the Marxian concept of alienation, research which purports to test these and similar hypotheses retains the assumption, implicitly or otherwise, that work is an essential human activity with the intrinsic potential for important negatively valued ('alienative') consequences. In one of the most comprehensive empirical attempts to explore this point of view, Blauner (1964) demonstrates that certain structural elements of the industries which he studies are 'fateful' for the workers' sense of powerlessness, meaning-

lessness, social isolation and self-estrangement.⁷

To encapsulate Blauner's main result, he found that workers whose industry was conducive to the routinization and fractionization of their jobs, little control over any aspect of the work process and little opportunity for social contact, were the most 'alienated'. Of the four groups studied, this condition best describes that of the auto assemblers. These 'alienating' conditions of the job are structured by the form of technology, the division of labour, social organization and economic structure of the auto industry. Similarly, printers were the least 'alienated' with machine tending textile workers and continuous process chemical plant operators exhibiting intermediate levels of 'alienation'.

Another examination of the Marxian viewpoint is presented by Kohn (1976). Kohn compares the effects of a number of occupation structural conditions upon feelings of powerlessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and cultural estrangement.⁸

⁷ Blauner's conceptions of powerlessness, social isolation and self-estrangement are the feeling states imputed to individuals in direct correspondence with the structural separations described by Marx. To these, Blauner adds meaninglessness, a fourth 'dimension' of alienation. By this he means that "... the employee may lack understanding of the co-ordinated activity and a sense of purpose in his work" (1964: 22).

⁸ Powerlessness (sense of personal efficacy) and self-estrangement (sense of detachment from self) are essentially the same conceptions used by Blauner and derived from Marx as described above. Normlessness is derived from Durkheim's "anomie" and is defined as "... a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals." (Seeman, 1959). Cultural estrangement refers to "assign[ing] low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society." (Seeman, 1959) (Kohn, 1976: 114-118).

The structural conditions of particular concern are control over the 'product' of one's work (ownership and position in the supervisory hierarchy)⁹ and control over the 'process' of one's work (closeness of supervision, routinization and substantive complexity).¹⁰ The general result of Kohn's analysis is that ownership and supervisory control have little effect whereas closeness of supervision, routinization and substantive complexity, conditions which limit the degree of occupational self-direction, are decisive for feelings of powerlessness, normlessness and self-estrangement.¹¹ Kohn interprets these findings in terms which provide limited support for the Marxian perspec-

⁹ Position in a supervisory hierarchy is treated separately from formal ownership but acknowledged (Kohn, 1976: 118) to be possibly the effective equivalent of ownership (in the means of production) in so far as control over the product of work is concerned. This is essentially the position of those (Blauner, 1964 is an example) who maintain that supervisory or managerial control over the enterprise has effectively pre-empted the place of ownership in the otherwise Marxian prognosis for the progress of alienation in Capitalist society.

¹⁰ Substantive complexity refers to the level of complexity at which a worker must deal with things, data or ideas, and people (Kohn, 1976: 119). Routinization, on the other hand, refers to the repetitiveness of tasks and the complexity of the 'units' of work. Taken together, closeness of supervision, routinization and substantive complexity indicate the degree of occupational self-direction which the worker can exercise on the job.

¹¹ Cultural estrangement is an anomaly in this context. Conditions such as low position in a supervisory hierarchy and not being self-directed in one's work, which are positively related to powerlessness, normlessness and self-estrangement, are negatively related to feelings of cultural estrangement. Kohn (1976: 121n) suggests that whereas the other forms of alienation reflect a negative judgement of self, cultural estrangement "... often means quite the opposite, that the individual is sufficiently secure in his judgements of self to be independent in his values."

tive. That is, whereas control over the work process (occupational self-direction) is a decisive structural element in the relation of man to his work, control over the product of work (conditioned by effective ownership) is less so.¹²

Both Blauner (1964) and Kohn (1976) demonstrate that certain structural conditions of work are decisive in the subjective relation of the individual to his job as indicated by several measures of 'alienation'. Though it is unclear as to what extent these structural conditions are themselves conditioned by formal ownership in the means of production (as a strict interpretation of Marx would have it) it does seem clear that lack of control over the process of work underlies many of the specific conditions (as diverse, for example, as technologically determined routinization and economically determined insecurity of tenure) which are found to result in feelings of 'alienation', particularly powerlessness and self-estrangement.

¹² Kohn also examines a third element of the occupational structure, namely, the degree of bureaucratization (operationally, the number of formal supervisory levels in the worker's organization) as a proxy for the complexity of the division of labour (1976: 118). His finding in this regard is opposite to what alienation theorists might expect. That is, degree of bureaucratization is negatively related to powerlessness, normlessness and self-estrangement. Though his point of view may be correct, that "...occupational conditions attendant on bureaucratization are conducive to intellectual flexibility, openness to new experience, and self-directed values" (1976: 120), his proxy measure does not adequately measure the division of labour in the sense that this latter is reflected in the minute subdivision of work tasks.

CHAPTER II

THE NEO-WEBERIAN HIERARCHY OF REWARDS

By contrast with the Marxian view wherein individuals are related to the occupational structure primarily through the ownership or non-ownership of property in the means of production (or an effective equivalent such as control or lack of control over the work process) the neo-Weberian viewpoint implies that individuals are subjectively related to the occupational structure primarily through the social distribution of rewards.

In setting out an analytical framework for understanding the organization of society Weber (1958: 180-195; 1964: 424-429) distinguishes between a structure based on material rewards and one based on social rewards. These are referred to as the 'economic order' and the 'social order' respectively.

The economic order consists of 'classes' or groups of people with similar life chances in so far as these life chances are determined by economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income under the conditions of commodity or labour markets (Weber, 1958: 181). The social order, on the other hand, consists of 'status groups'; groups of people who share any quality which influences their 'life fate' by virtue of the social estimation of 'honour' associated with it (Weber, 1958: 187).

Although Weber maintained that there is no necessary connection between the distribution of material rewards and that

of social honour or prestige, he recognized that they were, in fact, interdependent. This argument has been elaborated by McRoberts (1975) who suggests that, (a) in advanced societies, material rewards and prestige are allocated through a single role - the occupational role,¹³ and (b) they form a unitary hierarchy of occupations - the socioeconomic continuum. These points will be elaborated in turn.

The allocation of material rewards through the occupational role is relatively straightforward since the occupational role is the sole significant source of income for most people. However, the allocation of prestige through the occupational role is somewhat more complex and depends upon the relation of income and education to occupation. McRoberts makes the argument as follows.

The prestige of a role appears to be associated with (a) the desirability of the life-style associated with or thought to be associated with it, (b) the exclusiveness of the role, (c) the degree to which the role is seen as exemplifying socially desirable traits, and (d) the authority associated with the role (McRoberts, 1975: 26)¹⁴

¹³ As noted by McRoberts (1975: 27n) "...this is a slight oversimplification as there are small groups at top and bottom of the social order who do not have occupational roles".

