ISA/SSM/Conf.2/21-29

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE

24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS

24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale

et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification

and Social Mobility

COMMUNICATIONS

PAPERS

Vol. III

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/21-29

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE

24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS

24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale

et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification

and Social Mobility

COMMUNICATIONS

PAPERS

Vol. III

TABLE DES MATIERES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/21.

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE
24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I.

Stratification sociale et Mobilité sociale.

Sect. I.

Social Stratification and Social Mobility.

Die Bedeutung des Schichtungsbegriffes für die Analyse der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft

by

Professor Dr. H. von Schelsky,

Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft, Hamburg.

Die Bedeutung des Schichtungsbegriffes für die Analyse der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft

by

Professor Dr. H. von Schelsky,

Akademie für Gemeinwirtschaft, Hamburg.

Der Begriff der sozialen Schichtung scheint zunächst eine rein formal-soziologische Grundkategorie zu sein, die auf alle Gesellschaften zu allen Zeiten gleichmässig anwendbar ist, wobei das Kriterium der jeweiligen Schichtenstufung beliebig variiert und kombiniert werden kann (Einkommenshöhe, Besitzstand, Ausmass der politischen und wirtschaftlichen Rechte usw.) Tatsächlich stammt er aus der Selbstdeutung der Klassengesellschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts; die Lehren von der sozialen Schichtung in der neueren Soziologie verwenden also einen ideologisch abgeblassten, realistisch differenzierten Klassenbegriff. Seine analytische Fruchtbarkeit bleibt daher begrenzt auf den Bestand einer Klassenstruktur der Gesellschaft; sobald sich die Klassenunterschiede in einer Gesellschaft verwischen und die sozialen Spannungen aus anderen Quellen als denen der Klassenlage entspringen, wird der Schichtungsbegriff verhältnismässig bedeutungslos und unergiebig für die soziologische Analyse, weil er die wesentlichen dynamischen Gesetzlichkeiten dieser Gesellschaft gar nicht mehr erfasst.

Zu diesen Einsichten scheint uns insbesondere eine Analyse der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft zu führen, in der durch die Radikalität der sozialen und politischen Ereignisse die Überwindung der ehemaligen Klassenstruktur der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft vielleicht am weitesten fortgeschritten ist und die daher in dieser Entwicklung vorbildlich ein, wenn auch in vielen Wesenszügen spezifisch deutsch bleibendes, Beispiel für die neuere allgemeine Entwicklungsgesetzlichkeit der europäisch industrialisierten Zivilisation abgibt. Aber auch ohne diesen Anspruch auf Verallgemeinerung dürften die Grenzen und die noch vorhandene Bedeutsamkeit des Schichtungsbegriffes für die Analyse der deutschen Gesellschaft von allgemeinerem wissenschaftlichen Interesse sein; wir haben sie vor allem in umfangreichen empirischen Untersuchungen über die gegenwärtigen sozialen Verhaltensweisen der deutschen Familie sowie über die Rolle der arbeitenden und arbeitslosen Jugend, insbesondere ihre Berufs- und Aufstiegswünsche, in der gegenwärtigen sozialen Situation Deutschlands feststellen können (vgl. Literaturhinweis am Ende des Berichts). Leider können wir die daraus erwachsenen Grundgedanken nur in einigen kurzen Thesen darstellen:

