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ABSTRACT

The study was designed as an empirical test of the theoretical relationship defined by Marx between class position and self-estrangement. Based on an analysis of the primary writings a class typology was constructed which reflected the two-class model (Capitalists vs. Workers). This model was then expanded to include an intermediate, managerial class grouping.

The data used in the study formed part of a larger "Survey of Working Conditions" conducted by The University of Michigan Survey Research Center in 1969-70. Based on the above class typology a trichotomic class variable was developed (Employers, Managers, Workers). To measure self-estrangement an attitudinal scale was developed comprised of five items defended as reflecting various aspects of the "individual-labor process" relationship.

The analysis was divided into two phases. The first phase sought to compare the relative ability of the class variable to predict perceived self-estrangement with that of two other variables, Duncan's "Socio Economic Index" and a white collar/blue collar distinction. As predicted the class variable was found to be the best predictor of self-estrangement. Interpretation of these results was,
however, tempered in light of a number of significant observations including, 1) the existence of a relatively low percentage of explained variation \(R^2 = .292\), and 2) low decrements or changes in the \(R^2\)'s associated with the key predictor variables (e.g., the class variable accounted for only 5 percent of the explained variation). The second phase of the analysis sought to test for inter-class differences with respect to the phenomenon of perceived self-estrangement. The Scheffe method of a posteriori contrasts was employed to test for these possible differences. Based on the analysis it was concluded that the three class groupings reflect significantly different levels of mean self-estrangement. As predicted workers displayed the highest levels of perceived self-estrangement, employers the lowest, with managers as a class displaying levels in between these two. The study concludes with a discussion of the limitations associated with the analysis and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Modern day sociologists stand removed by nearly a full century from the life and work of Marx. It is not unreasonable to have expected this period following the death of Marx to have been one marked by the delineation and clarification of basic Marxian tenets and their consequential integration into "mainline" academic sociology. Yet, allowing for a few disparate and isolated exceptions, this is not what we find. The store of published material devoted to Marxian sociology admittedly continues to grow at an increasing rate, but an inevitable and unfortunate manifestation of such a rapid rate of growth is the existence of a considerable number of cursory and inadequate reconstructions of Marxian theory. Eric Fromm described the situation as follows:

Few authors have had the fate of being misunderstood and distorted as Marx has been. Few authors, also, have been so often quoted and so little read. Yet we can see in the last few years a definite turn in this situation...Marx has truly been rediscovered, and one does not go too far in saying that we are witnessing the beginning of a renaissance of Marxist thought (Early Writings, 1964a, p.i).
Empirical evidence appears to bear out Fromm's first assertion. Upon reviewing much of the recent literature on Marxian sociology one finds a disturbing trend toward reliance on secondary source material. While there exist many excellent secondary sources on the subject of Marxian sociology and social philosophy, these works constitute no substitute for a needed analysis of the primary works. Such a stress on secondary materials represents at least part of the reason for the pervasive distortion of Marx's writings.

Marx himself may be partially faulted for much of the distortion and misinterpretation associated with his works. Dahrendorf correctly argues that Marx viewed himself and consequently wrote both as a scientist and as a philosopher. As a result we find in Marx's writings a blend of scientific assertion and philosophical speculation. Were it possible, as some have asserted, to distinguish separate periods or divisions comprising Marx's writings employing the above distinction the problem would not be as complicated as it is. Those such as Aron, for example, accordingly assert that it is in fact possible to distinguish Marx the philosopher from Marx the scientist. Aron writes:

> It might be said that from 1848 until the end of his life, Marx apparently ceased to be a philosopher and became a sociologist and, above all, an economist (1968, p.147).
It is an implicit argument of this dissertation that such a distinction should not be made. Those who stress such a split fail to note a common theme running throughout the entire writings of Marx. That theme keys on the relationship existing between the ontological thrust of many of the earlier writings, and the humanistic critique of the capitalist mode of production found in the later works.

Marx may justly be accused of what one could call a "careless" writing style. One often finds Marx assuming more than a minimal degree of knowledge on the part of the reader. While in most if not all cases such an assumption on the part of an author is unavoidable, in the writings of Marx it appears to be carried to a needless extreme. Marx's writings are characterized by an overall lack of stress on such basics as definitional clarity (the concept of social class providing but one example). Those who would either doubt the above or who require a specific example are referred to the Grundrisse, a work described as forming the key link in all of Marx's writings.

There remains at least one additional reason for the alleged distortion of Marx's work. It is a reason summarized by Bertell Ollman in his emphasis on the dangers of reading Marx out of context. Keying on the notion of "internal relations" Ollman argues that the writings of Marx perhaps more than those of any other writer, past or
present, constitute a logically coherent whole. For example, one cannot possibly grasp the full thrust of a work such as *Capital* without a prior knowledge of Marx's views on the human condition expounded in his earlier writings. Nor, as is argued in this work, can one begin to fully understand the Marxian conception of self-estrangement ("Entfremdung") without knowledge of Marx's analysis of class structure and social change.

In light of the above, the present study attempts to present a concise but theoretically valid analysis of the Marxian notions of social class and self-estrangement. To this end a concerted effort has been made to reconstruct accounts of both social class and self-estrangement based on an analysis of primary works. The analysis draws from the full chronological range of Marx's writings, beginning with the earlier, "philosophical" works up to the later "scientific" writings including many of Marx's political drafts. The analysis is supplemented with selected secondary sources which serve to clarify.

In addition to the theoretical analysis of the concepts of social class and self-estrangement and their interrelationship, the specific goals of the study are as follows:

1. To present an alternative (and, I believe, more valid) operationalization of the theoretical concepts
including the development of a scale designed to measure the concept of self-estrangement.

2. To conduct an empirical test of the purported relationship between social class and self-estrangement. Such a test entails both an analysis of the relative ability of the class variable to predict self-estrangement as well as an analysis of inter-class variations with respect to self-estrangement.

Neither the analysis found in this study nor the goals here expressed were designed to treat, let alone resolve, the debate that has raged since Marx's death regarding what I shall call "revisionist speculation". Such speculation (beginning with the platforms of Bernstein (1965), Kautsky (1971), and Lenin (1929;1932), and continuing up to the present day as exemplified by the writings of such scholars as Baran and Sweezy (1966), Dahrendorf (1959) and Tucker (1972)) was spawned by the many perceived inadequacies associated with Marxian theory. Although this literature constitutes a sizable portion of the material devoted to Marxian theories of both social class and self-estrangement, it must remain outside the scope of this study. With respect to the notion of social class, the present study seeks neither to assess directly the overall applicability of the orthodox Marxian class model for modern capitalist society, nor to develop a revisionistic
alternative in the form of an updated class theory of modern society. As was illustrated by a recent debate among Marxian scholars, such an effort remains monumental in scope; clearly, resolution lies well in the future. Regarding self-estrangement, the purpose of this study is not to (in a direct sense) argue the relative merits of either Marx's stand regarding the ontological basis for human existence or the antithesis of that existence, human self-estrangement.

Impetus for the Study

The general impetus for the study may be traced to a long-standing personal interest in the concept of social class. Social class occupies a central position within both Marxian literature and sociology as a whole. The sociological literature is replete with research utilizing social class as both a dependent and independent variable. These studies range from definitions and analyses of social class to studies in which the concept is used to account for everything from income inequality and crime to such abstract concepts as alienation and life chances. While the concept of social class is as relevant today as it was a century ago, the sociological community remains split with respect to both its measurement and analysis. That this split will have been resolved by the end of this century appears unlikely.
A related impetus for the study centers on the author's interest concerning the concept of alienation. Such an interest was spawned by a reading of Marx's earlier writings including *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* and *The German Ideology*. Based on these and subsequent other readings it is my belief that a common theme pervades Marx's writings. The theme is that of human alienation and the dehumanizing effects of the capitalist mode of production on the individual. This belief is not an original one (see, for example, Fromm, 1971). It is one however, that has sparked continual debate particularly within the Marxian community.

A word regarding the use of the concept of self-estrangement as opposed to alienation in this study is needed. Much has been written recently on the increasing hazards associated with the use of the concept of alienation. Assuming that the utility of any concept rests on its ability to communicate, in a concise and explicit fashion, the essence of a specific idea or process, then the concept of alienation may very well have outlived its usefulness. It has been overused and misused to such an extent that any value it may at one time have possessed for social science has dissipated. While one can only speculate regarding the causes of the misuse, such speculation must include the trend toward conducting empirical research on the
concern based on a theoretical framework developed primarily from secondary interpretations. Seeman's (1959) frequently cited article illustrates the problem well. In defining alienation as a "multi-dimensional" concept the author succeeds in constructing a springboard of sorts for not only the empirical research that was to follow, but for much of the misuse also. Ironically, the most theoretically valid dimension delineated by the author, self-estrangement, is the component that appears most problematic for him. For the above reason as well as reasons developed in Chapter II of the study we prefer the concept of self-estrangement over that of alienation.

The specific impetus for the present study is a recently published study by Wright and Perrone (1977). Citing an alleged disjuncture between the theoretical and empirical/quantitative traditions within the area of social stratification and specifically Marxian analyses of social class, the authors present a "preliminary operationalization" of Marxian class categories to be employed in future research on the subject. They write:

Of all the theoretical traditions in sociology, social inequality probably plays the most central role in the Marxist perspective. Yet, quantitative investigations of the causes and consequences of inequality have almost totally ignored Marxian categories. Marxists have been suspicious of quantitative, multivariate approaches to the study of social reality, and the practitioners of multivariate statistics
generally have viewed the Marxist perspective as offering little of interest for empirical research.

The present research is an attempt to bridge this gap between the Marxist theoretical perspective and the rapidly growing body of quantitative studies of social inequality (1977, p.32).

A class variable is constructed employing the theoretical notions of ownership of the means of production and purchase/sale of labor power. Wright and Perrone attempt to gauge the utility of their variable by empirically testing the relative ability of the variable to predict income inequality. The results of the analysis prove promising, and as a result the authors call for future research on the subject. The present study represents one answer to that call.

Order and Content of Chapters

A theoretical framework based on analysis of primary and secondary sources is presented in Chapter II. The concepts of social class and self-estrangement are analyzed in separate sections of the chapter. The third section of the chapter consists of a brief summary statement stressing the interdependence of the two concepts. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the research hypotheses.

The third chapter is devoted to a discussion of the methods and procedures used in the study. Included in the chapter are sections devoted to: 1) a discussion of the
data utilized, 2) operational definitions of the concepts outlined in the preceding chapter, and 3) a discussion of the analytical techniques employed.

The analysis presented in Chapter IV is divided into two parts. First, the relative ability of the Marxian class variable to predict self-estrangement is contrasted with that of two other predictor variables, an occupational status measure (Duncan SEI scores), and a measure based on white collar/blue collar distinctions. Second, the separate class categories comprising the class variable are compared with respect to level of self-estrangement.

A summary statement, theoretical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are provided in the concluding chapter (V).


6. K. Marx, *The Grundrisse*, (M. Nicolaus transl.), Vintage Books, New York, 1973. *The Grundrisse* consists of seven roughly drafted and incomplete notebooks written by Marx during the winter of 1857-8. The work is described by Nicolaus, the English translator of the work, as a "most significant new development" (the German original was not published until 1953 with the English translation first appearing in 1973). The notebooks represent the only outline of Marx's complete political economic project and are in addition described by Nicolaus as representing perhaps the key link in Marx's writings, bridging the earlier philosophical writings with the later scientific and
economic works.

On reading the work, one finds it often difficult if not impossible to distinguish the author personally expounding on a specific issue from his attempts at paraphrasing and directly quoting others. This shortcoming is of course partially accounted for by the unfinished nature of the work alluded to above.


8 During the weekend of November 7-9, 1975, a panel consisting of Stanley Aronowitz, Paul Piccone, Trent Schroyer, Russell Jacoby and Marvin Surkin assembled on the campus of Brown University to discuss, "The Status of 'Class' in Marxist Theory," the full transcript of that panel discussion has been reprinted in Telos, 28, Summer, 1976, pp.145-66.


10 Of the five sub-components of alienation outlined by Seeman (powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement), it is the last component, self-estrangement, which appears most puzzling to the author. Referring to the notion of estrangement from self as "simply a metaphor," he concludes his discussion by stressing the "unclarities" and "difficulties" associated with his analysis of the concept. Despite displaying a reliance on relatively recent, secondary accounts of self-estrangement (most notably, C. Wright Mills and Eric Fromm) as well as a concomitant reluctance to discuss Marx's views on the subject, the author does allude to the possible relationship existing between the phenomenon of human self-estrangement and intrinsic job satisfaction.

11 The specific results of the study are presented in Chapter II.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The following chapter is divided into five sections. Section one outlines in brief form the basic tenets of "historical materialism", and concludes by stressing the crucial role assumed by social classes in the theory. The second and third sections are devoted to analyses of the concepts of social class and self-estrangement. In each case the analysis is based primarily on the primary writings of Marx, and is supplemented drawing from selected secondary source material. The fourth section consists of a summary statement stressing the interrelationship between social class and self-estrangement. The chapter concludes with a presentation and discussion of the research hypotheses.

Historical Materialism: Social Structure and Social Change

The Marxian anatomy of classes is designed not only to predict the pattern of the future and to understand events of the past, but also to explain the social structure at any given moment in history (Hodges, 1961, p.23).

Few if any of those engaged in the field of Marxian
scholarship over the past one hundred years would dispute the validity of the above quotation provided by Donald Hodges. Such diverse perspectives as those outlined by Buchkarin (1925), Lenin (1932), Dahrendorf (1959), Ossowski (1963), Bendix and Lipset (1966), Oilman (1968), and Poulantzas (1968, 1973, and 1975) share an emphasis in the importance of social class in Marxian thought. The concept of class represents in essence the core of Marxian theory. It can be employed as an analytical tool to discern Marx's views concerning the static as well as the dynamic nature of human society. Within the concept of social class is found the basis for both Marx's historicism and his predictions regarding the future of mankind.

Given the above, it is necessary before launching into a discussion of social class and its use in Marxian theory, to provide an adequate context for that discussion. Such a context involves essentially an overview of the Marxian notion of "historical materialism" and the position of social class within that system of thought.

Lange (1974) provides a somewhat terse, but informative definition of the notion of "historical materialism" when he writes as follows:

It (historical materialism) explains the entire development of human society as a complex of "dialectical" processes in which the primary, incessantly repeated stimulus is the interaction between man and his material environment in the social
process of production (pp.44-5).^2

The history of the development of human society (the often quoted first paragraph of *The Communist Manifesto* notwithstanding) may be viewed most simply as the inevitable supplanting of one historical "mode of production" by another. The term "mode of production", first outlined by Marx in his *Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*,3 connotes a specific economic system characterized by, a) a given type of ownership of the means of production (e.g., public, private, or a combination of the two) (Lange, 1974), and b) a specific historical stage or level of technological development. Throughout man's history there have existed a number of "antagonistic" as well as "non-antagonistic" modes of production including, according to Marx, "...(the) Asiatic, (the) ancient, (the) feudal, and (the) modern bourgeois (capitalist) modes" (Marx, *Selected Works* I, p.357). For Marx the bourgeois or capitalist mode represents the final antagonistic mode, and as such marks the end of the "prehistory" of human society.