¹⁴ The place of political domination or authority is unclear in this regard. While it is suggested, on one hand, that it too is becoming fused with the occupational hierarchy (McRoberts, 1975: 28) it appears, on the other hand, to be more directly associated with power which is regarded "...as being a separate and independent order which both causes or is the result of the social and material orders" (McRoberts, 1975: 28n). (cont'd)

Life-style is associated with the occupational role in that " ... the ability to purchase any or all of the attributes of a given life-style is virtually solely a function of income" (McRoberts, 1975: 30). On the other hand, the education associated with an occupational role provides a basis for its exclusiveness and social value.

First, education because it is seen as having a relationship to occupational performance, and because it is seen as being an attribute which is earned in a fair way rather than ascribed, serves as a legitimate basis for the exclusion of individuals from occupational roles, and for the definition of social equals. Secondly, education is an attribute which is socially valued both for its perceived instrumental value and as an expression of virtue... (McRoberts, 1975: 30).

This, in combination with the fact that in most modern industrial societies the claims to status based on ascribed criteria are declining in legitimacy, has led to the establishment of education as a major factor in the determination of the prestige of the occupational role and hence of its incumbents (McRoberts, 1975: 30-31).

On the basis of this reasoning it is acceptable to interpret the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (Duncan, 1961) as representing a single hierarchy of occupations on an income-prestige continuum - the hierarchy of material and social rewards. The socioeconomic status of each occupation is a linear combination of the levels of income and education associated with it. The index has face validity as a measure of material reward and derives validity as a measure of occupational prestige through

14 (cont'd)

This is a point which requires much further research. Here, following McRoberts (1975) and others (Goldthorpe & Lockwood, 1963: 157 for example), the categories of power and political domination will not be explicitly included as part of the analytical framework.

its correlation ($R = .91$) with the NORC prestige ratings.¹⁵

The social distribution of rewards is a fact of the occupational structure prior to any individual's incumbency of his particular occupational role. In this sense, the individual is confronted with a given distribution of material rewards and a related social evaluation of the relative 'worth' of all occupations. In addition, he is confronted subjectively with (a) his feelings about this social distribution and evaluation and (b) the specific rewards which, indirectly, accrue to his job partly as a result of this social distribution and evaluation. Of course the specific rewards of a job do not result directly from an overall social hierarchy of rewards but, rather, from the specific market situation, conditions of work, relations of superordination/subordination and specific evaluations of relevant others which, in turn, influence and are influenced by it.

Most of the empirical research which treats the relation of individual to job from this perspective examines broad categories of occupations such as manual/non-manual, blue collar/white collar, working class/middle class and industrial/professional

¹⁵ The NORC prestige ratings are derived from asking respondents to rate the 'general standing' of a number of occupations. Due to the difficulty of getting respondents to rate large numbers of occupations (respondent fatigue etc.) the Duncan Index was developed to approximate this rating using information obtainable from the census, i.e. income and education. It is assumed that the Duncan Index is as good across the entire range of occupations as it is in predicting the NORC rating for the several dozen occupations for which the actual correlation of .91 was obtained. For a full discussion of the NORC ratings and the Duncan Index, cf. Reiss (1961).

occupations. The one attribute which all of these dichotomous classifications have in common is that the first named in each is lower in the income-prestige hierarchy than the second. Furthermore, it is invariably found that these dichotomous classification schemes tend to differentiate workers by the types of rewards and satisfactions which they seek and obtain from their jobs.

Morse and Weiss (1962), for example, report that although non-monetary aspects of work are important for those in both middle class and working class occupations, the 'meaning' of work differs as does the content of middle class and working class jobs. Though most of their sample of employed men said that they would continue to work even if they could support themselves without working, the reasons differed. Those in middle class occupations (jobs which concern symbols and meanings) indicated that work gave them something interesting to do, giving them a chance to accomplish things and contribute. Those in working class occupations (jobs which emphasize physical activity) indicated that work was the alternative to being bored or restless (1962: 33).

Even though those in working class occupations were more likely to want to change occupations if given the opportunity, the overwhelming majority of workers in both classes of occupation said they were very satisfied or satisfied with their present jobs. Again, the reasons for their satisfaction differed, although in this case not by class but by occupational category.

The managers mention salary much more frequently than do the professional and sales people who stress the content of the job itself. The crafts and trades group respond positively to the kind of work they do, while the unskilled mention money, and those in service occupations tend to give as reasons for satisfaction the fact that it is the only type of job they could get and that they like the people they work with and meet. (Morse and Weiss, 1962: 34-35).

The authors conclude that, "There appears to be a tendency for the individual to react positively to his work situation and to emphasize the favourable aspects of it." (1962: 35).

Consistent results are reported by Dubin (1962) for 'industrial workers' and Goldthorpe (1966) for car assemblers. It appears that those in jobs lower in the socio-economic hierarchy - jobs which generally lack intrinsic interest - have an 'instrumental orientation' to their work. They are not likely to value their jobs as an important source of informal association nor do they associate their most important life activities with their occupational role. Furthermore, there is some evidence that the orientation towards economic reward is not a result of having an uninteresting job. As reported by Goldthorpe:

... the predominantly instrumental orientation to work was not simply or even primarily a consequence of these men being car assemblers; rather, one could say that most had become car assemblers because of a desire, and an eventual decision, on their part to give priority to high-level economic returns from work at the expense, if necessary, of satisfactions of an intrinsic kind" (1966: 229, emphasis in the original).

These studies suggest that (a) workers are subjectively related to their jobs through the rewards which they offer and (b) there is great diversity in the types of reward sought. It might be expected, then, that the social structural variable of greatest interest in this regard is the social distribution of

rewards of the neo-Weberian perspective outlined above.

To summarize briefly, the Marxian and neo-Weberian perspectives outlined in this and the previous chapter each lead to the identification of social structural formations which may influence the job experience of the individual. The Marxian concept of alienation has led some investigators to study the impact of propertylessness and lack of control upon the individual's job experience. Similarly, the neo-Weberian categories which reflect different positions in the income-prestige hierarchy have been studied with respect to differences in subjective job experiences. In the following chapter we will discuss these structural influences with respect to a single summary measure of the job experience, job satisfaction.

1

CHAPTER III

CLASS, STATUS AND JOB SATISFACTION

For the present purposes, job satisfaction will be defined as an affective response of the incumbent to a specific occupational role.¹⁶ The major psychological or social psychological orientations to satisfaction (as the generic form of job satisfaction) focus variously upon needs (Maslow, 1954), the psychological structure of affect (Bradburn, 1969; 1973) and the discrepancy between rewards and expectations (Homans, 1974: 225-240). However, despite the wide range of psychological theorizing, empirical studies of job satisfaction are remarkably consistent in the job attributes which are found to be relevant.