1. In der deutschen Gesellschaft der letzten zwei Generationen sind umfangreiche soziale Aufstiegs-und Abstiegsprozesse vor sich gegangen: zunächst bildet der kollektive Aufstieg der Industriearbeiterschaft und der mehr individuell, im ganzen aber ebenfalls schichtbildend vor sich gehende Aufstieg der technischen und Verwaltungs-Angestellten in den neuen Mittelstand die breite Aufstiegsmobilität der industriell-bürokratischen Gesellschaft. Mit diesen Aufstiegsprozessen kreuzen sich in etwas jüngerer Zeit breite soziale Abstiegs- und Deklassierungsprozesse, die im 1. Weltkrieg begannen, in den Jahren nach 1945 in den Heimatvertreibungen, politisch bedingten Deklassierungen usw. bisher kulminierten und besonders die Schichten des ehemaligen Besitz- und Bildungsbürgertums betroffen haben. Das Zusammenwirken dieser sich begegnenden Richtungen der sozialen Mobilität führt zunächst zu einer ausserordentlichen Steigerung der sozialen Mobilität an sich, darüber hinaus aber vor allem zu einem relativen Abbau der Klassengegensätze, einer Entdifferenzierung der alten, noch ständisch geprägten Berufsgruppen und damit zu einer sozialen Nivellierung in einer verhältnismässig einheitlichen Gesellschaftsschicht, die ebenso wenig proletarisch wie bürgerlich ist, d.h. durch den Verlust der Klassenspannung und sozialen Hierarchie gekennzeichnet wird. Eine umfassende und sich ständig ausdehnende Sozialpolitik auf der einen und eine strenge, sich in den Einkommenstufen sehr schnell verschärfende Steuerpolitik auf der anderen Seite werden zu Dauerfaktoren dieses sozialen Nivellierungsprozesses, dem sich heute nur noch wenige und kleine Gruppen entziehen.

2. Der Nivellierung des realen wirtschaftlichen und politischen Status folgt weitgehend eine Vereinheitlichung der sozialen und kulturellen Verhaltensformen in einem Lebenszuschnitt, den man, gemessen an der alten Schichtenstufung, in der "unteren Mitte" lokalisieren und daher als kleinbürgerlich-mittelständisch bezeichnen könnte. Dieser verhältnismässig einheitliche Lebensstil der nivellierten Mittelstandsgesellschaft wird keineswegs mehr von der Substanz einer sozial irgendwie hierarchisch gegliederten oder geschichteten Gesellschaftsverfassung geprägt, sondern diese "mittelständische" Lebensform erfüllt sich darin, einheitlich an den materiellen und geistigen Gütern des Zivilisationskomforts teilzunehmen. Der universale Konsum der industriellen und publizistischen Massenproduktionen sorgt auf der materiellen und geistigen Ebene dafür, dass fast jedermann seinen Fähigkeiten angemessen das Gefühl entwickeln kann, nicht mehr ganz "unten" zu sein, sondern an der Fülle und dem Luxus des Daseins schon teilhaben zu können. In diesem Sinne liegt in der industriellen Massenproduktion von Konsum-, Komfort- und Unterhaltungsgütern, deren sich auch die ehemals oberen, bürgerlichen Schichten heute schon voll bedienen, die wirksamste Überwindung des Klassenzustandes der industriellen Gesellschaft selbst begründet, allerdings auch ihre Uniformierung in Lebensstil und sozialen Bedürfnissen. Diese verhältnismässige Nivellierung ehemals schichttypischer Verhaltensstrukturen des Familienlebens, der Berufs- und Ausbildungswünsche der Kinder, der Wohn-, Verbrauchs- und Unterhaltungsformen, ja der kulturellen, politischen und wirtschaftlichen Reaktionen ist der vielleicht dominierendste Vorgang in der Dynamik der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft.

3. Damit kann die soziale Mobilität innerhalb der deutschen Sozialverfassung nicht mehr wesentlich als ein Umschichtungsvorgang, d.h. als der Prozess des sozialen Aufstiegs und Abstiegs innerhalb vorhandener sozialer Schichten verstanden werden, sondern allenfalls gerade als Entschichtungsvorgang, als ein Abbau der Bedeutung gesellschaftlicher Schichten überhaupt. Tatsächlich löst sich die soziale Mobilität, indem sie universal wird, mehr und mehr von der Schichtungsgesetzlichkeit ab und gewinnt andere, wahrscheinlich rein dynamische Kriterien. Selbstverständlich bleibt eine Analyse der sozialen Schichtung auch in der nivellierten Mittelstandsgesellschaft nach den alten Kriterien möglich, da deren Kennzeichen ja nicht ganz verwischt sind; es ist aber fraglich, ob damit noch Gruppierungen erfasst werden, aus deren sozialen Status man wirklich spezifische, einheitliche und gemeinsame soziale Interessen und Bedürfnisse ableiten kann.