The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production-antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from the social conditions of life of the individuals; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society creates the material conditions for the solution of that
antagonism. This social formation constitutes, therefore, the closing chapter of the prehistoric stage of human society (Selected Works I, p.357).

An analysis of Marx's writings enables us to discern a final, "non-antagonistic" socialist mode of production, a mode which will mark, for Marx, the beginning of the "history" of human society.

It is insufficient to assert simply that the history (or "prehistory") of man may be reduced to the inevitable supplanting of one productive mode by another. Such an assertion hardly constitutes a viable theory or explanation of social change. We are told by Marx that change is of a qualitative and revolutionary nature. What we are not given is the underlying cause of or driving force behind that change, the actual impetus for social change. The question before us thus becomes: Does Marx present a viable theory of social change, and if so, what is the basis for such a theory? The answer to the first part of the question is, I believe, a qualified yes. The seeds of such a theory are provided in the above quotation from the Preface. Each economic mode of production throughout history, in addition to being defined in part by a particular type of ownership of the means of production, gives rise to, "exploits", or is marked by, a specific stage in the level of development of "productive forces" and accompanying "relations of production".

In Wage-Labour and
Capital Marx writes as follows:

We thus see that the social relations within which individuals produce, the social relations of production, are altered, transformed, with the change and development of the material means of production, of the forces of production. The relations of production in their totality constitute what is called the social relations, society, and, moreover, a society at a definite stage of historic development, a society with peculiar, distinctive characteristics (1976c, pp.28-9).

These two aspects of the production process, "productive forces" and "relations of production", combine at any specific historical point in time to form an organic whole (Lange, 1974; Wesolowski, 1967). Social stability or social structure is thus maintained at a particular point in time as a result of this necessary congruence between the social relations of production and the material forces of production. Marx further alludes to this congruence, labeled by Lange as the "first basic law of sociology," (see Figure I) in the Preface,

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces (in, D. McLeilian, 1977, p.389).

This thesis appears again in The Poverty of Philosophy where he writes, "The mode of exchange of products depends upon the mode of exchange of the productive forces" (1956, p.86).
While these two aspects of the production process continually "tend toward" a state of coincidence or balance, the balance is never a perfect one. Herein lies the heart of Marx's theory of change. The process of social change may be traced to a "dialectical lag" existing between the constantly developing nature of the productive forces in society on the one hand, and the conservative nature of the relations of production on the other. If there is a constant in Marx's writings it would have to center on the dialectical relationship binding man with nature. It is a relationship labeled by Lange as the "law of progressive development of productive forces," and described by him as follows:

The way in which man acts on nature is determined by the existing productive forces, i.e., by the means of production, and in particular by the instruments of labour and the human experience and ability available to use such instruments. In the social process of labour, man transforms his natural environment and creates a new one which consists of the products of his labour...This new material environment is a stimulus which causes changes in the social process of production. New or better instruments of labour are made, the possibility of making use of instruments increases...Each new human action gives rise to more and more new external stimuli which bring about fresh changes in human activity. In this way, the social forces of production are continually developing (1974, pp.34-5).

Each successive stage or level in the development of social productive forces requires a concomitant stage of development with respect to productive relations. As Marx
writes, "The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill, society with the industrial capitalist" (1956, p.122). While productive forces develop in a constant, progressive manner, the economic base (social productive relations) and the societal "superstructure" to which it gives rise tend, in part due to their inherently conservative nature, to resist such change. The result is a stress or tension which develops in the form of a dialectical contradiction between history calling for change on the one hand, and social or cultural resistance to that change on the other. For Marx the resolution of this contradiction manifests itself in the form of social revolution. It is at this point that history takes a qualitative leap and we witness the supplanting of an obsolete social structure by a new revolutionary mode. Marx provides a specific example of this process in the Communist Manifesto:

At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organization of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in a word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it and by the
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economic and political sway of the bourgeois class (1975, p.94).

There exists an additional and perhaps overriding reason for the "dialectical lag" alluded to earlier. All antagonistic modes of production (e.g., feudal; bourgeois) are characterized by a division of society into two opposed antagonistic classes, a class of oppressors and a class of oppressed, a dominant class and a class which is dominated. The former rules by virtue of its ownership of and subsequent ability to exercise control over, the means and process of production. The latter is defined by its deprivation from control and ownership, despite the fact that it constitutes the class of "direct producers".

For Marx production is both elemental and crucial. The production process dominates not only the processes of distribution and exchange, but virtually all of society. Those who control the means and process of production in any society are dominant in all other sectors (e.g., political, cultural, social). Thus Marx writes in Capital III that it is not only possible for the "ruling class" to create and utilize legal laws and sanctions, but it is in fact in their true class interests to do so. It is therefore in the interest of the "ruling class", that class to which existing productive relations ensure ownership of the means of production, to maintain those productive relations
and their superstructure. At the same time it is in the interest of the "deprived class" (whose true interests are bound up with the productive forces) to seek to change existing productive relations. It is then these opposed interests based ultimately on relationship to the means of production which give rise not only to class distinctions, but more importantly to class antagonism, class struggle, and eventually, social revolution and the beginning of a transformation. Marx alludes to the role of social classes in this process of transformation in *The German Ideology*:

> In the development of productive forces there comes a stage at which productive forces and means of intercourse are called into existence, which, under the existing relationships, only cause mischief, and which are not longer productive but destructive forces (machinery and money); and connected with this a class is called forth, which has to bear all the burdens of society without enjoying its advantages, which, ousted from society, is forced into the most decided antagonism to all other classes; a class which forms the majority of all members of society, and from which emanates the consciousness of the necessity of a fundamental revolution (1939, pp.68-9).

**Social Class**

A few points of clarification must be made at the outset with respect to Marx's writings on the concept of social class. First, Marx was by no means the first in history to recognize the importance of social class. This fact Marx himself admitted. In a letter to a friend,
Joseph Weydemeyer, he writes:

...no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes (Marx and Engels, 1959, p.457).\textsuperscript{10}

Second, nowhere in his writing does Marx develop, by today's standards, a viable "theory" of social class. In fact the nearest approximation to even an adequate definition of historical examples of the term is provided not by Marx, but by Engels.\textsuperscript{11} In place of such a theory one finds strewn throughout the full range of Marx's writings, a series of almost disparate references to the notion of social class. Such references are for the most part geared toward displaying (no matter how indirectly on occasion) the relationship between the concept of class and Marx's overall system of thought. The reader is left to ferret out from among this multitude of allusions to the concept of class, those key statements which combine to provide a sense of order or coherency to Marx's views on the subject. Such a task is not easy to accomplish and itself accounts (as indicated in Chapter I) for much of the debate and confusion with respect to the concept of class. With these caveats in mind, what follows is an attempt to provide for the reader just such a reconstruction with respect to
Marx's conception of social class.

Ollman (1971) argues that Marx's writings viewed in their entirety constitute a critique of one specific historic mode, the last "antagonistic" mode in the "prehistory" of man, the capitalist mode of production ("CMP"). While this fact is most clearly illustrated in the so-called later or "economic" works, one finds the same theme stressed in such early writings as the Paris Manuscripts and The German Ideology as well as the Communist Manifesto. Specifically with respect to the concept of social class, while many of Marx's references appear transhistorical in nature, treating the concept in its abstract form, a disproportionate amount of the analysis addresses itself to the class structure of the "CMP". Accordingly the analysis in this particular section keys on the nature of class and class relations associated with capitalist society.

When Marx (with Engels) wrote in the year 1848 that, "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (1975, p.89), he provided the world with a far more indicative statement of his personal views on the nature and role of social class in the shaping of human history than would at first appear. The key to understanding the development of human history may be traced ultimately to man himself. For Marx man makes his own history, man viewed, not as an isolated fragment,
but as occupying a position within a specific "historico-structural" context. Marxian class analysis is thus directed at first, locating individuals (as defined by the labor process) within specific social classes, and second, locating those classes within an historical system of production, distribution and exchange.

Marx's opening statement in the *Manifesto* and the paragraphs which follow it take on an additional significance in the sense of providing, explicitly as well as implicitly, a set of criteria for the existence of social class. Those criteria include the following: 1) a stress on the interdependency of classes within the social structure, 2) direct relationship to the means of production as a key variable in defining class in an objective sense, 3) conflict in the form of "interest-based" class antagonism in defining class relations in general, and 4) a stress on the subjective element in defining social class including the development of a sense of "class consciousness" on the part of those located within a particular class and the subsequent transformation of that class into a political force in society.

Ollman (1968) argues that Marx viewed society as a complex entity comprised of a number of interacting and interdependent parts. These parts are social classes. This basic tenet of interdependent class relations provides an
illustration of Marx's conception and use of the Hegelian dialectical method. Just as in the master/slave relationship where the master is defined only in relation to his antithesis, the ruling or dominant class in society exists only to the extent that it gives rise to and ultimately exploits its antithesis. For Marx then, human history may be viewed as the history of a series of dialectical clashes between opposed yet interdependent forces within society. While the actors in those clashes or struggles may change from mode to mode (e.g., freeman/slave, lord/serf, capitalist/worker) the basis of that struggle remains unchanged. Perhaps the most concise statement of this notion of the interdependent nature of class relations is provided by Marx in *Wage-Labour and Capital* where in specific reference to the capitalist mode he writes:

> Capital therefore presupposes wage labour; wage-labour presupposes capital. They condition each other; each brings the other into existence.

> To say that the interests of capital and the interests of the workers are identical, signifies only this, that capital and wage-labour are two sides of one and the same relation. The one conditions the other in the same way that the usurer and the borrower condition each other (1976c, pp.32 & 33).

The second criterion for the existence of social class is discussed by Bukharin (1925) in the following definition,
A social class...is the aggregate of persons playing the same part in production, standing in the same relation toward other persons in the production process, these relations being also expressed in things (instruments of labor) (p.276).

While there are those who might take issue with the exact wording of the definition (Wright, 1977; Poulantzas, 1968; Przeworski, 1976), it serves to highlight a most basic criterion for the formation of social class. In addition to whatever else it may entail, the notion of class for Marx constitutes an objective component defined by "relationship to the means of production." This criterion provides the basis for defining not only the two basic protagonists in each historical mode, but all economic groupings, fractions or strata comprising the social structure. Evidence in the primary writings for the above criterion is provided in Engels' footnote to the Manifesto cited above,\(^{13}\) and in a passage from Wage-Labour and Capital in which Marx differentiates between capitalists and workers by employing the notion of purchase and sale of "labour-power".\(^{14}\)

Of the four criteria for the existence of social class listed above, it is the third, conflict as defining the nature of class relations in general, which is most often cited in both the primary and secondary works as the key variable in portraying the Marxian conception of social class.\(^{15}\) The notion of conflict lies at the core
of Marxian analysis of class structure. It is the most pervasive element found within, not only the economic level, but all levels of class analysis. Unique to Marxism is not the stress on conflict in society, but rather a view regarding the nature of that conflict and its eventual resolution. The view is summarized by Miliband as follows:

The Marxist approach to conflict is... not a matter of 'problems' to be 'solved' but of a state of domination and subjection to be ended by a total transformation of the conditions which give rise to it... Ultimately, stability is not a matter of reason but of force. The antagonists are irreconcilable, and the notion of genuine harmony is a deception or a delusion, at least in relation to class societies (1977, p.17).

While Marx recognized the existence of all types of conflict within societies, the stress or focus is always on class antagonism and class conflict. The basis of class conflict is neither spawned nor maintained over an extended period as a result of an act of volition on the part of one or both of the contending classes. That is to say social classes do not decide at some point in time to enter into a struggle with one another. Rather the basis for the conflict conditions the formation of the social classes and is traced ultimately, as indicated earlier, to the existence of opposed "class interests" based on relationship to the production process. Thus in the "CMP" for example the
basis for class conflict is provided by the irreconcilable conflict created by the capitalist's insatiable drive for profit on the one hand, and the worker's attempt to alter or end completely the condition of his subjection on the other. As Marx puts it in Wage-Labour and Capital, "Profit and wages remain as before, in inverse proportion" (p.39). A resolution to the conflict is attained through revolution and results in the structural transformation of society thus marking the beginning of a new epoch in the history of man.

While the first three of the four criteria mentioned above share almost universal consensus with respect to their applicability to Marxian class analysis the fourth criterion, i.e., the stress on a "subjective" dimension as a necessary condition for the existence of social class, remains to a certain degree an open issue. On one side of the debate we find interpretations such as those provided by Engels (1935) and more recently by Bober (1965) which tend to stress the deterministic element in Marx's writings and as such key on the "sufficient" nature of employing "objective" criteria (e.g., relationship to the means of production) when discussing the notion of social class. One of the most recent statements in support of this interpretation is provided by Wright and Perrone (1977) who, in drawing from (Przeworski, 1976) and others, state,
To say that classes constitute positions implies, ... that there are "empty places" in the social structure which are filled by individuals. The analysis of class must be understood primarily as the analysis of such empty places, "and only secondarily of the actual individuals who fill the slots" (p. 33).

Opposed to the above perspective is an interpretation which argues that objective criteria alone represent "necessary", but hardly "sufficient" conditions for the existence of class. This interpretation entails the notion that such criteria must be expanded to include a set of subjective or political elements central to a true definition of social class. The essence of this particular interpretation is summarized in succinct fashion by Miliband: "Rightly or wrongly, a political criterion is...assigned to the notion of class, and this remained a fundamental theme in Marx's thought" (1977, p. 22).

It is the position of this study that of the two perspectives, it is the latter which represents the most valid interpretation of the Marxian use of the concept of social class. As was indicated earlier in this section, there are a number of places in Marx's writings where the concept of social class is discussed in an abstract, almost reified manner. Support for this contention (in addition to the passages from the Preface and Wage-Labour and Capital provided earlier) is provided by Marx in the Grundrisse where
he writes:

Society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of interrelations, the relations within which these individuals stand. As if someone were to say:

Seen from the perspective of society, there are no slaves and no citizens: both are human beings. Rather they are that outside society. To be a slave, to be a citizen, are social characteristics, relations between human beings A and B. Human being A, as such, is not a slave. He is a slave in and through society (1973c,p.265).