Following Kalleberg (1977) these attributes can be grouped into categories or 'dimensions' of the job and include an 'intrinsic' dimension,¹⁷ financial benefits, comfort and convenience

¹⁶ This is essentially Kalleberg's definition where he states, "Job satisfaction refers to an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying" (1977: 126). Following Campbell (1972: 444) it is assumed, cautiously, that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are experiences that most people can report with reasonable validity. However, the term 'response' is used instead of Kalleberg's 'orientation' to reflect the fact that some variation in reported job satisfaction is a short term or momentary phenomenon (Seashore, 1973: 25).

¹⁷ The intrinsic dimension refers to "... those characteristics associated with the task itself - whether it is interesting, allows the worker to develop and use his/her abilities, allows the worker to be self-directive and whether the worker can see the results of the work" (Kalleberg, 1977: 128).

on the job, adequate resources to do the job, career opportunities and, marginally, relations with co-workers.¹⁸ These, then, are the relevant categories of specific rewards (characteristic of specific jobs), not to be confused with the social distribution of rewards (characteristic of the social and occupational structure) discussed in the previous chapter. However, there is some suggestion that specific rewards account for as little as forty per cent of the variation in job satisfaction (Seashore, 1973: 24-26).¹⁹

The Marxian and neo-Weberian conceptions outlined in the previous chapters suggest a structural view of the matter. That is, the experience of job satisfaction is partially conditioned by elements of the social structure, particularly class in the Marxian sense and socioeconomic status in the neo-Weberian sense.

Wright and Perrone (1977) offer an operational version of the expanded Marxian class categories which meets fairly adequately the requirements of the present point of view. The authors reason that the traditional Marxist analysis of capitalists,

¹⁸ There are two basic points of disagreement between this and other studies of job satisfaction. One involves the importance of relations with co-workers which Kalleberg reports to be negligible whereas others, particularly those with a 'human relations' perspective, maintain that it is central (cf. Argyle, 1972: 233-235). The second point at issue involves the structure of job satisfaction itself which is found by Herzberg (1966) to have two dimensions rather than one as maintained by Kalleberg. That is, satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be independent dimensions of affect with different factors affecting each.

¹⁹ As acknowledged by Seashore the figure of forty per cent is a highly speculative estimate. It does illustrate, however, that other factors are important.

workers and petty bourgeoisie does not accurately reflect the major divisions in the social relations of production and that a new social division, managers, is salient in advanced capitalist societies. This new category reflects the partial differentiation of ownership in the means of production into two components. These being the legal right to the product of labour on the one hand and control over the labour process on the other hand.

The complete class typology, then, is based upon (1) the ownership of capital, (2) the purchase of the labour power of others, (3) the control (i.e. supervision) of the labour power of others and (4) the sale of one's own labour power. These criteria produce the following typology (Wright and Perrone, 1977: 33-34).

- (1) capitalists: own their own means of production, purchase the labour power of others and do not sell their own labour power;
- (2) petty bourgeoisie: do not sell their own labour power, nor purchase the labour power of others, but do own their own means of production;
- (3) managers: wage-labourers who do not own their own means of production, do not formally employ workers, but who do control or supervise labour power;
- (4) workers: do not own their own means of production nor own or control the labour power of others, but do sell their own labour power to capitalists.

Where classes are categorized in this way it is expected

that job satisfaction will decline from the capitalists who will be most satisfied to the petty bourgeoisie, managers and, lowest in satisfaction, the workers. There are essentially two reasons to expect this result.

First, control over productive resources will be used to secure valued rewards such as the freedom to perform tasks which are intrinsically satisfying as well as the external benefits of pay and comfort and convenience on the job. This implies that statistically, the positive relation between class and job satisfaction will be mediated by the specific rewards which are attained in the job.

Second, the technical division of labour, which goes much deeper than the ability of a particular class to control the specific rewards which it gets, is more pronounced the 'lower' the class position. Provided that feelings of powerlessness and self-estrangement, which increase with the technical division of labour (Blauner, 1964), bear the intuitively direct relation to job satisfaction, this should imply that capitalists will be most satisfied, followed by the petty bourgeoisie and so on. Furthermore, the 'alienation' perspective leads one to emphasize particularly the 'intrinsic' job rewards when examining the effect of Marxian class positions. That is, working class disadvantage will be especially marked in respect of intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic satisfactions from their jobs.

Unlike class, which in a certain restricted sense can be said to reflect conditions which make for control of the market,

socioeconomic status reflects conditions which make for success within the market place, ie. the possession of marketable skills. Moreover, those in dominant positions (of either class or status) are responsible for socializing the others to accept certain evaluative criteria for rank ordering occupations, accounting for the high correlation between socioeconomic status and occupational prestige. In modern western societies these criteria are the possession of skill, technical expertise and education (cf. Parkin, 1972: 40-44).. This raises two issues for the relation of socioeconomic status to job satisfaction.

First, those in positions of high socioeconomic status should be most satisfied due to the higher level of specific rewards which these jobs can, indeed must, offer. That higher levels of specific reward will be forthcoming in jobs of higher socioeconomic status is ensured by the relatively favourable market position of the incumbents which itself can sustain only short term fluctuations without affecting the socioeconomic status of occupations.

Secondly, if prestige is a valued social reward, those in high status occupations will be more satisfied than the others because, in addition to the higher level of specific rewards, there should be some direct satisfaction from their position in the socioeconomic hierarchy.

Before summarizing this section, one further point should be mentioned concerning the manual/non-manual division of labour. Although the reward-skill hierarchy forms a continuum, there is a

break along manual/non-manual lines which, according to one view, gives meaning to the notion of 'class' system in advanced societies (Parkin, 1972: 24-26). Reasoning from inequalities of pay, fringe benefits, career prospects, working conditions etc., Parkin concludes that

... because 'manual workers both skilled and unskilled, with the same employer, tend to have fairly homogeneous conditions of employment', and because non-manual categories, 'even when they diverge are more like one another than they are like manual workers', we are justified in drawing our class boundary line between blue-collar and white-collar categories (1972: 26).²⁰

Socioeconomic status then is related, reciprocally, to the distribution of specific job rewards through the distribution of marketable skills and directly to job satisfaction through differentials in occupational prestige. It is to be expected, therefore, that job satisfaction increases with socioeconomic status. Furthermore, if Parkin is correct concerning the significance of the manual/non-manual divide, one would expect the greatest difference in job satisfaction to follow this dichotomous classification.

To recapitulate briefly, it has been implied that there are three social structural variables of potential interest in the conditioning of the subjective relation of the individual to the work role. These are (1) the class structure in the Marxian sense which will hereafter be referred to simply as social class, (2) the income-education-prestige continuum which, hereafter,

²⁰ The segments in quotation marks are from Wedderburn and Craig (1969: 7-8), emphasis added by Parkin.

will be referred to as socioeconomic status or just status, and (3) the manual/non-manual division of labour which will be referred to as such, though it too is potentially a 'class' division in the general sense suggested above.