Von den Versuchen, neue und andere Kriterien als die der Schichtung für die Analyse des Aufbaus der deutschen Gesellschaft zu gewinnen, sei ein Beispiel erwähnt, das die verschiedenartige Abhängigkeit der Lebensführung und Existenzerhaltung von den bürokratischen Grossorganisationen der modernen Gesellschaft zum Kennzeichen der sozialen Gruppierung macht: L. Neundörfer [1] unterscheidet in dieser Hinsicht zunächst die Gruppe der "Diensttuenden", die er dadurch charakterisiert, dass sie die Freiheit in der Disposition ihrer Alltagsarbeit nicht mehr besitzt, sondern ihr Eigenverantwortung und Initiative, allerdings auch das Risiko dafür durch irgendwelche bürokratisch genormten und verantworteten Anweisungen abgenommen werden; sie umfasst vor allen alle Arbeiter, Angestellten und Beamten, dazu noch viele Berufe, die nur noch als pseudo-selbständig betrachtet werden können (Ärzte in ihren Verhältnis zu Krankenkassen usw.). Die zweite Gruppe ist die der Sozialrentner, die ohne jeden Bezug auf berufliche Arbeit in ihrer Existenz überhaupt nur von den Massnahmen bürokratischer Daseinsvorsorge abhängen. Als dritte Gruppe bleiben die sogenannten Selbständigen, also vor allen der alte Mittelstand der bäuerlichen Landwirtschaft, des Handwerks und Handels, die noch in höherem Masse Freiheit und Risiko in der Disposition der eigenen beruflichen und wirtschaftlichen Tätigkeit haben, obwohl auch diese Gruppe der allgemeinen Tendenz zur Rückversicherung in bürokratischen Grossorganisationen mehr und mehr folgt. Das Zahlenverhältnis dieser Gruppen in der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft is grob gesprochen 3 : 1 : 1; es ist keine Frage, dass die gemeinsamen Interessen innerhalb jeder Gruppe heute sehr stark sind, obwohl jeweils sehr verschiedene Einkommens- und soziale Prestigeschichten darin zusammengefasst sind. Strukturbildende, tragende Schicht unserer Gesellschaft ist eindeutig die erste Gruppe, während die anderen nur noch als soziale Randgruppierungen gewertet werden können; eine hierarchische Stufung oder Schichtung dieser Gruppen würde das Wesentliche ihres Unterschiedes völlig verkennen.

4. Der Schichtungsbegriff behält nun in so fern seine Gewichtigkeit in der Analyse der deutschen Gesellschaft, als eine Form des sozialen Verhaltens sich der sonstigen sozialen

Nivellierung bisher entzieht: die sozialen Leitbilder oder das soziale Selbstbewusstsein der einzelnen. Gegen nichts wehrt sich das Sozialbewusstsein der kleinbürgerlichen und mittelständischen Menschen mehr als gegen die sozialen Standortlosigkeit ohne gesellschaftlichen Rang und Geltung, deshalb wird typischerweise in dieser nivellierten Gesellschaft die Rangfolge der Prestigeschichtung der alten Klassengesellschaft gewahrt und festgehalten, ja in vielen Fällen betont man die Zugehörigkeit zu bestimmten alten Prestigegruppen heute stärker als früher, obwohl hinter diesen Formen der "Einbildung" kaum noch soziale Realitäten stehen. Diesen Festhalten an veralteten sozialen Leitbildern entspricht das Verharren der weitgehend gewandelten Gesellschaft in ihren alten politischen Ideen und Frontenstellungen, wie überhaupt gerade die nivellierte Mittelstandsgesellschaft ideologische zu Restaurationen jeder Art neigt.