That Marx at times tended to view social classes as "empty places" or structural units is not to be debated. What needs to be addressed however is the extent to which such a conception represents the primary or comprehensive view expressed by Marx. The simple answer must be that it does not express either. For if classes are to be the historical actors, the agents of change that he refers to in *The German Ideology*, the *Communist Manifesto* and elsewhere, no interpretation could be content with such a reified notion of class. One finds scattered throughout the full range of Marx's writings a considerable amount of support for the above position. Marx writes in the *Manifesto* on the subject of class as a political force as follows:

This organization of the proletarians into a class and consequently into a political party is being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves (1975, p.99).

...the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the
leading class of the nation, must constitute itself as a nation... (p. 109).

It is in *The Poverty of Philosophy* that we find Marx's often quoted discussion of the transformation of a class defined "of itself" to one "for itself":

Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The combination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests. But the struggle of class against class is a political struggle (1956, p. 195).

In *The Eighteenth Brumaire* he writes:

In so far as millions of families live under conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their culture from those of the other classes, and put them in hostile opposition to the latter, they form a class. In so far as there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond and no political organization among them, they do not form a class (1975, p. 124).

Finally in the year 1871, approximately twelve years before his death, Marx spoke the following words:

...against this collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes;
This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and its ultimate end—the abolition of classes (1974a, p.270).

The discussion up to this point has centered on providing the reader with a general overview of the Marxian notion of social class and the position occupied by social class within Marx's overall system of thought. The focus next shifts to what is perhaps the most important section of the chapter, a specific analysis of class structure.

Class Structure and the Capitalist Mode of Production

As is indicated in the section heading, the following discussion focuses on a specific historical example of the class structure, that associated with the capitalist mode of production.

The Two-Class Model. The starting point of Marxian analysis of the class structure is the two-class model. Such a model represents not only the beginning of Marxian analysis, but defines at the same time the most basic distinction or cleavage within the capitalist mode. As indicated earlier, all antagonistic modes of production are defined by such a division of the social and economic structure. This fact is nowhere better illustrated than in the capitalist mode. In the Manifesto Marx and Engels state,
...the epoch of the bourgeoisie,...has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is splitting up more and more into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat (1975, p.90).

A disproportionate amount of the debate concerning the Marxian two-class model centers on the question of the overall applicability of such a "simplistic" interpretation for modern industrial society. Accordingly, there are those (particularly in American sociology) who tend to reject the model in favor of a more "complex" interpretation better suited for the analysis of "the class structure of advanced societies."

To reject the two-class model outright reflects in a sense a failure to grasp Marx's true intent in employing the distinction. By employing the basic dichotomic schema in their analysis of the capitalist mode, neither Marx nor Engels assumed that class relations characteristic of a given stage in the development of the capitalist mode were reducible to just two opposed ideal-types. As is evident in many of their writings, both were keenly aware of the existence of additional class-groupings as well as the role played by such groupings in defining the "CMP" at a particular stage in its development. Nor is the notion of class conflict itself employed in a restrictive sense to refer solely to struggles which develop between the two
basic divisions in society. The important point here, however, is the stress placed by Marx on the primacy of the struggle within the "CMP" between owners of the means of production and wage labor.

There is an additional reason for stressing the primacy of the two-class model. This reason relates to the goals of the present study as expressed in Chapter I. A basic theme of the third section of this chapter centers on the contention that it is a stress on this decisive split between ownership and labor in the capitalist mode which contributes most significantly toward an understanding of the nature and causes of the phenomenon of human self-estrangement. While an expanded version of the model is suggested to take into account the potentially intervening effect of "intermediate" class positions, the initial distinction remains most crucial.

Marx and Engels thus begin their discussion of the class structure of the "CMP" by distinguishing between two basic classes, that which owns the means of production, and that which is forced to sell or "surrender" its "labour-power" on the open market. The former is labeled by Marx and Engels, the capitalist class or "bourgeoisie", the latter, the working class or "proletariat".

Wesolowski (1967) defines the bourgeoisie in terms of its domination within the economic sector. This domination
entails control over both the means and process of production, as well as the distribution of the product. Such domination within the economic sector manifests itself, however, in both a political and ideological sense as well. Politically the bourgeoisie rules through legal sanctioning of economic relations and use of state force. The state viewed in this sense represents a tool of political domination or, as Engels puts it, "...a reflex...of the economic needs of the class controlling production" (Selected Works I, p.462). Ideological domination represents perhaps the most insidious, pervasive, and as such most efficient method of control exercised by the bourgeoisie. Domination in this sense stems from capitalist control of not only state power, but all social institutions, in a word the entire social "superstructure" reflecting economic relations. Marx sums it up in the Manifesto when he writes, "Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production" (p.107).

Engels in his footnote to the Manifesto provides a second criterion for defining the bourgeoisie as a distinct class. In addition to "owning the means of social production", the bourgeoisie are defined by Engels as "employers of wage labour". Marx in Wage-Labour and Capital amends the above definition in identifying the capitalist as one who purchases "labour-power" ("Arbeitskraft"). This second
criterion as we shall see is a crucial one. For as a result, the worker (or his "labour-power") is transformed into a commodity to be used by the bourgeoisie at its will. Marx writes, "Labour-power, then, is a commodity, no more, no less so than is...sugar. The first is measured by the clock, the other by the scales" (1976c, p.17). It is this single act of "commodity purchase" more than any other which provides the basis for the phenomena of exploitation and estrangement in the "CMP".

For purposes of this study the most important aspect of the above discussion of the bourgeoisie as a separate class is neither the fact of its ownership of the means of production nor its employment of wage-labor, but conversely, its relative freedom from the need to sell its own labour-power. As Ollman (1971) points out, although both the capitalist and worker stand estranged in capitalist society, it is the capitalist by virtue of this relative freedom who feels himself "comfortable" and "confirmed" in this condition. We shall return to this point in the third section.

That the above criteria serve, at best, to provide a somewhat vague and innocuously defined category should be apparent. This fact is, however, not surprising in light of Marx's use of the concept. The term bourgeoisie, like many others, appears in portions of Marx's analysis as an ideal-type of sorts. Thus when analyzing a particular
class structure the "cut-off" point for the bourgeoisie must be, as Miliband (1977) contends, somewhat arbitrarily drawn. Specific problems arise in particular when attempting to locate certain "fractions" or "groupings" within a class structure. While some of the specific reasons for these problems are outlined in the discussion of the "intermediate classes" following shortly, one such reason may be outlined in the present context.

The bourgeoisie like all classes in Marxian analysis exists not as a static category having developed overnight within a single mode, but rather as a dynamic, continually changing component of historical analysis. Having its origin in a "precapitalist" formation, the bourgeoisie throughout its existence has undergone a series of stages or steps in its development. Paralleling these stages in the development of the bourgeoisie as a class are a series of accompanying changes or alterations in the social and economic structure of society. The most notable among these changes is described by Marx as follows:

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life (1975, pp.93-4).

Within these accompanying changes in the social structure ushered in by the bourgeoisie are to be found, ironically,
the "seeds" of its own destruction. Marx summarizes the process in the Manifesto as follows:

The essential condition for the existence and for the sway of the bourgeois class is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage labor. Wage labor rests exclusively on competition between the laborers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the laborers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination due to association. The development of Modern Industry therefore cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable (pp.101-2).

It is in such a manner that the capitalist class thus produces not only the weapons for its own defeat, but also those who are to man those weapons, its dialectical antithesis, the modern working class, the proletarians.

The proletarian class, defined by Engels as, "the class of modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live" (1975, p.89),\textsuperscript{23} like its antithesis has undergone a series of stages in its development.\textsuperscript{24} Thus like the term "bourgeoisie," the term "proletariat" possesses a number of problems with respect to its analysis within the class structure. Complicating the task is the fact that Marx, throughout his writings, refers to the role of the proletariat in a number of different contexts. We
wish to draw attention to just two: 1) the role of the proletariat as producer of "surplus value", and 2) the revolutionary role of the proletariat as the "universal" class in history.

In discussing the working class, Poulantzas (1975) argues as follows:

It follows that it is not wages that define the working class... Although every worker is a wage-earner, every wage-earner is certainly not a worker, for not every wage-earner is engaged in productive labour (p.20).

In a somewhat restricted sense Poulantzas' argument is a valid one. In the first volume of Capital Marx implies such a restrictive view of the worker as one who engages in "productive labour", which for Marx entails working for the "self expansion of capital" through the production of "surplus value". The working class thus becomes the class in society which produces surplus value. The real problem lies however in attempting to decide which groups in society are engaged in productive labor (i.e., the production of surplus value) and which are not. Marx himself complicates the problem by offering an expanded notion of the concept "productive labour." "In order to labour productively," Marx states, "it is no longer necessary for you to do manual work yourself; enough, if you are an organ of the collective labourer, and perform one of its subordinate functions" (1977b, pp.508-9). We are thus
left with an expanded notion of the working class to include not only the modern-day factory worker, directly engaged in commodity production, but also those engaged for example in the processes of transportation and distribution. Included also, employing the above criterion, would be all those related to the work process who perform "intermediate" or supervisory functions.

The above discussion serves to illustrate a crucial point with respect to Marx's use of such class labels as proletariat or working class (or, for that matter, bourgeoisie). In terms of actual use in his analysis of the "CMP", Marx seldom employs the concept to connote a homogeneous, categorically defined structural component. A class such as the proletariat must be defined within a particular historical context as being comprised of a number of "intra-class fractions" or "strata". It is these strata and their interrelationships which provide insight into the nature of the class structure of the capitalist mode at a particular stage in its development.

Before turning to a discussion of the role of "intermediate" class categories in Marxian analysis brief mention must be made of the second of the two contexts outlined above regarding Marx's conception of the proletariat as a class. This particular context centers on the revolutionary role assigned to the proletariat by Marx. Both Bukharin
(1925) and Miliband (1977) stress this role as a necessary criterion for the defining of the proletariat as a class. The earliest mention of this role by Marx is found in his Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right written in 1843:

A class must be formed which has "radical chains," a class in civil society which is not a class of civil society, a class which is the dissolution of all classes, a sphere of society which has a universal character because its sufferings are universal, and which does not claim a "particular redress" because the wrong which is done to it is not a "particular wrong" but "wrong in general." There must be formed a sphere of society which claims no "traditional" status but only a human status, a sphere which is not opposed to particular consequences but is totally opposed to the assumptions of the German political system; a sphere, finally, which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating itself from all the other spheres of society, without, therefore, emancipating all these other spheres, which is, in short, a "total loss" of humanity and which can only redeem itself by a "total redemption of humanity." This dissolution of society, as a particular class, is the "proletariat" (1964a, p.58).

The above quotation is a particularly important one. In it we find a portrait of the proletariat as the universal embodiment of the suffering of mankind. The alienation of man is, as Meszaros (1972) indicates, an historical phenomenon. One which reaches its apotheosis in the capitalist mode, and particularly within the plight of the proletariat. In this sense the class interests of the proletariat, in contradistinction to its antithesis, are
universal in nature and entail not only an overcoming of its own misery and suffering, but the misery and suffering of all of mankind. The proletariat's specific role as a class revolves around the key function it serves in the dissolution of class-based society and the subsequent transcendence of man's estrangement from himself and society.

In the Manifesto Marx provides an additional sense in which the proletarian revolution represents a universal movement in history. He writes:

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority (pp.100-1).

The Intermediate Classes. One reason outlined for a proposed expansion of the two-class model centers on the dynamic and heterogeneous nature of social classes themselves. There are however, at least two additional justifications for such an expansion. The first of these keys on the dynamic nature of each economic mode of production (the "CMP" in particular). Just as the classes within a social structure are continually changing and developing so does the structure itself undergo a constant process of change or maturation. In addition to his statements in the Preface previously cited, Marx makes specific
reference to such a process when he speaks in the Manifesto and Capital II of the effects of a maturing mode on the class structure. A final justification is provided by Marx in Capital I where he writes: "...epochs in the history of society are no more separated from each other by hard and fast lines of demarcation, than are geological epochs" (1977, p.371).

The point to be stressed here is that, in terms of a class analysis, historical modes of production must not be viewed in categorical terms. While social change may be viewed as the supplanting of one mode by another, this change is neither as immediate nor absolute as Marx at times would have us believe. Complicating an analysis of any specific class structure then is the existence of a number of "transitionary" class remnants associated with an earlier mode. Specific examples in Marxian analysis would be the existence of both artisan and peasant class-groupings found in the early stages of capitalist development.

One final and perhaps most apparent reason for proposing an expanded view of the class structure of the "CMP" may be traced to Marx's use of a number of additional class categories in his analysis. Found scattered throughout the primary works are references to such categories as, "petty bourgeoisie", "ideological classes", "middle and lower middle classes", "peasant classes", "dangerous
classes". The twentieth century has witnessed a series of attempts to account for the above categories by employing an expanded dichotomic model. Most notable among these attempts are those of Bukharin (1925), Hodges (1961) and Ollman (1968).

Bukharin outlines (in addition to the two basic classes) a series of generic "class types" employed by Marx in his analysis. The most important among these "class types" are the following: 1) "Intermediate Classes", 2) "Transition Classes", and 3) "De classe Groups" (pp.283-4). Subsumed under the label "Intermediate Classes" are all those categories occupying, "...a middle position between the commanding and exploiting (sic) classes" (p.283). Included in this category would be all technical and "mental" workers in capitalist society according to Bukharin. The label "Transition Classes" refers to remnants from precapitalist formations (e.g., peasant and artisan classes), while the term "De classe Group" is used to refer to all persons who exist outside of the labor process. The most obvious example of this last category would be the "dangerous class" or "lumpenproletariat" described by Marx as encompassing the following groupings:

...vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, "lazzaroni", pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, "maquereaus", brothel keepers, porters, "literati", organ-grinders,
ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars—
in short, hither and thither (1975, p. 75).

In line with Bukharin's analysis, Hodges (1961) pro-
poses a trichotomic model of modern capitalist society based
on the opposition of "ruling classes" (exploiters and op-
pressors), "intermediate classes", and "subject classes"
(the exploited and oppressed) (p. 26). Hodges includes
within this intermediate category, the entire range of mid-
level strata associated with the "CMP" including the
petty bourgeoisie, the ideological classes, artisans,
peasants, small manufactures, shopkeepers, small trades-
people and landowners. Hodges employs essentially two
criteria in defining this intermediate stratum. First, all
class groups within this category are "transitional" in
nature. He writes:

Intermediate classes are transitional classes,
in the Marxian view, which means they are
either "rising" or "declining". The problem
is to determine the limits of their rise and
fall, and the principal stages in their devel-
opment (p. 28).

Second, groupings within the intermediate strata are de-
dined as possessing a contradictory position with respect
to the class structure. As support for this criterion,
Hodges cites Marx's following criticism of Ricardo for fail-
ing to mention an increased number of middle classes,

...situated midway between the workers on
one side and the capitalists and landowners
on the other. These middle classes rest with
all their weight upon the working class and at the same time increase the social security and power of the upper class (1964b, pp.190-1).