The proposition that class and status, as outlined above, should make a difference to reported job satisfaction is in itself not surprising. That is, both elements of the social structure should affect job satisfaction variously through the distribution of specific rewards and prestige.

Furthermore, the apparently fundamental nature of the manual/non-manual division (Parkin, 1972) suggests itself as a baseline for comparing the class and status principles. In particular, one should be interested to ask whether this division helps in understanding the working of the class and status principles or, rather, does it supersede the two principles in its effects upon differentials of job satisfaction?

Finally, one can inquire as to the relative effectiveness of class and status in determining the degree of structured inequality. Wright and Perrone (1977) demonstrate that in comparison with status, social class explains the greater amount of variation in income. However, it can be argued that job satisfaction is a better indication of real welfare than money income alone. It will be interesting, then, to see if the Wright and Perrone finding is duplicated using job satisfaction as the dependent variable. We turn now to examine the data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data used in the analysis which follows was collected in January and February of 1973 by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. The study, entitled "Quality of Employment Survey" includes an American national sample of employed persons over the age of fifteen. The total number of respondents interviewed was 1,496.²¹

The major variables of interest are job satisfaction, specific job rewards, social class and social status. These will be described immediately in some detail. Other variables of interest, including collar colour, age, sex, income and education will be described as they are introduced. Needless to say, the operationalization of all these concepts is confined within the limitations of the questions asked in the original survey.

An index of general job satisfaction was constructed from five items including whether or not the respondent would recommend his job to a friend, take the same job again, look for a new job in the near future and whether or not the job was what he expected when he took it. The fifth item was a direct question as to how satisfied the respondent was with his job in general. Each item was scored on a three point scale with the low score

---

²¹ A similar survey was conducted in Canada which, unfortunately did not include the questions relevant to determining the respondents' class position. cf. Burstein et al. (1975).

(1) indicating low satisfaction, the high score, (3) indicating high satisfaction, and the middle score, (2) being an intermediate level.²² For example, when asked whether he would recommend his job to a friend the respondent was offered the following choices.

- (1) he would advise against it,
- (2) he would have doubts about recommending it,
- (3) he would strongly recommend it.

The index, which will be referred to from here on as the job satisfaction index, was constructed as the median of these five items. That is, each respondent in the survey was assigned a score on a discreet, interval level scale ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 3 (high satisfaction), which is the median of his responses to the five items.²³

²² It should be noted that the direct question concerning how satisfied was the respondent with his job is coded, in the original survey, into four categories. These are (1) not at all satisfied, (2) not too satisfied, (3) somewhat satisfied, and (4) very satisfied. For the purpose of constructing the index, categories 1 and 2 were collapsed in order to make this item commensurable with the other four.

²³ The formula used in calculating the median is

$$L_i + 1 - \left[\frac{F_i - N}{f_i} \right] (L_i + 1 - L_i)$$

where L_i = the lower boundary of the interval in which the middle case falls

F_i = the cumulative frequency up to and including the interval in which the middle case falls

f_i = the frequency associated with just the interval in which the middle case falls

N = the sum of frequencies across all intervals ($N = 5$ since there are five items used).

The SPSS statements used to calculate the score for each respondent are available upon request. A sample of scores were checked to ensure that the logical statements used in (cont'd)

With a mean of 2.576, the distribution of scores on the job satisfaction index is highly skewed towards the upper end. In a manner consistent with all similar measures of job satisfaction, only seventeen per cent of the sample had a score of 2 or less. That is, if the midpoint of the index is arbitrarily designated as the breaking point, seventeen per cent of the sample are dissatisfied with their jobs while the remaining eighty-three per cent are satisfied.

A similarly constructed index of specific job rewards, the main control variable in the analysis, was used as a proxy for all the effects of the job itself. Using the data from the "Quality of Employment Survey", Kalleberg (1977) found that the thirty-four questionnaire items dealing with specific attributes of the job clustered into six underlying dimensions of job reward. These included intrinsic rewards, financial rewards, adequate resources to do the job, comfort and convenience on the job, career opportunities and, finally, relations with co-workers. Kalleberg reports that, for the sample as a whole, these underlying aspects of the job are of unequal weight in accounting for the overall variation in general job satisfaction. Building on this analysis, the job rewards index was constructed as the median of each respondent's scores on twenty of the thirty-four job attribute items, each weighted to reflect the importance of its underlying dimension. Table IV-1 lists the twenty items with the underlying dimensions, Kalleberg's correlation coefficient for

23 (cont'd)

the computation give the same result as the mathematical formula described above.

TABLE IV-1

Weighted Items Used in Construction of Job Rewards Index

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Standardized Coefficient*</u>	<u>Items Used</u>	<u>Assigned Weight</u>
Intrinsic	.323	- opportunity to develop own special abilities	4
		- work is interesting	4
		- lot of freedom to decide how work is done	4
		- chance to do things (R) does best	4
		- (R) can see the results of his work	4
Financial	.213	- the pay is good	3
		- the job security is good	3
Resource adequacy	.139	- people (R) works with are friendly and helpful	2
		- enough help and equipment to get the job done	2
		- enough information to get the job done	2
		- enough authority to do the job	2
		- enough time to get the job done	2
		- people are helpful to (R) in getting the job done	2
		- people (R) works with are competent at their jobs	2
Career	.088	NONE**	-
Convenience	.059	- travel to and from work is convenient	1
		- (R) is not asked to do excessive amounts of work	1
		- physical surroundings are pleasant	1
		- (R) can forget about personal problems at work	1
		- free from the conflicting demands which others make	1
		- the hours are good	1
Co-workers	not significant ($p > .05$)	NONE	-

* The standardized coefficient is a regression coefficient which represents the relative contribution of each dimension to overall job satisfaction (Kalleberg, 1977:135).

**The career dimension is excluded because none of the items pertaining to it are applicable to respondents in the capitalist and entrepreneurial classes.

each dimension, and the corresponding weight assigned to each item in constructing the index.²⁴

Each item used in constructing the job rewards index was scored on a four point scale. For example, when asked how true it was of the respondent's job that he could see the results of his job, the following choice of responses was offered.

- (1) This is not at all true of my job.
- (2) This is a little true of my job.
- (3) This is somewhat true of my job.
- (4) This is very true of my job.