It is the position of this study that the above class model outlined by Hodges is a valid one, supported in general by both secondary interpretation as well as the primary writings. With respect to secondary analyses, both Ossowski (1963) and Oillman (1968) advocate similar trichotomnic schemas. Miliband (1977) and in particular Aronowitz (1973) stress the utility of the two-class model when amended to include such intermediate strata. For both Miliband and Aronowitz this intermediate stratum is defined to comprise the "managerial" fractions associated with the "CMP".

Support from the primary writings for the above model abounds. In a passage from The Eighteenth Brumaire Marx discusses the transitional nature of the petty bourgeoisie, a class, "...in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously mutually blunted" (p.54). In Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution we find references to the "small trading and shopkeeping" class as occupying an "intermediate" position between the "large capitalists" on the one hand and the "industrial class" on the other, as well as a reference to the "different fractions of the middle class" (in, Selected Works II, pp.45-6). In the following passage from the Manifesto Marx provides a list of
specific "fractions" of the middle class:

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class (p.100).

It is in this section of the Manifesto that Marx describes a maturing capitalist mode in forecasting the eventual "sinking" of the middle class and portions of the bourgeoisie into the ranks of the proletariat.41

Perhaps the most important discussion in the primary writings for purposes of this study is a short section in Capital III where Marx discusses the contradictory or intermediate role of management and supervision in capitalist society. It is clear from a reading of this section that Marx views the "manager" as both a wage laborer and as one who engages in necessary, "productive" labor. At the same time, management is viewed as a manifestation of the basic antithesis between capital and labor. He writes:

The labour of supervision and management is naturally required wherever the direct process of production assumes the form of a combined social process, and not of the isolated labour of independent producers. However, it has a double nature.

On the one hand, all labour in which many individuals cooperate necessarily requires a commanding will to co-ordinate and unify the process, and functions which apply not to partial operations but to the total activity of the workshop, much as that of an orchestra conductor. This is a productive job, which
must be performed in every combined mode of production.

On the other hand—quite apart from any commercial department—this supervision work necessarily arises in all modes of production based on the antithesis between the labourer, as the direct producer, and the owner of the means of production. The greater this antagonism, the greater the role played by supervision (1970b, pp.383-4).

A recent attempt to operationally define and empirically test the Marxian notion of social class is provided by Wright and Perrone (1977). Employing the criteria of ownership of the means of production, purchase of the labor power of others, control of the labor power of others, and sale of one's own labor power, the authors develop the expanded class typology presented in Table 1. As noted in the table, the primary distinction between Capitalist and Petty Bourgeoisie class categories lies in the former's purchase and control of the labor power of others. While both Manager and Worker categories are defined as wage laborers, the former is distinguished from the latter by the notion of control associated with its position with respect to the labor process. Employing a series of items extracted from the 1969 "Survey of Working Conditions" conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, the authors construct an operationalization of the Marxist class typology presented in Table 2. Based on the three "most important" of these categories, Employers, Managers, and
Table 1. Expanded Marxist Criteria for Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ownership of the Means of Production</th>
<th>Purchase of the Labor Power of Others</th>
<th>Control of the Labor Power of Others</th>
<th>Sale of One's Own Labor Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wright and Perrone (1977), p.34.
Table 2. Operationalization of the Marxist Class Typology*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Position</th>
<th>Self-Employed</th>
<th>Have Employees</th>
<th>Have Subordinates on the Job</th>
<th>Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wright and Perrone (1977); p.37.
Workers, dummy variables are constructed and inserted into a regression equation to predict income inequality. The ability of the class variables to predict income inequality is compared with that of a series of variables including in particular a "status" measure of social class, Duncan SEI scores. As predicted by Wright and Perrone, the class variables accounted for the largest increment in explained variance associated with the dependent variable.

Both the above typology and its operationalization are not immune to criticism. The distinction for example between Employers and Petty Bourgeoisie appears tenuous at best. The basis for placing in different categories, let us say, a small independent manufacturer who is self-employed and hires no additional labor power, and another who hires two additional employees seems somewhat questionable. In addition, the method for determining the Managers category appears a bit simplistic and somewhat problematic.

Despite the above criticisms, both the typology and its operationalization appear valid and are used as the basis for the typology and operationalizations employed in this study. The most important distinction for purposes of the study is between those who sell their labor power and those who do not. In addition, the notion of control (operationally defined as supervision) with respect to the labor process appears as a potentially significant variable in the
prediction of self-estrangement. The limitations associated with the use of the model and its operationalization are essentially the same as those outlined by Wright and Perrone and are discussed in the last chapter of this study.

Having outlined briefly the role of the concept of social class in Marx's social philosophy and its particular structure in the capitalist mode, the discussion next shifts to the phenomenon of human self-estrangement. The purpose is to provide the reader with an overview of Marx's view of the nature of self-estrangement and, hopefully, to illustrate how the roots of the condition are to be found ultimately in the class structure.

**Self-Estrangement**

The key to understanding Marx's conception of self-estrangement hinges on a prior knowledge of his view regarding the essential nature of man. Human self-estrangement is a state or condition of "non-being". For Marx it is a negation, the dialectical negation of human existence itself. Thus before exploring the nature of self-estrangement it is necessary to first outline Marx's view regarding its antithesis.

**The Dialectics of Labor**

Marx's ontology revolves around the necessity of human labor ("Arbeit"). To be, to exist as a human being, is to
engage in the process of "creative activity". Put most simply, man, according to Marx, must work. This view stressing the ontological priority of labor does not find its origin in the writings of Marx. Before him, Hegel emphasized the primary role assumed by labor or work in the process of self-affirmation. It is labor that, as Hegel writes, "...shapes and fashions the thing". He goes on to state:

Through work and labour,...consciousness of the bondsman comes to itself...Thus precisely in labour where there seemed to be merely some outsider's mind and ideas involved, the bondsman becomes aware, through this rediscovery of himself by himself, of having and being a "mind of his own" (1931, pp.238-9).

Although highly critical of Hegel's specific view of the nature of human labor, Hegel is credited by Marx with having grasped the "essence of labor" as the "essence of man".

One of the earliest references to the role of labor in the ontological process is found in The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 where Marx refers to labor as "life activity", or "productive life itself". Through his work as unrestrained, creative activity man objectifies himself in the world and in the process affirms his own existence. Marx writes:

In creating a "world of objects" by his practical activity, in "his work upon" inorganic nature, man proves himself a conscious species being, i.e., as a being that treats
the species as its own essential being, or that treats itself as a species being (1973b, p.113).

Man is a "species being." This fact is reflected in his social nature, but most importantly in the unique human quality of creativity which he possesses. Among the species man alone is gifted with the distinctive ability to create and fashion tools. Through the use of such tools man appropriates from nature and in the process satisfies certain basic needs. While work, viewed in an instrumental sense as this satisfaction of "basic needs," is common to all species, in man these needs become hierarchically differentiated. Although possessed of certain fundamental biological needs, among them the needs for subsistence and shelter, it is not these biological needs which define man as a unique species. In the Manuscripts Marx argues that an animal produces in an immediate sense only to provide for its physical needs and the physical needs of its offspring. In this sense an animal's product belongs, "...immediately to its physical body" (p.113). Man, in contradistinction, confronts his product freely. To be truly human the individual must labor to not only satisfy immediate physical needs, but at the same time to realize a creative potential. As Marx writes:

An animal forms things in accordance with the standard and the need of the species to which it belongs...Man...forms things in accordance
with the laws of beauty (1973b, pp.113-4).

In Capital I Marx further elaborates on the distinctive nature of human labor:

...what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realizes a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will. And this subordination is no mere momentary act. Besides the exertion of the bodily organs, the process demands that, during the whole operation, the workman's will be steadily in consonance with his purpose. This means close attention. The less he is attracted by the nature of the work, and the mode in which it is carried on, and the less, therefore, he enjoys it as something which gives play to his bodily and mental powers, the more close his attention is forced to be (1977, p.178).

The role of "Nature" in this process of becoming is, for Marx, paramount. Nature exists as more than an external environment comprised of the raw materials appropriated by the individual. In defining labor Marx writes that it is a process, "...in which both man and Nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates and controls the material re-actions between himself and Nature" (1977, p.177). The relationship between the individual and nature is a dialectical one. Man acts upon nature, and nature in turn acts back upon and shapes man.
Nature is accordingly viewed as an organ of human activity, as an integral part of man. Marx writes in the Manuscripts as follows:

Nature is man's "inorganic body"--nature, that is, in so far as it is not itself the human body. Man "lives" on nature-means that nature is his "body", with which he must remain in continuous interchange if he is not to die. That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature (p.112).

Meszaros (1972) illustrates the above relationship between man, nature and labor in the figure presented below:

![Diagram](image)

The threefold interaction between "man" (M), "nature" (N), and "industry" (I) is, according to Meszaros, characterized by a "dialectical reciprocity" between all three components (p.104). Man as the subject or initiator of activity, acts upon both nature (through appropriation) and industry (through the process of production). At the same time man exists both as a "natural product" and as the product of his labor. Labor and its products represent not only, as Plamenatz (1975) argues, forms of "self expression," they represent in addition, the actual material embodiment of
man's talent, his skill and his imagination.

The Marxian conception of man outlined above keys on the dialectical nature of existence. With the first historical act, creative labor, man becomes man. As a result of his activity man represents for the first time not only an "object" totally immersed in nature, but also a "subject", the creator of a product, the initiator of an act. It is for Marx, this "subject/object" split and the negation that it entails which define the individual. Through work and the labor process man creates and is able to reflect back on that creation, to be critical of it, to reshape it. As Plamenatz writes, "It is through his work above all that man comes to understand and control himself, that he acquires his image of himself" (1975, p.118).

Unfortunately the greater portion of Marx's discussion of the exact nature of labor centers on a conception of labor in its estranged form. This is not surprising, however, in view of the fact that Marx lived and wrote during a period in history when industrial conditions were at their worst. As a result, the dehumanizing nature of labor within the capitalist mode was in many respects more apparent then than it is today. It is possible however to infer from Marx's writings regarding the nature of labor in its "non-estranged" form. At a minimum such labor would be unrestricted, allowing the individual to work at whatever he
wished under conditions of his own choosing. Labor in this sense would in addition allow the individual to develop his mental and intellectual capacities as well as his physical abilities. Finally labor would be of such a nature as to allow the individual the choice to perform a number of tasks or functions within society. One of the more concise (and often quoted) references by Marx to the notion of labor in its "species-defining" form is found in The German Ideology. In discussing the nature of work in communist society Marx writes:

...in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another to-morrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic (1939, p.22).

The view outlined above stressing the primacy of work in defining the human species is by no means unique to Marx or Marxian scholarship in general. Examples of similar views found in modern-day sociology are provided by Berger (1964) and Mills (1973). Berger writes:

Work is one of the fundamental human categories...To be human and to work appear as inextricably intertwined notions. To work means to modify the world as it is found. Only through such modification can the world be made into an arena for human conduct, human meanings, human society or, for that
In describing the notion of "craftsmanship" as a "fully idealized model of work gratification," Mills outlines a series of "features" which define the nature of such work:

There is no ulterior motive in work other than the product being made and the processes of its creation. The details of daily work are meaningful because they are not detached in the worker's mind from the product of the work. The worker is free to control his own working action. The craftsman is thus able to learn from his work; and to use and develop his capacities and skills in its prosecution. There is not split of work and play, or work and culture. The craftsman's way of livelihood determines and infuses his entire mode of living (p.220).

Estranged Labor: 'The Negation of the Negation'  

The use of the concept of estrangement ("Entfremdung") in the Manuscripts is inextricably linked to the concept of labor. Self-estrangement for Marx connotes, above all else, the separation of the individual from the product of his labor and the labor process.  

In answer to the question, What constitutes estranged labor? Marx states that labor is estranged to the extent that it exists "external" to the worker. For Marx this fact gives rise to the following manifestations. First, the worker feels himself unsatisfied, unhappy and denied in his work. Second, the worker is prevented through his work from developing freely his physical and mental energy.
Third, as a result of the external character of his labor, the worker, "...is at home when he is not working, and when he is working he is not at home" (1975, p.110). Fourth, work is not voluntary, but forced. Finally, labor in this form appears to the worker not as his own, but as belonging to someone else. The worker's labor is thus characterized as having been transformed. Where once it stood as the material embodiment of man's essence, labor now confronts him as a dominating alien force reflecting the heart of his misery and exploitation. As Marx writes in Capital I, "...all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers" (p.645).

While the notion of self-estrangement ("estranged labor") may be traced to pre-capitalist formations, it is clear that for Marx the condition peaks in the capitalist mode. It is also apparent that the notion of self-estrangement provides the primary foundation for the Marxian critique of the "CMP". Many of Marx's most graphic accounts of the capitalist mode key on its dehumanizing effects on human labor. This point is illustrated in the following excerpt from Capital I,

...within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productiveness of labour are brought about at the cost of the individual labourer;...they mutilate the labourer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, de-
stroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour-process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they distort the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labour-process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the Juggernaut of capital (1977, p.645).

Marx traces the source of man's self-estrangement specifically to a number of "second order mediations" which he associates with the rise and development of the capitalist mode. These include most notably the notions of private property, division of labor and commodity exchange. At one point in the Manuscripts Marx discusses the "meaning" of private property in its non-estranged form as, "...the "existence" of "essential objects" for man, both as objects of gratification and as objects of activity" (p.116). However as the capitalist mode of production develops, the concept of property in its original ontological form becomes distorted. Marx puts it in Capital I as follows:

Now, however, property turns out to be the right, on the part of the capitalist, to appropriate the unpaid labour of others or its product, and to be the impossibility, on the part of the labourer, of appropriating his own product (p.584).

It is this act of capitalist appropriation, more than any other, which constitutes the basis for self-estrangement in capitalist society. Private ownership of property, in
providing the foundation for class distinctions in the "CMP", establishes the structural preconditions for the estrangement and exploitation of man by his fellow man. Further elaboration of the overall impact of private ownership of property on the human condition is provided by Marx as follows:

Private property has made us so stupid and one-sided that an object is only "ours" when we have it—when it exists for us as capital, or when it is directly possessed, eaten, drunk, worn, inhabited, etc.—in short, when it is "used" by us (1973b, p.139).

While the division of labor and commodity exchange are referred to by Marx as representing additional causes of the phenomenon of self-estrangement in capitalist society, it is clear that both develop and thrive within the institution of private property.

As second order mediations, private property, division of labor and commodity exchange, collectively represent the "negation" of the original man(M)-nature(N)-industry(I) relationship outlined earlier. As a direct result of these mediations (private property in particular), industry (I) is transformed into its alienated antithesis, estranged labor, thus altering the entire nature of the interrelationship. The worker or "direct producer" is estranged from the labor process and from his "objective self". Once both a "subject" and an "object", man in capitalist society is
neither. The worker in capitalist society neither creates nor reflects critically with respect to the product of his labor. Instead he is forced to toil endlessly only to surrender the product of his efforts for a paid wage. Man literally, as a result, is transformed into a non-being, an appendage of a machine, a "workhorse." 

Class Structure and Self-Estrangement

The concepts of social class and self-estrangement are so intermeshed in Marxian literature that it is virtually impossible to conduct an adequate analysis of one without, at some point in that analysis, making reference to the other. The notion of class as discussed in the primary writings provides us with the basis for an understanding of not only the nature and cause of man's self-estrangement in modern society, but also its transcendence. To live in a class-based society is to lead an estranged existence. It is Marx who envisions an era in human history characterized by man's triumph over self-estrangement, an era marked also by the absence of class and class antagonism. It is in such an era that the structural foundation for both social class and self-estrangement will have been transcended. That common foundation is labor—labor, not in its "species-defining" form, but in its distorted, estranged form as private property. In addition to defining class distinctions
in capitalist society, private property represents, accordin-
g to Marx, "...the material, summary expression of alien-
ated labor" (1973, p.119).

While it is the institution of private property which
functions ultimately to estrange the individual, it does so
through the class structure. When Marx speaks of the sep-
oration of labor from its product, it is the estrangement
of the worker or "direct producer" to which he refers. For
Marx, the class of "direct producers", the working class,
represents the estranged class in society. It is this class
which suffers most directly, the negative, dehumanizing ef-
fects of the "CMP". The relationship in this particular
context between the working class and its antithesis, the
capitalist class, is defined by Marx in the following pas-
sage from the Manuscripts:

If the product of labor is alien to me,
if it confronts me as an alien power, to
whom, then, does it belong?

To a being "other" than myself...

The "alien" being, to whom labor and the
product of labor belongs, in whose service
labor is done and for whose benefit the pro-
duct of labor is provided, can only be "man"
himself.

If the product of labor does not belong
to the worker, if it confronts him as an
alien power, then this can only be because
it belongs to some "other man than the work-
er." If the worker's activity is a torment
to him, to another it must be "delight" and
his life's joy...
Through "estranged, alienated labor," then, the worker produces the relationship to this labor of a man alien to labor and standing outside it. The relationship of the worker to labor creates the relation to it of the capitalist (or whatever one chooses to call the master of labor) (pp.115-6).

Marx thus provides us with an additional and perhaps most important criterion for the defining of class distinctions, the notion of self-estrangement itself. Capitalist society viewed in this sense is comprised on the one hand of those who directly benefit from the institution of private property, i.e., those "in whose service labor is done", and on the other, all those who find themselves estranged as a direct result of the act of capitalist appropriation. This distinction although an important one for purposes of this study, is somewhat problematic. The difficulty lies in the fact that, as Marx points out, all individuals within the capitalist mode stand as victims of that system. Clearly if the worker is estranged as a result of capitalist appropriation, the capitalist too, by virtue of his position "outside labor", suffers in an ontological sense. However, while both capitalist and worker are "victimized" within the capitalist system, Marx makes it clear that the two classes are differentiated by virtue of their separate reactions to this condition:

The propertied class and the class of the proletariat represent the same human self-alienation. But the former feels comfortable
and confirmed in this self-alienation, knowing that this alienation is "its own power" and possessing in it the "semblance" of a human existence. The latter feels itself ruined in this alienation and sees in it its impotence and the actuality of an inhuman existence.

It is this disparity that exists between capital and labor in the capitalist mode with respect to perceived self-estrangement which provides the basis for the empirical analysis that follows. While it is perhaps impossible to test directly the relationship between class position and self-estrangement, it is theoretically possible to test the social psychological manifestations associated with this relationship. Stated most simply, to the extent that Marx is correct, one would expect to find significant differences between individuals occupying opposed class positions within capitalist society.

A final word with respect to the "managerial" strata is needed. Such strata clearly pose a problem with respect to the present analysis. The role of the "manager" within modern society represents (with respect to the phenomenon of self-estrangement) a contradictory position. Like the working class this stratum is comprised of wage laborers who do not directly own the means of production. As a result one would expect to find levels of estrangement similar to the working class displayed by its members. However, due to the intervening influence of the specific nature of their
work with respect to the labor process (i.e., supervision and control), one might expect a concomitant drop in level of perceived estrangement in comparison with workers. An additional aim of the present research therefore, is to explore more fully this contradictory position of the "intermediate" managerial stratum with respect to the phenomenon of self-estrangement.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are divided into two sets. The first set consists of hypotheses 1 and 2, and is directed toward a comparison of social class with occupational status and white collar/blue collar distinctions in the prediction of perceived self-estrangement. The second set consisting of hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 is directed toward an analysis of class position (Employers, Managers, and Workers) \(^{67}\) with respect to perceived self-estrangement.

To the extent that Marx was correct in his assessment of the relationship between class position and self-estrangement, one would expect social class, when operationally defined in a manner consistent with the discussion presented in this chapter, to be a relatively effective predictor of self-estrangement. To test this proposition, it was decided to compare the ability of the social class variable to predict perceived self-estrangement with first, that of an occupational status measure, and second, with that of a
blue collar/white collar distinction. The specific hypotheses tested were as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Social class will have a greater effect on self-estrangement than occupational status.

**Hypothesis 2:** Social class will have a greater effect on self-estrangement than white collar/blue collar distinctions.

For Marx, it will be recalled, the crucial distinction in terms of class position with respect to the phenomenon of self-estrangement is between those who are forced to sell their labor power and as a result become separated from both the labor process and the product of their labor (operationally defined in this study as the class of "Workers"), and those relatively free from such a need (operationally defined as the class of "Employers"). While for Marx both classes are estranged in capitalist society, it is clearly the former, the working class, which experiences this condition most directly. The class of employers, as a result of its position with respect to the means of production, feels itself "at home" and "satisfied" in its state. It was therefore hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 3:** Workers on the average will display significantly higher levels of self-estrangement than employers.

The expansion of the two-class model to include an "intermediate" managerial class grouping poses a problem with respect to the prediction of self-estrangement. To the extent that Marx was correct in his analysis one would
expect managers to display average levels of self-estrangement somewhere between employers and workers. As wage laborers managers should reflect higher levels of self-estrangement than employers. However, this same grouping, because of the degree of control accorded its position, could be expected to display relatively lower mean levels of self-estrangement than the class of workers. It therefore was hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 4**: Managers on the average will display significantly higher levels of self-estrangement than employers.

**Hypothesis 5**: Managers on the average will display significantly lower levels of self-estrangement than workers.

The methods for testing the above hypotheses and the results of the analysis are presented in Chapters III and IV respectively.
NOTES

1. The emphasis is mine.

2. I am indebted to Professor Lange's comments on the subject of "historical materialism" provided in his text, Political Economy, New York, 1974, for much of the discussion in this section of the chapter. For Marx and Engels' conception of "historical materialism" see, The German Ideology (I & II), International Publishers, New York, 1939, p.28.


4. The terms "relations of production" and "social relations of production" are being used here interchangeably. See, Nicos Poulantzas, Political Power and Social Classes, NLB, London, 1968, for a discussion of the alleged distinction. The defense for using the two terms interchangeably is provided by Poulantzas himself who indicates that they are found used interchangeably in Marx's works.


6. This relationship is a key one and is one to which I return later in the chapter.

7. The relationship between the economic base or "infrastructure" of society and that society's superstructure is, for Marx, a key relationship. He writes in the Preface as follows:
In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society—the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the social, political and intellectual life processes in general (Selected Works I, p.356).


Lange (1974) labels this necessary conformity between superstructure and economic base the "second basic law of sociology" (See Figure 1.).


10 Marx goes on in the same letter however to outline what he considers to be his personal contributions to the study of social class. They include: "proof" that, 1) "the existence of classes is bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production", 2) "the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat," and 3) "this dictatorship itself constitutes only the transition to the 'abolition of all classes' and to a 'classless society'" (1959, p.457).


See footnote #11, above.


For a discussion of the importance of conflict in defining class relations in general the reader is referred to the following representative passages from the primary works: The Poverty of Philosophy, op.cit., pp.137, 138, and 197; Communist Manifesto, op.cit., p.89; The Civil War in France, International Publishers, New York, 1976a, pp.61-2; and Wage-Labour and Capital, op.cit., p.39.

The division of the class structure into a series of levels including political and ideological levels as well as economic pervades many secondary accounts of the notion of class conflict and domination. See for example, Miliband (1977), Wesolowski (1967), and Poulantzas (1975). The reader is directed in particular to Miliband's discussion of the "State" as a tool for political domination in, The State in Capitalist Society, Quartet Books, London, 1973.

Emphasis is mine.

See for example, Marx's discussion in Wage-Labour and Capital of the seeds of conflict within the working class.

The terms "bourgeoisie" and "capitalist" are being used interchangeably.

Wesolowski defines the "state" as,

...an ensemble of people separated from society, acting as members or functionaries of definite institutions...(p.71).

The state is further defined as being charged with the tasks of issuing and executing regulations which are "binding to
all citizens". The reader is directed to Marx's discussion of the nature and role of the state in capitalist society found in Easton and Guddat (1967), pp.151-215.

21 See, footnote #11, above.

22 See, the Communist Manifesto, op.cit., pp.90-6, for Marx's discussion of the development of the bourgeoisie as a class.

23 Marx conveys a similar conception of the proletariat in Value, Price and Profit, 1976, p.38.

24 See, the Communist Manifesto, op.cit., pp.97-102, for Marx's discussion of the development of the proletariat.

25 Capital I, op.cit., p.509.

26 Emphasis is mine.


28 See, the Communist Manifesto, op.cit., p.118; and The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, op.cit., p.54.

29 See, Capital I, op.cit., p.446; and The Class Struggles in France, in, Selected Works II, op.cit., p.154.

30 See, the Communist Manifesto, op.cit., pp.97, 99 and 100; and Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution, in, Selected Works II, op.cit., p.46.

31 See, the Communist Manifesto, op.cit., pp.100 and 115.

32 Ibid, p.100.
33 See, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, op. cit., p.75.

34 The term "dangerous class" is employed by Marx in the Manifesto to describe the "lumpenproletariat". Due to its unique position outside of the labor force, Marx feared its potential use by the ruling class as a, "...tool of reactionary intrigue" (p.100).

35 Emphasis is mine; Lange (1974) provides a useful distinction between the terms "stratum" and "class". That distinction is summarized as follows:

By social stratum, as opposed to social class, we mean a group whose position is determined not by the relations of ownership of means of production, but by the specific features of a given superstructure (p.43).

36 Marx employs the term "ideological classes" to refer to such occupational groupings as, governmental officials, priests, lawyers, soldiers (Capital I, p.446), scientists, and doctors (Class Struggles in France, p.35). In the Communist Manifesto the above are referred to as the "paid wage-laborers" of the bourgeoisie (p.92).

37 Although the landowner class is identified by Marx as one of the three "great" classes in capitalist society in the often cited final chapter of Capital III, Hodges argues that landowners represent a "transition class", and as such are to be included in the category of intermediate classes.

38 Hodges criticizes Bukharin for drawing a "hard and fast line" between "transition" and "intermediate" classes.

39 It should be noted that such a criterion poses a problem. The problem revolves around a point raised earlier in the discussion, that is namely, all classes within society may be viewed, in a Marxian sense, as transitional in nature, and as such must be analyzed with respect to their particular stage of development. See also, Oilman's (1968) discussion of this issue.
The overall issue of ownership vs. control of the means of production is a crucial one and has been the subject of much debate for a past number of decades. For a capsulization of this debate see, M. Zeitlin, "Corporate Ownership and Control," American Journal of Sociology, 79, 2, March, 1974, pp.1073-1119. Marx was not unaware of such a separation of ownership and control. See for example, his discussion of this subject in Capital III, pp.383-90.


The table has been amended to exclude a fifth, "Ambiguous" category.

Wright and Perrone themselves express concern with respect to the Managers category.

The notion of "work" as ontological necessity is being used in this context interchangeably with the notions of "labor" and "creative activity". Hannah Arendt draws an interesting and somewhat relevant distinction between the concepts of work and labor. To avoid possible confusion however I have decided not to employ such a distinction. For Arendt's discussion of that distinction see, The Human Condition, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1974, pp.79-93.


Labor, for Hegel, is "abstract mental activity" only.


Ibid, p.113.

See, Capital I, op.cit., p.179. Marx makes the point here that such a "gift" exists in the "germ" among certain
animal species.

Emphasis is mine.

Capital I, op.cit., p.179

Marx was keenly aware of the dehumanizing nature of work in the "CMP". Detailed description of the labor process in capitalist production are provided in sections of Capital I. In addition see Engel's, The Condition of the Working Class in 1844, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1955.


My reading of two secondary works in particular has aided greatly, the organization of this particular section. They are, R. Schacht, Alienation, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1970; and, E. Drysdale, "The Theory of Alienation in the 1844 Manuscripts of Karl Marx," an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1969.

Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, op.cit., pp.110-11. As Marx points out in this section, estrangement from the product of one's labor and from the labor process are interrelated and represent merely separate manifestations of man's self-estrangement.

See Marx's later elaboration of this point in Wage-Labour and Capital, op.cit., p.19.


See, Meszaros, 1972, op.cit.
60. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, op.cit., p.117.

61. See also Marx's discussion of the plight of the worker found on p.68 of the Manuscripts.

62. See for example, the Grundrisse, op.cit. p.162; and the Manuscripts, op.cit., p.159. See also, "Division of Labour and Manufacture," Capital I, op.cit., pp.336-68.

63. Ibid, pp.159-64.

64. Capital III, op.cit., p.86.

65. See Marx's discussion of communism as the "positive transcendence" of both private property and self-estrangement in the Manuscripts, op.cit., pp.134-5.


67. These categories and their operationalization are discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Data Source

Information used in this study is contained in the 1969 "Survey of Working Conditions" conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. The data were obtained through a series of structured interviews conducted in November and December, 1969 and January, 1970. The survey was sponsored by the Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, and contained 1,533 respondents each with 660 variables of information.¹

The Sample

The universe sampled in the survey consisted of all employed workers (20 hours a week or more), 16 years old or older, living in the coterminous United States during November and December, 1969 and January, 1970. The sampling procedure began with 2,736 listings which yielded 1,951 eligible respondents. Interviews were conducted with 1,533 workers representing a response rate of 78.6 percent.²

For purposes of the present study, the analysis has been restricted to those respondents who work fulltime (35 hours a week or more). While this results in a reduced 79
sample size, the problem of analyzing the part-time labor market is avoided. Finally, farmers and farm laborers were excluded due to the difficulties of assessing income in kind for agricultural occupations.  