The resulting job rewards index is a score on a discreet interval scale ranging from 1 (few positively valued attributes) to 4 (many positively valued attributes). The mathematical formula used is the same formula for the median used in computing the job satisfaction index. The weighting was accomplished by including each item the number of times specified by its weight.²⁵

In addition to the job rewards index, separate variables were constructed for intrinsic rewards, financial rewards, resource

²⁴ The fourteen items not included in the index construction were excluded for one of two reasons. Either it is not clear from Kalleberg's article to which underlying dimension an item belongs, in which case the weighting procedure would be inaccurate, or an item is not applicable to a significant sub-group of the sample. For example, all three items which clustered on the career dimension are not applicable to self-employed respondents. As such they, and the entire dimension, were excluded from the analysis. Since the weighting of the career dimension is comparatively low, it is felt that any resulting distortion would not be too great.

²⁵ The resulting total N is not 20, the number of items, but 46, the weighted number of items. This can be seen clearly by adding the item weights listed in Table IV-1.

adequacy and comfort and convenience on the job by taking the median of the items under each dimension in Table IV-1. It became apparent rather late in the course of analysing the data that the job rewards index, because it effectively constrains the relative impact of the components, may produce results which are statistically artificial, and that quite different results might be obtained controlling for job rewards in a disaggregated form. This indeed proved to be the case, resulting in the discussion of discrepant models below.

Following Wright and Perrone (1977) the categories of social class were constructed from two dichotomous items concerning the self-employed/employed by other status of the respondent and whether or not he supervises anyone on the job. Table IV-2 gives the four class categories with the selection criteria and number of cases from the "Quality of Employment Survey" which fall into each category.

It should be noted that the criteria of Table IV-2 is only the best available approximation to the criteria for class categories outlined on page 21. It is not exact because a question concerning whether or not the respondent employs others,

Table IV-2

Construction of Class Categories				
	<u>Self-employed</u>	<u>Have subordinates on the job</u>	<u>Employed by someone else</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Capitalists	Yes	Yes	No	123
Petty Bourgeoisie	Yes	No	No	66
Managers	No	Yes	Yes	543
Workers	No	No	Yes	759

which did appear in an earlier survey ("Survey of Working Conditions" - 1969), was not included in the "Quality of Employment Survey". The result is that the 'Capitalist' category is somewhat less than perfectly reliable in comparisons with other classes. That is, it requires the assumption that being self-employed and having subordinates on the job is equivalent to employing others, an assumption which will hold for most but probably not all cases (cf. Wright and Perrone, 1977: 42).

The measure of occupational status used in the "Quality of Employment Survey" and which is adopted for the present analysis is the Duncan socio-economic index (SEI). As explained in a previous chapter, this approximates the reward-skill-prestige hierarchy which is meant to be encompassed by the term 'status'. Where appropriate (as in the analysis of variance) the decile scale is used in place of the full two-digit scale.²⁶

The data has been manipulated using analysis of variance and multiple regression techniques with dummy variables for the class categories. The main results are displayed in Tables IV-3 to IV-7 below.

Table IV-3 summarizes several analysis of variance models

²⁶ The decile scale is essentially a rank ordering of the sample based upon the population distribution of the full two-digit scale. The lowest decile score is assigned to all occupations which are pursued by the tenth of the norm population with the lowest full scale scores. The next lowest decile score is assigned to all occupations pursued by the next tenth of the population and so on. Precisely which full scale scores fall into which decile category depends on the distribution of full scale scores in the norming population, usually the latest full census.

for class, status and collar colour²⁷ with job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Models 1, 2 and 4 show that both class and status have a significant effect upon job satisfaction and that each retains a significant impact when the other is statistically controlled. This means that with respect to the way in which job satisfaction is affected, class and status are quite separate phenomena.²⁸

By contrast, the effect of collar colour is much smaller (Model 3) and, when the effects of class and status are controlled, not significant (Model 5). This can be taken to indicate that the manual/non-manual division is of less consequence than might at first be imagined. That is, in the presence of class and status, 'collar colour' adds nothing to the explanation of variance in job satisfaction.

Furthermore, none of the interaction effects are statistically significant at conventional levels. The most straightforward interpretation of this result is to say that the effect of status upon job satisfaction is constant across all class

²⁷ Collar colour is a dichotomous classification of workers (white collar/blue collar) which approximates the manual/non-manual division of labour. Parkin (1972), in fact, uses the terms blue collar - manual and white collar - non-manual as pairs of synonyms. It should be noted that farmers were coded separately and not included.

²⁸ This is not too surprising since the actual correlation of class with status is itself quite small. In a simple cross tabulation of class and status (decile range), the rank order correlation (Kendall's tau c) is .179. Though statistically significant ($p < .001$), this is surprisingly low for a pair of concepts which are often tacitly treated as coterminous with one another.

TABLE IV-3

Analysis of Variance with Job Satisfaction Dependent

<u>Model</u>	<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>Effects</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Significance of F</u>
1.	Class	between	3	13.40	$p < .001$
		within	1,485	367.21	
2.	Status (decile)	between	9	13.40	$p < .001$
		within	1,463	357.97	
3.	Collar Colour	between	1	4.87	$p < .001$
		within	1,443	364.56	
4.	Class and Status (decile)	Class	3	6.64	$p < .001^+$
		Status	9	7.21	$p < .001$
		Interaction	25	6.37	$p = .385^*$
		Residual	1,430	344.02	
5.	Class, Status (decile) and Collar Colour	Class	3	6.72	$p < .001$
		Status	9	6.60	$p < .002$
		Collar Colour	1	.79	$p = .072^*$
		2-way Interactions	31	8.69	$p = .260^*$
		3-way Interaction	4	.48	$p = .743^*$
		Residual	1,374	334.26	

---

*Not significant at $p = .05$.

positions and, likewise, the effect of class is constant across all levels of socio-economic status. That is, the appropriate model for describing the effects of class and status upon job satisfaction is one in which the effects are additive. This is shown in a more obvious way in Tables IV-4 and IV-5.

Table IV-4 presents the expected mean job satisfaction for each combination of class category and status decile range as calculated from the additive model:

$$Y_{ij} = \bar{Y} + X_i + X_j \quad (i = 1 - 4) \quad (j = 0 - 9)$$

where Y_{ij} = expected job satisfaction for each combination ij of class and status.

X_i = effect of being in the i^{th} class category ($i = 1 - 4$).

X_j = effect of being in the j^{th} status decile range ($j = 0 - 9$).

$\bar{Y}$ = the constant grand mean (2.57) of the job satisfaction index, and where X_i and X_j are deviations from the grand mean as calculated in the multiple classification analysis.²⁹

The figures in each cell of Table IV-4 directly above the expected mean job satisfaction are the actual (observed) means for each group. Table IV-5 gives the sign and magnitude of the difference between observed and expected job satisfaction (ie. the residuals) for each combination of class structure.

The information in Tables IV-4 and IV-5 is of primary

²⁹ The multiple classification analysis is provided by SPSS to allow the examination of the pattern of effects for which the analysis of variance gives the statistical significance only.