The above restrictions coupled with exclusions due to lack of specific item response, yielded a final sample size of 1,073 respondents. Tables 3, 4 and 5 provide a partial sample description based on the demographic variables sex, race, and income. As noted in Table 3, 749 (70 percent) of the sample respondents were male while 324 (30 percent) were female. Of the total sample, 972 (91 percent) were white while 101 (9 percent) were black.

Operationalization of Theoretical Concepts

The primary concepts analyzed in the present study, social class and self-estrangement, were operationally defined as discussed below.

Social Class

The class variable employed in this study is similar to that used by Wright and Perrone (1977) in their study of income inequality. The basis for the operationalization of the concept of social class is provided in the class typology presented in Table 6. Employing the criteria of a) "Ownership of the Means of Production," b) "Control of the Labor Power of Others," and c) "Sale of One's own Labor Power,"
Table 3. Sample Distribution by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Sample Distribution by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Sample Income Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 0-3,999</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-5,999</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-8,999</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-12,999</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000 and over</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Income variable recorded as actual income
Table 6. Criteria for Class Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a three class model is developed. As indicated in the table, "Capitalists" are defined as those who own the means of production, control the labor power of others, and are therefore free from the need to sell their own labor power. The class of "Workers" comprises all those who neither own the means of production nor control the labor power of others and who are thus forced to sell their labor power in order to survive. Finally, "Managers", like the working class, are defined by their lack of ownership of the means of production and their consequential need to sell their own labor power in return for a paid wage. As a class, managers differ from workers in terms of their function in relation to the labor process, i.e., control of the labor power of others. As indicated earlier, it is this specific function of "control" with respect to the labor process which represents a potentially significant influence in predicting perceived self-estrangement.

For purposes of this study, the above class typology was operationally defined as presented in Table 7. The following two items from the data set were used to construct the operationalization:

1. "Most of the time on this job do you work for yourself or someone else?"
2. "Do you supervise anybody as part of your job?"

Based on response to these items the following operational
### Table 7. Operationalization of the Marxian Class Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Position</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Have Sub. on the Job</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employers*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Managers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes "self-employers"
definitions were constructed:

Employees. This category includes all those respondents who, in response to item 1, indicated that they worked for themselves. The reader will also note in Table 7 that this category was defined to include both those who, in response to item 2, indicated that they had no subordinates on the job as well as those who responded positively to the item. Although Wright and Perrone (1977) employ this distinction to define a separate class category (Petty Bourgeoisie), it was decided to exclude such a distinction from the operationalization. This was done for two reasons. First, to distinguish a petty bourgeoisie class category in such a manner (i.e., self-employed having no subordinates) appears theoretically questionable at best. Second, for purposes of the present study (the prediction of perceived self-estrangement) the crucial distinction appears as neither the employer's self-employment nor his hiring of others but, conversely, his concomitant freedom from the need to sell his labor power.

Workers. This category was defined to include all those respondents who indicated a) that they were not self-employed, and b) indicated that they had no subordinates on the job.

Managers. This category includes those respondents who a) were not self-employed, and b) indicated that they
had subordinates on the job. As noted in Table 7, 49.3 percent of the sample (529) were classified as workers, 40.5 percent of the sample (435) were classified as managers, while only 10.2 percent (109) were classified as employers.

Self-Estrangement

Drawing from the discussion presented in Chapter II, Marx's conception of the phenomenon of self-estrangement may be summarized as follows. Self-estrangement centers on the relationship between the individual and both the labor process and the product of labor. In order for the individual to be, to exist both as an individual and as a "species being", he must be free to engage in creative, unrestricted acts of self-expression. Specifically in reference to the labor process, the individual must be allowed to participate in all those decisions effecting both how labor is to be allocated as well as the ends to which such labor is directed.

Heightening in the capitalist mode is a condition which may be described as the distorted negation of the ontological need outlined above. As the result of a number of second order mediations which Marx associates with the capitalist mode (e.g., private property, division of labor, commodity exchange), the individual is robbed of this necessary active role with respect to the labor process. He is in turn forced to toil at often meaningless, monotonous tasks.
He becomes, for Marx, literally an appendage of a machine.

In an attempt to operationalize the theoretical concept of self-estrangement, a series of items were extracted from the data set which were originally employed to tap various dimensions of work satisfaction. In analyzing the following five items, however, it was felt that all five could be defended as indicators of the "individual-labor process" relationship outlined above and in Chapter II. Specifically the items appear to tap the key notions of creativity and individual autonomy with respect to the labor process. The items are as follows:

1. "A job that requires that you keep having to learn new things."

2. "A job that allows you a lot of freedom as to how you do your work."

3. "A job that allows you to make a lot of decisions on your own."

4. "A job that requires you to be creative."

5. "A job that allows you to do a variety of different things."

Before reading the list of statements to the respondent, the interviewer read the following statement, "I'll read a list of things that might describe a person's job. Would you say this is a lot like your (main) job, somewhat like your (main) job, a little like your (main) job, or not at all
like your (main) job?" Responses were recorded based on
the following 4-point scale:

1=A lot
2= Somewhat
3=A little
4=Not at all

For each of the five items, the higher the respondent's
score the more estranged he/she was considered to be. For
example, in terms of item 1, "A job that requires that you
keep having to learn new things," a respondent who indicated
that this statement was "Not at all" like his main job was
considered to be more estranged with respect to that par-
ticular item than a respondent indicating that the state-
ment was "A lot" like his main job.

To measure self-estrangement an attitude scale was
developed comprised of the above-mentioned five items. As
a first step in the development of the scale an inter-item
correlation matrix was constructed (see Table 8). As can
be seen in the table, two of the items (3,4) produced an
item-total correlation coefficient greater than .50, two
(1,5) produced coefficients between .45 and .50 while one
of the items (2) produced a coefficient under .40. The
five scale items were then factor analyzed to test for uni-
dimensionality. Factor analysis allows the researcher to
determine the extent to which the individual scale items
under question tap or "load" on a single dimension or factor.
The results of the analysis indicated that the items were
Table 8. Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for Self-Estrangement Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
loading on the same factor thus providing support for the unidimensionality of the scale. The scale items were then weighted using their appropriate factor scores. By arguing that an item's factor score represents an approximate measure of the extent to which that item taps the particular dimension under question (in this case, self-estrangement), such a weighting procedure would hopefully result in a more refined measure. The factor loadings for the scale items are presented in Table 9. A respondent's self-estrangement score was obtained by multiplying the score for each separate item by its appropriate factor weight and summing across all five items.

Variables
The additional variables used in the analysis were measured as discussed below. 5

Occupational Status

Occupational status was measured using the Duncan SEI scale. 6 In the survey decile values from the Duncan scale were coded as opposed to the full two-digit scale. While collapsing the original scale into these categories or deciles results in a loss of information, the intent of the scale remains unchanged (i.e., scale score and prestige are, as before, directly related). Table 10 displays frequencies and percents for the deciles, as well as the relationship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A job that requires that you keep having to learn new things.</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A job that allows you a lot of freedom as to how you do your work.</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A job that allows you to make a lot of decisions.</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A job that requires that you be creative.</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A job that allows you to do a variety of different things.</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Principal Factor with Iterations
Table 10. Sample Distribution by Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duncan Scale</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1073</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between each decile and the full scale.

Blue Collar/White Collar

For purposes of the study a distinction between manual and non-manual labor was desired. Although this specific distinction was not provided in the survey, respondents were asked to classify their occupation as being either blue collar or white collar in nature. The similarities between the two measures (manual/non-manual and blue collar/white collar) were considered to be sufficient enough to defend inclusion of the blue collar/white collar distinction in the analysis. This variable was coded as follows:

1 = White collar  
2 = Blue collar

Table 11 shows frequencies and percents for the two categories.

Income

Respondents were asked to indicate their individual yearly income before taxes. The actual amount indicated by the respondent was coded (see Table 5).

Education

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest grade of school they had completed. Responses were coded as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1073</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex

Respondent's sex was coded as follows:

1 = Male
2 = Female (see Table 3)

Race

Respondent's race was coded as follows:

1 = White
2 = Black (see Table 4)

Statistical Analysis

The analysis is divided into two sections. The first section is devoted to a direct comparison of the class variables with occupational status and white collar/blue collar distinctions in predicting perceived self-estrangement. Section two keys on the analysis of inter-class variations with respect to level of perceived self-estrangement.

Direct Comparison of Social Class with Occupational Status and White Collar/Blue Collar Distinctions

One method for determining the best predictor of a given dependent variable is to insert all variables in question into the same regression model. For the direct
### Table 12. Sample Distribution by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 11</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. or Prof.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1073</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison of class with occupational status and white collar/blue collar distinctions, the following standardized regression equation was estimated:

\[
\text{Self-Estrangement} = \beta_1 \text{Income} + \beta_2 \text{Education} + \beta_3 \text{Sex Dummy} + \beta_4 \text{Race Dummy} + \beta_5 \text{Blue Collar Dummy} + \beta_6 \text{Occupational Status} + \beta_7 \text{Employer Dummy} + \beta_8 \text{Worker Dummy}
\]

The drop in the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was then examined when the status variable was excluded, when the blue collar dummy was excluded, and finally when the class variables were excluded. In this way the relative effects of each of these variables could be estimated and compared in an attempt to determine the most effective predictor of perceived self-estrangement. This particular method for comparing independent effects was selected in place of the more common method of analyzing the respective standardized regression coefficients for two reasons. The first reason relates to the method used in this study for measuring social class. The transformation of the class variable into two separate dummy variables posed a problem with respect to the interpretation of the regression coefficients. To this author's knowledge there is no adequate method for interpreting the two separate coefficients associated with the class dummies in comparison with, for example, the single coefficient associated with the occupational status.
measure. A second reason for not interpreting the regression coefficients centers on the problem of multicollinearity. As Blalock (1963) indicates, at the slightest hint of intercorrelation among predictor variables in a regression equation, the standard error terms associated with the respective coefficients tend to expand. The more the error terms expand, the more unreliable the coefficients become as indicators of the independent effects. With respect to the present analysis there is sufficient reason to expect a certain degree of intercorrelation among a number of the predictor variables (e.g., occupational status with blue collar, occupational status with income and education). For these reasons, the standardized regression coefficients were not interpreted with respect to the hypothesized effects.

Dummy Variables

A number of the independent variables employed in the regression analysis were measured at the nominal level. These variables included sex, race, blue collar/white collar and social class. These specific variables, due to their level of measurement, posed a problem with respect to their inclusion in the analysis. In order to avoid the problem, the above-mentioned variables were transformed into dummy variables. A dummy variable is a method of allowing for
the inclusion of variables not conventionally measured on a numerical scale into a regression equation. This is accomplished by assigning two arbitrarily selected numerical values (usually 0 and 1) to each of the categories comprising the variable.8 The dummy variables employed in the present analysis were coded accordingly. Thus, using the "Employer Class Dummy" as an example, the Employer category was coded as 1 with both the Manager and Worker categories coded as 0.

Inter-Class Variations

In order to compare the three class categories (Employers, Managers, Workers) with respect to perceived self-estrangement, two separate analyses were performed. The first task consisted of obtaining adjusted group means for the three categories. This was accomplished by performing analysis of variance (ANOVA) using self-estrangement as the dependent variable and controlling for both independent and covariate effects. The adjusted group means were then compared using an "a posteriori" contrast test. A general description of these tests is provided by Nim, et al. (1975) as follows:

An a posteriori contrast test is a systematic procedure for comparing all possible pairs of group means. The groups are divided into homogeneous subsets, where the difference in the means of any two groups in a subset is not significant at some prescribed level. The procedure
is based on the test:

\[(X_i - X_j) < R(\alpha, g, f) \times S_{\bar{X}}\]

where \(R(\alpha, g, f)\) is a range based on a significance level (\(\alpha\)), the number of groups in the subset (\(g\)), and the degrees of freedom (\(f\)) in the between-group sum of squares. \(S_{\bar{X}}\) is the standard error in the combined subset (p.427).

The specific test selected for the analysis was the Scheffe method. This particular test was chosen for two reasons. First, it is an exact test even for unequal group sizes. Second, of the range of a posteriori tests available, the Scheffe test is clearly the most conservative with respect to Type I error (Winer, 1962). A common criticism regarding the use of a posteriori tests centers on the tendency of such tests to uncover differences between group means which in fact do not exist. The selection of the Scheffe test was made in part as a defense against such criticism.

Summary

In summary the analysis will be an empirical test of the research hypotheses outlined at the end of the preceding chapter. This analysis will establish a) the relative effect of social class on perceived self-estrangement vis-a-vis occupational status and white collar/blue collar distinctions, and b) the relationship between class position and perceived self-estrangement.
NOTES

1 Quinn, Robert P., Seashore, Stanley E. and Thomas W. Mangione, "Survey of Working Conditions," Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, November 1969-January 1970, pp.I-II. As is often the case with secondary analysis, both the validity and the reliability of the survey items is assumed. A partial defense for the above assumption is provided however by the reputation of The University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research. Despite the widespread use of this data source, the present study represents a unique attempt at analyzing the information.

2 Ibid, p.VI.

3 Wright and Perrone, 1977, op.cit., reduce the sample employed in their research in a similar manner.

4 In operationally defining the class categories in the typology it was decided to substitute the label "Employers" for that of "Capitalists". Such a label appears to describe more exactly the nature of the category.

5 Stimulus questions for all variables (including class and self-estrangement) employed in the analysis are provided in Appendix C.


7 Such a method for comparing effects is suggested by O.D. Duncan. See, O.D. Duncan, 1961, op.cit.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The analysis was divided into two sections. Part one of the analysis sought to test the relative ability of the class variable to predict perceived self-estrangement. Specifically, the effect of the class variable with respect to perceived self-estrangement was contrasted with that of an occupational status measure, Duncan SEI scores, and white collar/blue collar distinctions. To obtain the desired comparisons two separate regression equations were computed, one containing all variables (class, occupational status, blue collar, sex, race, education and income), and a second containing the three key variables (class, occupational status, and blue collar) only. Each of three key variables was then separately removed from the equation and the relative drop in the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was in each case noted. The respective decrements were then compared in order to draw conclusions with respect to the hypothesized relative effects of the class variable.

The second phase of the analysis sought to compare the three separate class categories (Employers, Managers, and Workers) with respect to mean level of perceived self-estrangement. The first step in this phase of the analysis consisted of
obtaining adjusted group means for the three class categories. This was accomplished by computing a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with self-estrangement as the dependent variable and class as the independent variable. The Scheffe method of a posteriori contrasts was employed to test the hypothesized relationships.

Direct Comparison of Social Class with Occupational Status and White Collar/Blue Collar Distinctions

Social Class and Occupational Status

Table 13 presents the correlation matrix, means and standard deviations for the variables employed in the study. In noting the direction of the zero-order correlations between the dependent variable (self-estrangement) and the key predictor variables (class, occupational status, and blue collar) one finds, as expected, a) both occupational status and the employer class dummy inversely correlated with self-estrangement (e.g., the higher the occupational status, the lower the self-estrangement) and, b) the blue collar and worker class dummies directly correlated with self-estrangement (e.g., workers displaying higher levels of self-estrangement than non-workers).

An analysis of the matrix reveals a certain degree of intercorrelation among the independent variables. Most notable are the correlations between the blue collar dummy and education \( r_{26} = -.49 \), occupational status and education
Table 13. Correlation Matrix, Means and Standard Deviations for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>8,555</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X_1$=Self-Estrangement
$X_2$=Education
$X_3$=Income
$X_4$=Sex
$X_5$=Race
$X_6$=Blue Collar Dummy
$X_7$=Occupational Status
$X_8$=Employer Class Dummy
$X_9$=Worker Class Dummy
(r_{27} = .56), and the blue collar dummy and occupational status (r_{67} = -.74). Not only does the presence of these relationships draw into question the reliability of the respective coefficients, but in addition, any interpretation of the respective decrements or drops in the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) should be made in light of such relationships.

It should be recalled that the comparison of social class and occupational status is critical to a Marxian vs. a non-Marxian explanation of self-estrangement. For the Marxian position adopted in this study, social class is anticipated as being the better predictor since recognizing one's estrangement is by definition a cognitive reflection on one's separation from his work. For Marx, the degree to which this separation is felt will vary with one's relationship to the means of production. It is simply irrelevant to speak of man's relationship to the economic order in terms of his occupational prestige--irrespective of your prestige, it is employers (and, to a certain degree, managers) that control the labor process and the actions of others. One class orders; another is ordered. It was therefore hypothesized that:

Social class will have a greater effect on self-estrangement than occupational status (Hypothesis 1).

This first hypothesis was supported. As indicated in
Table 14, with all variables included in the equation, the amount of explained variance associated with the dependent variable (self-estrangement) was just over 29 percent ($R^2 = .292$). When the occupational status variable was removed from the equation the coefficient of determination fell to .256, resulting in a net drop of approximately 3.6 percent. When this same procedure was repeated removing the class variables from the equation the total explained variance fell to just over 24 percent ($R^2 = .242$); a net decrement attributed to the class variables of approximately 5 percent. In comparing the two decrements, it can be seen that the class variables accounted for approximately 1.4 percent more of the explained variance associated with the dependent variable.

Somewhat similar though less significant results were obtained when only the three key variables in the analysis (class, occupational status and blue collar) were employed in predicting perceived self-estrangement. The three variables alone accounted for approximately 26.6 percent of the variance associated with the self-estrangement variable. With occupational status removed from the equation the amount of explained variance fell to approximately 19.4 percent (a drop of 7.2 percent). The removal of the class variables from the equation yielded approximately the same decrement 7.3 percent ($R^2 = 19.3$ percent).
Table 14. Comparison of Explanatory Power of Occupational Status, Blue Collar/White Collar and Class (Non-Farm Full-time Participants in the Labor Force Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Included in the Regression Equation</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Coefficients (Dependent Variable=Self-Estrangement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_1$  $X_2$  $X_3$  $X_4$  $X_5$  $X_6$  $X_7$  $X_8$  $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All Variables</td>
<td>-.06  -.09  -.09  -.07  -.06  -.31  -.08  .21  .292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>-.10  -.41  -.09  .24  .266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $X_5$</td>
<td>.29  .083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $X_6$</td>
<td>-.44  .190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>-.08  .36  .159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Relative Changes in $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$ Net of $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_6, X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>N.S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$ Net of $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7, X_8$ Net of $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6$</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$ Net of $X_6, X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$ Net of $X_5, X_7, X_8$</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7, X_8$ Net of $X_5, X_6$</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X_1$=Income  $X_6$=Blue Collar Dummy
$X_2$=Education  $X_6$=Occupational Status
$X_3$=Sex Dummy  $X_7$=Employer Class Dummy
$X_4$=Race Dummy  $X_8$=Worker Class Dummy
Social Class and Blue Collar/White Collar Distinctions

It will be recalled from the discussion presented in Chapter II of this study that the phenomenon of self-estrangement entails according to Marx the separation of mental from manual labor.\(^2\) While it was felt that this distinction looms as a potentially significant indicator of perceived self-estrangement, the differences associated with class position were perceived to be more efficient predictors of self-estrangement. Specifically it was hypothesized that:

Social class will have a greater effect on self-estrangement than white collar/blue collar distinctions (Hypothesis 2).

The data firmly support the second hypothesis. As indicated in Table 14, when the blue collar variable was removed from the equation containing all variables the resulting drop in the coefficient of determination was less than 1 percent (.003). When this same variable was removed from the three-variable equation, the drop was again less than 1 percent (.005). These decrements appear substantially lower than the decrements associated with the class variables (.050 and .073 respectively).

An additional observation regarding the decrements in \(R^2\) presented in Table 14 warrants mention. By employing the following equation it was possible to test the separate decrements in \(R^2\) for significance:
\[ \frac{R_i^2 - R_W^2}{1 - R_i^2} \times \frac{N - r - 1}{r - s} \]

where:

- \( R_i^2 \) = the \( R^2 \) with all variables included
- \( r \) = the larger number of variables in the equation
- \( s \) = the smaller number of variables in the equation
- \( R_W^2 \) = the \( R^2 \) with the smaller number of variables in the equation
- \( N \) = the sample size

As noted in Table 14, the decrements associated with the class variables as well as those associated with the occupational status variable were found to be highly significant (\( p < .001 \)). With respect to the blue collar variable, the drop in the coefficient of determination associated with that variable's removal from the three-variable equation was found to be significant at the .01 level, while its removal from the equation containing all variables resulted in no significant decrease in explained variance.

Although the findings reported up to this point provide general support for the hypothesized effects, any interpretation of those findings must be tempered in light of a number of significant observations. These observations include: a) questionably low coefficients of determination, b) comparatively small changes or decrements in the coefficients of determination, and c) the presence of
intercorrelated independent variables.

While coefficients of determination such as those reported in this study are not uncommon in the field of attitude prediction, any equation which leaves unexplained roughly 70 percent of the variation must be questioned. This same caution is applicable to the individual decrements or drops in the $R^2$s associated with the predictor variables. While social class appeared to have the greatest effect on perceived self-estrangement (accounting for 5 percent of the explained variation), any type of conclusion or inference with respect to the overall efficacy of social class in predicting self-estrangement would seem tenuous at best. General implications of these findings are discussed in the final chapter.

Inter-Class Variations

The purpose of the second phase of the analysis was to test empirically the specific nature of the relationship between class position and perceived self-estrangement. If Marx was correct in his analysis, one would expect to find, a) those forced to sell or sacrifice their labor power (operationally defined as the class of "workers") displaying, on the average, significantly higher levels of perceived self-estrangement than those free from such a need (operationally defined as the class of "employers"), and b) those
occupying an "intermediate" or "contradictory" class position (i.e., wage laborers employed in a supervisory capacity; operationally defined as "managers") displaying, on the average, levels of perceived self-estrangement significantly higher than employers and lower than workers. The specific hypotheses tested were as follows:

Workers on the average will display significantly higher levels of self-estrangement than employers (Hypothesis 3).

Managers on the average will display significantly lower levels of self-estrangement than workers (Hypothesis 4).

Managers on the average will display significantly higher levels of self-estrangement than employers (Hypothesis 5).

The first step in the analysis was to compute mean self-estrangement scores for each of the three class categories. In order to arrive at a truer approximation of these group means an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed which controlled for both independent and covariate effects. The respective means are provided in Table 15. This particular analysis, in addition, served to provide additional support for the significant effect of class position on perceived self-estrangement (F = 36.9, p<.001).\(^3\)

It will be recalled from Chapter III that the statistical technique chosen to test the hypotheses was the Scheffe test of direct comparisons. The formula for computing the Scheffe statistic (S) is as follows:
\[ S = \sqrt{(k-1) F_{\text{crit.}}} \times \sqrt{\frac{MSE_{\text{error}}}{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}} \]

where:

- \( k \) = the number of category means involved in the overall F-test
- \( F_{\text{crit.}} \) = the tabled value of F for \((k-1)\) and \((N-k)\) degrees of freedom at a given level of significance
- \( MSE_{\text{error}} \) = the within-category mean square used in the overall F-test and entered in the ANOVA Summary Table
- \( n \) = the number of cases in a sample category

The above S statistic represents a "critical difference" value, i.e., the minimum allowable difference (given a prescribed level of significance) when comparing any two specific group means. The level of significance selected for this analysis was .01\(^4\). The respective critical difference values (S scores) are reported in Table 15.

**Workers vs. Employers.** Hypothesis 3 was supported. As indicated in Table 15, the mean self-estrangement score\(^5\) for workers was 5.94 compared with a mean score for employers of 4.51 (a difference of 1.43). The critical difference for this particular comparison was .56. The difference between the two group means was thus found to be significant at the .01 level.
Table 15. Mean Level of Self-Estrangement By Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Net*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Comparisons S X-Diff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X-Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E vs M</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E vs W</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M vs W</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adjusted for Independent and Covariate effects
** p<.01
Managers vs. Workers. Hypothesis 4 was also supported. The mean self-estrangement score for managers was 5.09 compared with the worker mean score (as indicated above) of 5.94. This represented a significant difference of .85 exceeding the .34 minimum difference needed.

Managers vs. Employers. The final hypothesis (5) was also supported by the data. The category means of 5.09 and 4.51 respectively represented a difference of .58 just exceeding the significance standard of .57.

Two general conclusions regarding this particular phase of the analysis can be drawn. First, as expected, the largest difference between category means was that found between workers and employers (gross difference=2.07; net difference=1.43). Second, also as expected, managers, in terms of perceived self-estrangement, were found to occupy an intermediate position located between workers and employers. The reader will note that the smallest difference uncovered was that between managers and employers (gross difference=.57; net difference=.58). Although difficult to interpret, these findings seem to suggest that managers as a class grouping appear to more closely parallel employers in terms of perceived self-estrangement than workers. These findings possess potentially significant implications for the discussion presented in Chapter II and, in
particular, for the notion of control with respect to the labor process vis-a-vis class position as an effective predictor of perceived self-estrangement. These implications will be discussed in the final chapter.

The findings associated with this particular phase of the analysis provide substantial empirical support for the theoretical contention of the existence of class differences with respect to perceived self-estrangement. A number of observations tend to add credence to the general conclusion of the analysis—namely, the existence of an inverse relationship between class position and self-estrangement. First, it should be recalled that the group means analyzed were adjusted for both independent and covariate effects. As a result, these "net" means should represent truer approximations of the respective self-estrangement levels associated with each class category. Second, the significance level itself (.01 as opposed .05) adds support for the significance of the findings. Finally, the nature of the Scheffe test also adds strength to the interpretation. As indicated in Chapter III, the Scheffe test is perhaps the most conservative of all a posteriori tests with respect to Type I error. The possibility therefore of drawing substantively insignificant conclusions is reduced considerably.

The final chapter begins with a brief summarization of
the analysis reported in this chapter, followed by a discussion of, a) the theoretical implications of the findings, b) the limitations of the present research, and c) suggestions for future research in the area.
NOTES

1. In an effort to obtain a truer approximation of the separate group means, the means were calculated while controlling for both independent and covariate effects.

2. It should be recalled from the discussion in Chapter III that the present analysis substituted "white collar/blue collar" distinctions in place of manual/non-manual differences.

3. This particular technique also provided a test of all interaction effects. These interaction effects were found to be non-significant (see Appendix B).

4. Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were tested employing one-tailed tests of significance. Such tests may be defended based upon the directional nature of the hypotheses as stated (i.e., "Workers on the average will display significantly higher levels of self-estrangement than employers").

5. All references are to adjusted means.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The goals of this study, as outlined in the opening chapter, were three in number. The study sought first to provide the reader with a concise yet valid reconstruction of the Marxian notions of social class and self-estrangement. Specifically it sought to emphasize a common basis for the two notions as outlined in the primary writings--namely, human labor in its alienated and distorted form as private property.

The study also sought to develop valid operationalizations for these theoretical concepts. The class variable employed in this study was similar to that developed by Wright and Perrone (1977) and reflected the two-class model. The variable was comprised of, a) a class which owns the means of production (operationally defined as employers), and b) a class which is forced to sacrifice its labor power (operationally defined as workers). This basic two-class model was then expanded to include an intermediate "managerial" class grouping distinguished by its supervisory function with respect to the labor process. The concept of
self-estrangement was operationally defined by scaling a series of five attitudinal statements which described various aspects of the "individual-labor process" relationship.

The third and final aim of the study was directed at empirically testing Marx's theoretical relationship between class structure and perceived self-estrangement. The data used in this study were from a larger survey conducted by The University of Michigan Survey Research Center on a national sample of the United States labor force during the years 1969 and 1970.

The purpose of this final chapter is to, a) provide a brief summary of the empirical findings, b) discuss the theoretical implications of those findings, c) outline the limitations of the present research, and provide suggestions for future research in the area.

Summary of Empirical Findings

The first phase of the analysis sought to test the efficacy of the Marxian class variable in predicting perceived self-estrangement. The class variable's ability to account for the variation associated with the self-estrangement measure was compared with that of an occupational status measure, Duncan's "Socio-Economic Index," and a blue collar/white collar distinction. Multiple regression analysis was used to assess the independent effects of the three variables.
Two separate equations were used to predict perceived self-estrangement. The first equation consisted of the three "key" variables (class, occupational status, and blue collar), and four additional variables (income, education, sex and race). The second equation used only the three "key" variables.

An analysis of the respective coefficients of determination revealed that the variables under question shared only modest success in predicting perceived self-estrangement. As indicated in Chapter IV, the first equation accounted for just under 30 percent of the total variance (.292). Of that 29.2 percent explained variation however, roughly 27 percent (.266) was attributed to the three "key" variables.

Of the three key variables compared in the analysis, social class (as predicted) appeared to have the greatest effect on the dependent variable. Although the findings technically provided support for the hypothesized relationships, any overall conclusions with respect to those relationships must be qualified in light of the relatively small decrements or drops in the coefficients of determination associated with each variable. While these decrements were, for the most part, found to be significant statistically, it should be pointed out that the formula used to test these decrements for statistical significance appears
sensitive to sample size. An additional reason for stressing a cautious interpretation of this particular phase of the analysis stems from a direct comparison of the increments associated with each variable. Although the effect of the blue collar variable on self-estrangement was negligible (decrements of .003 and .005 respectively), a comparison of occupational status and class decrements revealed that the two variables displayed more or less similar levels of predictive power. A comparison of the decrements associated with the first equation shows a net difference of only 1.4 percent (5 percent for the class variable as opposed to 3.6 percent for occupational status) while the same comparison with respect to the second equation indicates virtually no difference between the two variables (7.3 percent for the class variable as opposed to 7.2 percent for occupational status).