TABLE IV-4

Mean Job Satisfaction for Forty Categories of Class and Status*

<u>Duncan Decile Range</u>													
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Class		
X_i		2.412	2.309	2.000	2.453	2.512	2.416	2.637	2.508	2.616	2.597	Worker	
	-.082	2.328	2.311	2.673	2.378	2.488	2.429	2.532	2.504	2.575	2.589	Class	
		2.413	2.547	Zero Cases		2.461	2.667	2.700	2.531	2.650	2.640	2.679	Managerial
	.051	2.461	2.444	2.806	2.511	2.621	2.562	2.665	2.637	2.708	2.722	Class	
		2.250	2.833	2.693	2.542	2.823	2.833	2.643	2.505	2.924	2.938	Petty Bourgeoisie	
	.149	2.559	2.542	2.904	2.609	2.719	2.660	2.763	2.735	2.806	2.820	Class	
		Zero Cases		3.000	2.824	2.500	2.847	2.677	2.856	2.729	2.849	Capitalist	
	.200	2.610	2.593	2.955	2.660	2.770	2.711	2.814	2.786	2.857	2.871	Class	
	-.169	-.186	.176	-.119	-.009	-.068	.035	.007	.078	.092	$\bar{Y} = 2.579$		

 X_j * The upper figure in each cell is the observed mean and the lower figure is the expected mean = $\bar{Y} + X_i + X_j$.

TABLE IV-5
Residuals from Table IV-4 (Observed Minus Expected Values)

Decile Range		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Class
0	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Worker class
	.084	.002	.673*	.075	.024	.013	.105	.004	.041	.008	
-	+	.103	missing	.050	.046	.138*	.134	.013	.068	.043	Managerial class
	.309*	.291*	.211	.067	.104	.173*	.120	.230*	.118	.118	Petty Bourgeoisie class
missing	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	Capitalist class
	.407*	.131	.160	.520*	.136	.137	.070	.128	.022		

Md = 0

* Eight values fall outside the interquartile range of the residuals.

descriptive importance. Table IV-4 shows a definite trend of increasing job satisfaction as one moves from the worker class (-.082) through to the capitalist class (+.200). Similarly, but with the conspicuous exception of the third decile range (ie. #2),³⁰ job satisfaction generally increases with socio-economic status from -.169 for the lowest decile through to +.092 for the highest. This suggests that class and status account for about the same degree of differentiation across the range (.282 and .261 respectively). However, class appears to account for the positive deviation from the mean job satisfaction whereas status accounts for the negative deviation. That is, low status is associated with low satisfaction while high status has relatively little effect (-.169 vs. +.092). Similarly, 'high' class position is associated with high satisfaction as compared with the very small effect of 'low' class position (+.200 vs. -.082).

This is consistent with Herzberg (1966). The 'motivation-hygiene theory', as it is called, postulates two independent sets of factors which contribute to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction respectively. It appears that class may be associated with 'motivation' factors (satisfiers) and status with 'hygiene' factors (dissatisfiers). This point will be elaborated below where further evidence is adduced in its favour.

The residuals (Table IV-5) are quite small and uniform indicating that the additive model is reasonable. However, of

³⁰ Of the 38 respondents who fall into the third decile range, 37 are farmers or farm managers. This could account for the inordinately positive effect.

eight values which fall outside the interquantile range of the residuals, six belong to the petty bourgeoisie and capitalist classes. This indicates that the model is not as good a fit for these classes as it is for workers and managers. This seems quite plausible if it can be assumed that the significance of job satisfaction is not so clear for capitalists and entrepreneurs as it is for workers and managers whose occupational roles might be more specifically defined.

It appears, then, that class in the Marxian sense and socio-economic status are very nearly additive in their effects upon job satisfaction, the precise combination of the two being largely contingent upon external factors. It remains to examine this relation with respect to other factors which help to determine differences in job satisfaction. Table IV-6 presents the regression coefficients for several equations which variously combine class, status, specific rewards and age with job satisfaction as the dependent variable.³²

Equation 1 shows that class and status together account for nearly five percent ($R^2 = .047$) of the variation in job satisfaction. This in itself is more important than might at first be imagined since, as Kohn (1976: 120) points out, 'correlations between social-structural and psychological phenomena

³² Age and job rewards were selected as the major control variables through a stepwise regression procedure in which the respondents' income and education were eliminated as not significant. Family income makes a statistically significant contribution whose substantive impact, however, is not great enough to warrant inclusion. Analysis of variance indicates that sex differences in job satisfaction are not significant.

TABLE IV-6.
Selected Regressions with Job Satisfaction Dependent

Variables in the Equation	Regression Coefficients											R ²
	Standardized (above)					Unstandardized (below)						
	Int- rin- sic Re- wards	Fin- anc- ial Re- wards	Re- source ade- quacy	Com- fort	Job Re- wards Index	Age	Status	Capit- alist Dummy	Petty Bourge- oisie Dummy	Man- ager Dummy		
1. Class and Status (Standardized) (Unstandardized)							.12 .003	.14 .25	.10 .24	.09 .09	.047	
2. Class only								.16 .28	.10 .23	.13 .13	.035	
3. Status only							.15 .003				.021	
4. Job Rewards (Index), Age, Class and Status					.47 .39	.13 .005	.06 .001	.02* .04*	-.005* -.01*	.02* .03*	.279	
5. Job Rewards (Components)	.34 .22	.24 .13	.10 .09	.07 .05							.316	
6. Job Rewards (Components) and Age	.32 .21	.24 .13	.10 .09	.05 .04		.12 .004					.329	
7. Job Rewards (Components), Age and Class	.31 .20	.24 .13	.10 .09	.06 .04		.11 .004		.02* .04*	.02* .05*	.02* .02*	.329	
8. Job Rewards (Components), Age and Status	.31 .20	.23 .13	.10 .09	.05 .04		.12 .004	.04* .001*				.330	
9. Job Rewards (Components), Age, Class and Status	.30 .19	.23 .13	.10 .09	.06 .04		.11 .004	.04* .001*	.02* .03*	.02* .05*	.01* .01*	.330 40	

*Not significant at $p \leq .05$.

are never as great as those among social-structural conditions or those among psychological states'.

Comparing the relative net effects of class and status shows that class contributes more to the variation in job satisfaction than does status. That is, class net of status (R_1^2 minus $R_3^2 = .026$) contributes more to R^2 than does status net of class (R_1^2 minus $R_2^2 = .012$). However, equations 7 to 9 show that when job rewards (separate components) and age are controlled, both class and status cease to have a significant effect. In other words, the effects of class and status upon job satisfaction are mediated by the specific rewards which, as perceived by the respondent, accrue to his job.