The second phase of the analysis sought to compare the three separate categories comprising the class variable with respect to mean level of perceived self-estrangement. It was hypothesized that of the three class categories, workers would on the average display the highest levels of perceived self-estrangement, employers the lowest, with managers as a class displaying levels somewhere in-between these two. The Scheffe method of a posteriori contrasts was used to test the individual comparisons.
The analysis of the respective class means provided empirical support for the hypothesized relationships. As predicted, workers were found to display the highest levels of self-estrangement (adjusted mean=5.94), followed by managers (adjusted mean=5.09), and employers (adjusted mean=4.51). Results of the Scheffe test of comparisons showed the mean differences in all three comparisons to be significant at the .01 level. This tends to provide general support for the contention that perceived self-estrangement is, at least in part, a reflection of one's relationship to the means of production (class position). In addition this provides empirical support for the importance of one's control of the labor process as a predictor of perceived self-estrangement. While the difference between statistical means for manager and worker self-estrangement scores was substantial (representing a net difference more than twice that needed for significance; net difference=.85, S=.34), the difference between manager and employer mean scores was of lesser significance (net difference=.58, S=.57). These findings are important given the theoretical argument made earlier. It is clear that employers and managers parallel each other to some degree. Both possess some control over the labor process even though managers fall into a somewhat ambivalent state of being in but not definitively of either the pure worker or employer classes; yet they are
attitudinally more similar to the latter than the former.

Theoretical Implications

For Marx the roots of man's self-estrangement may be traced directly to the class structure (in particular that associated with the capitalist mode of production). It is the working class, or class of direct producers, which experiences most directly the dehumanizing effects of this condition. Due to their relationship to the means of production, workers are forced to relinquish rights of control regarding, a) the labor process and its operation, and b) the utilization of the products of their own labor. As a result of this act of capitalist appropriation of the worker's labor, the work process is robbed of any semblance of meaning and importance it may have once possessed for him. For Marx the worker in modern capitalist society is literally suspended in a state of non-being and exists in an imposed state of unrealized potential. This potential is for species-defining creativity and active decision making with respect to his life and labor. Although also estranged, the capitalist ironically feels himself satisfied and content in his condition. Such contentment stems directly from the rights of control associated with the capitalist's position in the class structure.

Mediating this basic two-class dichotomy is the
existence of a new "managerial" stratum viewed by Marx as occupying an intermediate and contradictory position within the class structure. The contradictory nature of this position is perhaps best illustrated using the phenomenon of self-estrangement. As wage laborers, managers should be expected to display levels of perceived self-estrangement, on the average, higher than those associated with the capitalist class (employers). Yet, at the same time, because of their specific function of control and supervision of the labor process, managers could also be expected to reflect somewhat lower levels of perceived self-estrangement than workers. One of the specific aims of this study was to compare the level of perceived self-estrangement of the managerial class vis-a-vis the capitalist and worker classes.

Implications of the present research regarding the overall ability of social class to predict perceived self-estrangement are, in general, difficult to draw. Although the amount of variation accounted for by the social class variable was small (5 percent), social class did appear to be the best predictor of perceived self-estrangement. Such a small increment precludes any inferences with respect to the efficacy of social class in predicting perceived self-estrangement. However to conclude that class position is a poor predictor of perceived self-estrangement would be premature and possibly erroneous. This is due to the
limitations of the present research discussed in the following section. The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is that a definitive answer is not at hand and there is a definite need for future research on the topic.

Despite the lack of clarity in the previous finding, in general, the results of this study suggest certain implications for Marx's theorized relationship between class position and perceived self-estrangement. The principal observation is that there exist inter-class differences with respect to levels of perceived self-estrangement. Specifically, the results support the contention that workers, in comparison with capitalists and managers, experience more directly and are most aware of the dehumanizing effects of work in capitalist society. More notable, however, are the implications for the importance of control of the labor process and its effect on perceived self-estrangement. Of the three class groupings defined in the study, it was the working class that was characterized by an absence of control of the labor process. This fact, coupled with the similarities uncovered between manager and employer levels of perceived self-estrangement, indicate the potential for control of the work process as an intervening effect in the prediction of perceived self-estrangement. Any conclusions regarding a direct comparison of the two effects (class position and control of the labor process) remain outside the
scope of the present study. Such a comparison, however, must eventually be made in order to empirically assess the efficacy of the variables.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There were a number of limitations associated with the present research. Such limitations should not only be noted in interpreting the findings of the study, but, in addition, should function as a general guide for future research in the area. For purposes of presentation these limitations have been categorized under the following three areas: 1) sampling 2) measurement, and 3) operationalization.

One limitation of the study concerns the relatively small number of respondents classified as employers in the class operationalization. Recall that of the final sample (1,073), only 109 respondents were classified as employers compared to 435 as managers and 529 as workers. As defined, the employer class category clearly represents a rather heterogeneous distribution. For purposes of this study the key distinction sought was that between those who are forced to sell their labor power and those free from such a need. It might have been useful to explore in greater detail differences within the employer class category with respect to perceived self-estrangement. At present, the categories mask possible intra-class variance. For example, within the
employer class there could exist very different levels of self-estrangement if one controlled on number of workers employed and the degree of supervision necessitated. For employers this range would be from self-employed with no employees to larger corporate holdings--clearly radically divergent forms of entrepreneurial ownership. To facilitate such an analysis the present sample design would need to be altered to produce a substantially expanded employer class. It would even be advisable perhaps to control for number of workers employed to assure such representation.

The most serious limitation of the present research centers on the operationalization and measurement of the dependent variable, self-estrangement. Although the scale used in this study to measure perceived self-estrangement constitutes a theoretically sound attempt to operationalize the concept, this operationalization represents only a beginning step toward the development of a truly valid and long overdue measure of perceived self-estrangement. The following general suggestions for refining the measure are offered:

1. The number of items comprising the scale used in this study is clearly insufficient. As opposed to the current five items, the scale should be expanded ideally to include ten or fifteen items. Such an alteration should contribute to the reliability of the measure.
2. Much work is needed on the wording of the scale items. First, such changes as substituting the word "allows" for the word "requires" in items 1 and 5 are recommended (e.g., "A job that requires you to be creative," could be altered to read, "A job that allows you to be creative"). Second, a number of statements designed to ferret out aspects of the relationship between nature of the job and realization of worker potential would add to the validity of the scale. Third, the inclusion of a series of items worded such that a positive response would reflect a state of higher rather than lower perceived self-estrangement is also suggested (e.g., "A job that prevents you from doing the kind of things you do best"). Finally, it is strongly suggested that the form of the attitude statements be altered to allow for a series of five Likert-type response categories. The following statement is offered as an illustration:

"My job allows me the opportunity to be creative in my work"

SA A U D SD

Such a change would hopefully reduce measurement error and, consequently, yield a higher percentage of explained variation \((R^2)\) when employed in regression analysis.

In light of the criticisms offered by Haug and Sussman (1971) of the Duncan scale, it is recommended that an
alternative measure of occupational status be employed for purposes of a direct comparison with the class operationalization.\textsuperscript{2} If the Duncan scale is employed it is strongly recommended that the full two-digit scale be used as opposed to the decile values reported for the data used in this study.

One additional limitation must be noted. Much like the employer class category, the manager class as operationally defined in this study represents a fairly heterogeneous category. A single response to the question of supervision of employees is insufficient in terms of measuring the concept of control. While the notion of class position (relationship to the means of production) appears as a non-continuous, categorical distinction, the concept of control could certainly be viewed as a matter of degree. It is specifically recommended that the notion of control be expanded to encompass more than supervision of labor power.

There remains to be discussed one final and perhaps overriding limitation associated with the study. It is a limitation which stands not only as a shortcoming of the present research, but far more importantly, as a major indictment of the current state of survey methods. The basis of the analysis found in this study was a comparison of perceived self-estrangement and class position. Such a comparison must be viewed however, as a compromise with
respect to the purported goals of the study. The purpose of Chapter II of this dissertation was to explore, through an analysis of the primary writings, the relationship between class structure and human self-estrangement as viewed by Marx. This phenomenon of self-estrangement was, for Marx, unmistakably an "objective" condition brought about by the alienating and dehumanizing effects of the system of property relations associated with modern capitalist society. An awareness on the part of the individual of his plight in such a class structure was, for Marx, no precondition for his estrangement. That an eventual awareness on the part of the working class of both the nature and perpetrators of their estrangement is a necessary prerequisite for a final transcendence is hardly disputable. The point to be stressed here is that man in capitalist society is estranged whether he happens to be cognizant of that fact or not.

Ideally, the empirical analysis in this study should have been directed at an assessment of the theoretical relationship outlined between class position and this objective condition of self-estrangement. What has been provided alternatively is a test of class position with what is assumed to be a social psychological manifestation of the objective condition. The most serious indictment of this, and all similar research, revolves, not around the actual
object of analysis, perceived self-estrangement, but rather around the accompanying set of assumptions made on the part of most researchers conducting attitude research. The most tenuous set of assumptions concerns interpretation. For example, usually it is taken-for-granted that those being studied interpret attitude statements in a manner consistent with their intent. This pervasive assumption of a universal standard of interpretation is one of the most problematic aspects of modern empirical research. If Marx was correct in his assertion regarding the relationship between consciousness and one's position in the class structure, one must question the validity of not only this study, but all attitude research. This particular limitation was raised with the knowledge that a comprehensive resolution is non-existent. Any partial resolution may be traced to the need to critically interpret all such research with this limitation in mind. One need only mention Phillips (1971) famous essay cautioning sociologists about "Knowledge From What?" to find contemporary support for this position. It must be kept in mind that an empirical measure represents merely an approximation whose precision is always problematic. Thus our measurement, hence knowledge, of a given phenomenon must remain as less than completely satisfying, especially when employing attitudes as indicators of "consciousness."
Conclusion

The aims of this study comprise what should certainly be labeled a modest test of a rather immodest theoretical argument. It sought neither to present an alternative to the work conducted up to this day on the subject of alienation nor a revised theory of social class. Despite the overall abundance of secondary literature devoted to the subjects of alienation and social class, the present effort was designed as an exploratory assessment and test of the purported interrelationship of the two concepts. The value of the work may be traced to its attempt to bridge the long standing disjuncture existing between Marxian scholarship on the one hand, and the neo-positivist leanings of modern sociology on the other. To the extent that we are able to succeed ultimately in bridging this disjuncture sociology as a distinct discipline will hopefully come to realize its function as a "positive", humanistic science of human development.
NOTES

1  Unidimensional Likert scales composed of 10 to 15 items are fairly common. However, as the number of items increases past this point, the unidimensionality of the scale may become problematic (Oppenheim, 1966).

2  One possible alternative to the Duncan scale would be Hollingshead's "Two-Factor Index of Social Position" (see, Haug and Sussman, 1971, op.cit.).
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APPENDIX A

CROSSTABULATIONS OF SOCIAL CLASS WITH SELF-ESTRANGEMENT SCALE ITEMS
Table A. Social Class by Self-Estrangement Item 1\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Categories</th>
<th>Item Weights\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Item 1 stated: "A job that requires that you keep having to learn new things."

\textsuperscript{b} Item weights were: 1=A lot; 2=Somewhat; 3=A little 4=Not at all
Table B. Social Class by Self-Estrangement Item 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Categories</th>
<th>Item Weightsb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Item 2 stated: "A job that allows you a lot of freedom as to how you do your work."

b Item weights were: 1=A lot; 2=Somewhat; 3=A little; 4=Not at all
Table C. Social Class by Self-Estrangement Item 3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Categories</th>
<th>Item Weightsb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Item 3 stated: "A job that allows you to make a lot of decisions."

b Item weights were: 1=A lot; 2=Somewhat; 3=A little; 4=Not at all
Table D. Social Class by Self-Estrangement Item 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Categories</th>
<th>Item Weights</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Item 4 stated: "A job that requires that you be creative."

b Item weights were: 1=A lot; 2=Somewhat; 3=A little; 4=Not at all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Categories</th>
<th>Item Weights&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Item 5 stated: "A job that allows you to do a variety of different things."

<sup>b</sup> Item weights were: 1=A lot; 2=Somewhat; 3=A little; 4=Not at all
APPENDIX B

TEST OF INTERACTION EFFECTS
Table F. Test of Interaction Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Way:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_2$</td>
<td>8.940</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.470</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_3$</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_4$</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2 \times X_3$</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2 \times X_4$</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3 \times X_4$</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3$</td>
<td>3.998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_2 \times X_4$</td>
<td>5.138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_3 \times X_4$</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2 \times X_3 \times X_4$</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Way:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 \times X_4$</td>
<td>8.599</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.599</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X_1 =$Class  
$X_2 =$Blue Collar  
$X_3 =$Race  
$X_4 =$Sex
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEMS USED IN THE STUDY
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEMS

Social Class

Most of the time on this job do you work for yourself or someone else?

1. Work for self
2. Work for someone else

Do you supervise anybody as part of your job?

1. Yes
2. No

Self-Estrangement

"A job that requires that you keep having to learn new things." Would you say this is a lot like your (main) job, somewhat like your (main) job, a little like your (main) job, or not at all like your (main) job?

1. A lot
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all

"A job that allows you a lot of freedom as to how you do your work." (How much is this like your (main) job?)

1. A lot
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all

"A job that allows you to make a lot of decisions on your own." (How much is this like your (main) job?)

1. A lot
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all
"A job that requires you be creative." (How much is this like your (main) job?)

1. A lot
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all

"A job that allows you to do a variety of different things." (How much is this like your (main) job?)

1. A lot
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all

Occupational Status

A demographic variable which scores the respondent's occupation according to the Duncan SEI. The Duncan scale ranks the entire experienced labor force of 1950 into tenths according to the socio-economic scores of their occupations.

00. Lowest Status
01. Next Lowest
02. 
03. 
04. 
05. 
06. 
07. 
08. 
09. Highest Status Decile

White Collar/Blue Collar

Whether respondent's occupation is designated as white collar or blue collar.

1. White Collar
2. Blue Collar
3. Farm Occupations

Income

How much does your pay or income from your (main) job
figure out to be a year, before taxes and other deductions are made?

(Amount coded to nearest dollar)

00001. One dollar

:

97000. 97,000 or more

Education

What was the highest grade of school you completed?

00=None
10=Some Grade School (Grades 1 to 7)
20=Completed Grade School (Grade 8)
30=Some High School (Grades 9 to 11)
40=Has High School Diploma (Grade 12)
50=Some College (Grades 13 to 15)
60=Has College Degree (Grade 16)
70=Graduate or Professional Training (See Table 12)

Sex

Respondent's sex is:

1. Male
5. Female

Race

Respondent's race is:

1. White
2. Negro
3. Oriental, other
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