Before analysing further this mediated model (diagramed below as Model II), a word must be said concerning equation 4 (diagramed below as Model I) in which the job rewards index is included in lieu of its component variables and in which status is found to have an unmediated effect upon job satisfaction. As implied earlier in this chapter, Model I will eventually be discarded due to the possibility that it is an artifact of the way in which the job rewards index was constructed. However, in considering whether or not to discuss Model I at all, it was decided that the theoretical significance was too great to be discarded out of hand just because, in this instance, it is methodologically inferior to the alternative Model II,

---

MODEL I

Model I best describes the a priori expectations outlined in the previous chapter.³³ Equation 4 in Table IV-6 supports this model ($R^2 = .279$) and shows that under some conditions, status may be shown to retain a significant direct effect upon job satisfaction when job rewards are controlled even though the entire direct effect of class disappears. This reflects the expectation that, unlike class, occupational status has some affective significance for the worker (due to the prestige component) over and above that which is seen to be the result of the effect of status upon the distribution of specific rewards.

Based upon equation 9 ($R^2 = .330$) of Table IV-6, Model II shows that when the job reward components are controlled separately the direct effect of status disappears.³⁴ This in-

---

³³ Age tends to be correlated with everything and is, therefore included in the regression equations to avoid the misattribution of its effects. It is omitted from the diagrammed models, however, as it is not of central concern in the present context.

³⁴ It should be noted that Model II is accepted over Model I on the grounds that it accounts for the greater variation in (cont'd)

volves a bit of a dilemma for the way in which socioeconomic status is conceived. Indeed, at the structural level, occupational prestige appears to be somewhat chimerical, leaving one to infer that insofar as its consequences are concerned, socioeconomic status reflects differentials in market capacity only.

MODEL II

In order to unravel the pattern in which class and status influences specific job rewards, Table IV-7 presents the coefficients of multiple determination (R^2) for a number of regressions involving each type of job reward on class, status, and age.³⁵ Status influences intrinsic rewards ($R^2 = .055$) and

---

³⁴ (cont'd)

job satisfaction ($R^2 = .330$ vs. $R^2 = .279$). The fact that this criterion for accepting a model is not infallible provides another reason for our hedging over the rejection of Model I. That is, an increase in R^2 is expected just from increasing the number of independent variables and it is felt that, in these particular circumstances, the possibility of this statistical artifact is the lesser of two evils.

³⁵ One again, age appears to influence all types of job reward. It is omitted from the diagram of Model II for the sake of convenience.

financial rewards ($R^2 = .028$). Class influences intrinsic rewards ($R^2 = .130$), financial rewards ($R^2 = .012$) and resource adequacy ($R^2 = .018$). Neither class nor status have a significant effect upon comfort and convenience on the job. Again, these relations are reflected in the diagram of Model II above.

TABLE IV-7

Coefficients of Multiple Determination (R^2) with Job Reward Components Dependent

<u>Variables in the Equation</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>			
	<u>Intrinsic Rewards</u>	<u>Financial Rewards</u>	<u>Resource Adequacy</u>	<u>Comfort</u>
1. Age, Class and Status	.1786	.0402	.0310	.0409
2. Class and Status	.1591	.0334	.0177	.0051*
3. Class only	.1296	.0124	.0175	.0048*
4. Status only	.0547	.0275	.0002*	.0001*

*Not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Particular attention should be paid to the effects of class and status upon intrinsic rewards and financial rewards respectively (the lower left quadrant of Table IV-7). It will be recalled that Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory

was invoked to explain the finding that class accounted for positive deviation from the mean job satisfaction while status accounted for the negative deviation. Table IV-7 provides further support for this interpretation since in comparison with class, status has a greater impact ($R^2 = .028$ vs. $R^2 = .012$) upon financial rewards which according to Herzberg is a hygiene factor or dissatisfier. On the other hand, in comparison with status, class has a greater impact ($R^2 = .130$ vs. $R^2 = .055$) upon intrinsic rewards, a motivation factor or satisfier.³⁶

In sum, the data point to the following conclusions.

- (1) Class and status are very nearly independent of one another and additive in their effects upon job satisfaction.
- (2) In the presence of class and status, the manual/non-manual divisions adds nothing to the variance of job satisfaction explained.
- (3) Class and status effect job satisfaction indirectly through the distribution of specific rewards.
- (4) There is some indirect evidence that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate 'dimensions' of affect and that status is associated with 'dissatisfiers; whereas class is associated with 'satisfiers'.

³⁶ It should be noted parenthetically that in Herzberg's scheme (cf. Herzberg, 1966: 115) resource adequacy cannot be unambiguously classified as either a satisfier or dissatisfier and comfort and convenience on the job (working conditions) is classified as a dissatisfier. Although Herzberg includes status as a dissatisfier, he is referring to the respondent's explicit recognition of specific status privileges (1966: 217) rather than to the social standing of the occupation itself.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Job satisfaction, like the modern, psychologistic concept of 'alienation', is a measure of the quality of the work experience. In the early Marxian view the quality of this experience is intrinsic to the realtions of production. That is, rather than any rewards which may accrue to the job, the intrinsically important aspect of work is control over the product and over the process of labour itself. Hence, the Marxian view that social class is an important structural conditioner of job satisfaction.

Modern 'alienation' theorists such as Blauner (1964) and Kohn (1976) conclude that control of one's own work or 'occupational self-direction' is, indeed, an important influence upon the quality of working life. The data from the 'Quality of Employment Survey' confirms this view and links it with Marx's structural analysis in a way which is not quite explicit in either Kohn or Blauner.

One of Kohn's main conclusions is that "Insofar as ownership and hierarchical position affect alienation, it is mainly because owners and people high in the supervisory structure are able to be self-directed in their work (1976: 122). Substituting our own terms which are very nearly equivalent to Kohn's at the operational level, the present data confirm that 'insofar

as class affects job satisfaction, it is mainly because those in 'higher' class positions are able to gain higher levels of 'intrinsic reward'. This is a straightforward way of interpreting our finding that the relation between class and job satisfaction is mediated by specific rewards, the most important of which are intrinsic rewards.

What Kohn has failed to take into account is the possibility that, when dealing with a psychological dependent variable, one may have to take the main structural influence one step back, so to speak. The resulting 'mediated' model reflects the not unlikely tenet that the impact of structural formations is mediated by 'things' which are experienced by the individual. This is not to deny that the range of 'things' which perform this mediating function may be wide enough to include symbols, behaviour of others, etc. It does suggest that there is a useful distinction between structural formations which cannot be directly experienced and the consequences of these structural formations which can be experienced.

Blauner, too, lays heavy stress upon those conditions of industrial employment which determine the intrinsic rewards of work, including the routineness of tasks and degree of control over one's own work. He concludes that there is a heterogeneity within the working class with respect to levels of alienation, the important variable being the industry within which the worker is employed rather than his class position. Our analysis does not negate his findings concerning the compar-

ative industries any more than his negates our findings concerning comparative classes. It does demonstrate, however, that the intrinsic rewards so important in Blauner's analysis of alienation are distributed differentially by class and that a neglect of this entirely, in favour of industry characteristics, would be somewhat premature.

It has been variously concluded that those in uninteresting jobs tend to have an instrumental orientation toward work (Goldthorpe, 1966), work is not necessarily a central life interest (Dubin, 1963) and that workers are generally satisfied with whatever positive aspects they can find in work (Morse and Weiss, 1962). If these assessments were correct in any simple sense one would expect the socio-economic status of occupations to outweigh Marxian class categories in its impact upon satisfaction with the work role. The data show that in a general (employed) sample this is far from being the case. Rather, status has a relatively limited impact upon job satisfaction through the distribution of intrinsic and financial rewards.

Insofar as socio-economic status is taken as an indicator of market capacity - the distribution of technical expertise, skill and education - the data present no fundamental problem of interpretation, the indications being that class position is at least as important as these factors as an influence upon the distribution of specific rewards and job satisfaction. However, a problem does arise in respect of the structural formation which the socio-economic index was first intended to approximate:

the distribution of occupational prestige.

Contrary to expectations, the data provide no support for the proposition that the prestige of an occupation has an effect upon the degree of job satisfaction to be had from it. This calls into question the entire idea of the distribution of occupational prestige as a bona fide structural formation with any real consequences. This doubt leads one to question further the usefulness and meaning of the socio-economic index as an independent variable in studies of the present sort.

One of the most surprising results of our analysis is the finding that the manual/non-manual division, when class and status are considered, is not a significant influence upon job satisfaction. This implies, if differences in job satisfaction are a valid indicator, that the manual/non-manual division is not an important structural element of modern societies.

In reporting this conclusion one must acknowledge the view of writers such as Mills (1956) and Braverman (1974) who have analysed non-manual work in terms of its progressive 'degradation' in the modern era. It would come as no surprise to these writers that those in white collar jobs are no more satisfied than those in blue collar jobs since there is very little to choose between them.

No single statistical study can be conclusive and this is true a fortiori in the present instance where, in absolute terms, the magnitude of the effects with which we are dealing is very small. Therefore all the conclusions to which these data point .

must await the evidence of further, more precise, investigation. The additive model of class and status stands out as being of particular importance in this regard. Provided that the previously noted conceptual difficulty with 'status' can be overcome, the additive model may be applied with greater advantage to phenomena other than job satisfaction contributing to an empirically based theory of social structure.

REFERENCES

- Argyle, M.
1972 Social Psychology of Work. London:
Allen Lane the Penguin Press.
- Blauner, R.
1964 Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker
and His Industry. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press.
- Bradburn, N.M.
1969 The Structure of Psychological Well-Being.
Chicago: Aldine.
- 1973 "Is the Quality of Working Life Improving?
How Can You Tell? And Who Wants to Know?"
Pp. 88-104 in A. Portigal (ed.), Measuring
the Quality of Working Life. Ottawa: De-
partment of Labour.
- Braverman, H.
1974 Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York:
Monthly Review Press.
- Burstein, M. et al
1975 Canadian Work Values: Findings of a Work
Ethic Survey and a Job Satisfaction Survey.
Ottawa: Department of Manpower and Immi-
gration.
- Campbell, A.
1972 "Aspiration, Satisfaction, and Fulfillment."
Pp. 441-466 in Campbell & Converse (eds.),
The Human Meaning of Social Change. New
York: Russell Sage.
- Dubin, R.
1963 "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of
the Central Life Interests of Industrial
Workers." Pp. 53-72 in Smigel (ed.),
Work and Leisure. New Haven; Conn.: Col-
lege & University Press.
- Duncan, O.D.
1961 "A Socioeconomic Index for all Occupations."
Pp. 109-138 in A. Reiss (ed.), Occupations
and Social Status. New York: The Free
Press.

Goldthorpe, J.H.

- 1966 "Attitudes and Behaviour of Car Assembly Workers: A Deviant Case and a Theoretical Critique." *British Journal of Sociology* 17 (Number 3): 227-244.

_____ and D. Lockwood.

- 1963 "Affluence and the British Class Structure." *The Sociological Review* 11 (Number 2): 133-163.

Herzberg, F.

- 1966 *Work and the Nature of Man.* New York: World Publishing Co.

Homans, G.

- 1974 *Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Jordan, Z.A. (ed.)

- 1971 *Karl Marx: Economy, Class and Social Revolution.* New York: Scribner's.

Kahn, R.L.

- 1972 "The Meaning of Work: Interpretation and Proposals for Measurement." Pp. 159-205 in Campbell & Converse (eds.), *The Human Meaning of Social Change.* New York: Russell Sage.

Kalleberg, A.L.

- 1977 "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 42 (February): 124-143.

Kohn, M.L.

- 1976 "Occupational Structure (and Alienation)." *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (July): 111-130.

Laslett, P.

- 1962 "The World We Have Lost." Pp. 86-93 in Eric and Mary Josephson (eds.), *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society.* New York: Dell.

Marx, K.

- 1964 *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.* D. Struik (ed.). New York: International Publishers.

- Maslow, A.
1954 Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper.
- McRoberts, H.A.
1975 Social Stratification in Canada: A Preliminary Analysis. Ottawa: Carleton University. Ph.D. Thesis.
- Mills, C.W.
1956 White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morse, N., and R. Weiss.
1962 "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job." Pp. 29-35 in Nosow and Form (eds.), Man, Work and Society. New York: Basic Books.
- Parker, S.
1972 The Future of Work and Leisure. London: Paladin.
- Parkin, F.
1972 Class Inequality and Political Order. London: Paladin.
- Reiss, A.
1961 Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Seashore, S.
1973 "Job Satisfaction as an Indicator of Quality of Employment." In A. Portigal (ed.), Measuring the Quality of Working Life. Ottawa: Department of Labour.
- Seeman, M.
1959 "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review 24 (December): 783-791.
- 1972 "Alienation and Engagement." Pp. 467-527 in Campbell & Converse (eds.), The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russell Sage.
- Smelser, N.
1976 The Sociology of Economic Life. (Second ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Udy, S.H. Jr.

1970 Work in Traditional and Modern Society.
Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

1973 Work in America. Cambridge, Mass.:
M.I.T. Press.

Weber, M.

1958 "Class, Status, Party." Pp. 180-195 in
Gerth and Mills (eds.), From Max Weber:
Essays in Sociology. New York: Galaxy
Books.

1964 The Theory of Social and Economic Organi-
zation. Translated and edited by A.M.
Henderson and T. Parsons. New York:
The Free Press.

Wedderburn, D., and C. Craig.

1969 "Relative Deprivation in Work." Paper
presented at the British Association for
the Advancement of Science, Exeter.

Wright, E.O., and L. Perrone.

1977 "Marxist Class Categories and Income In-
equality." American Sociological Review
42 (February): 32-55.

END

05 · 03 · 80

FIN