Die Ursache für dieses Verharren in alten sozialen Prestigebild scheint uns darin zu liegen, dass eine permanente und universale soziale Mobilität die Entwicklung statischer sozialer Sicherheits- und Geltungsvorstellungen gar nicht gestattet und da sich die Ansprüche darauf als tiefverwurzelte menschliche Grundantriebe erweisen, können sie in einer rein dynamischen Gesellschaft in wesentlichen nur an alten sozialen Idealen und Ideologien eines noch statischen Gesellschaftszustandes orientiert werden. Dies führt zu einer konstitutionellen Irrealität des sozialen Selbstbewusstseins in der nivellierten hochdynamischen Gesellschaft der industriellen Zivilisation.

5. Dies zeigt sich vor allen in der Unerfüllbarkeit der sozialen Aufstiegsbedürfnisse. Die Stabilität des sozialen Status in einer statischen Schichtungsgesellschaft vermochte begründete soziale Sicherheitsgefühle zu verbreiten; in einer alle Bevölkerungsgruppen umfassenden grundsätzlichen sozialen Mobilität muss sich das Bedürfnis nach sozialer Sicherheit in einem Streben nach ständigen sozialen Aufstieg, in einem immer Mehr-haben-Wollen und immer Mehr-sein-Wollen äussern. Soziale Unsicherheit und soziales Aufstiegsstreben bedingen sich dann gegenseitig und werden beide universal. Gerade die Deklassierungen und Verelendungen ehemals bürgerlicher Schichten und die Entwurzelung der ostdeutsch-ländlichen Bevölkerung haben den Willen zum sozialen Aufstieg, der schon früher den Mittelstand, das Kleinbürgertum und die Arbeiterschaft beherrschte, heute zu einen allgemeinen Kennzeichen der deutschen Sozialverfassung werden lassen. Darin ist zunächst die gewaltige Mobilisierung sozialer, in diesem Falle vor allem beruflicher und wirtschaftlicher Energien begründet, die zweifellos in der deutschen Nachkriegssituation zu diagnostizieren ist. Andererseits ist nicht zu verkennen, dass auf die Dauer diese an veralteten Prestigeansprüchen orientierten sozialen Bedürfnisse unerfüllt bleiben müssen, da ja dieser allgemeine Drang zum Aufstieg auf der sozialen Leiter zusammentrifft mit einen Abbau oder doch einer starken Verkürzung der sozialen "Leitern" überhaupt; so wird die Unerfüllbarkeit der sozialen Aufstiegsbedürfnisse zu einen konstitutionellen Kennzeichen der sich nivellierenden Gesellschaft werden, aus den sich sehr entscheidende soziale Spannungen ergeben können.

6. Mit dieser Entwicklung hat eine Frage der älteren deutschen Soziologie eine unerwartete Antwort gefunden: die Analyse der sozialen Schichtung der deutschen Bevölkerung zu Ende der 20er und zu Beginn der 30er Jahre stiess im sogenannten Mittelstandsproblem stets auf die besondere Schwierigkeit, dass der Widerspruch zwischen realem sozialen Status und dem Prestigebild des sozialen Selbstbewusstseins in dieser Schicht, insbesondere in der Gruppe der Angestellten, eine klare Zuordnung dieser Gruppen innerhalb der Schichtung der Klassengesellschaft verhinderte (vgl. die Arbeiten von Schumpeter, Geiger, Michels, Lederer-Marschack, Kracauer, Grünberg, Dreyfuss u.a.). Zwei Erwartungen wurden mit der sozialen Entwicklung dieser Schicht verbunden: entweder dass sich ihre "falsche bürgerliche Ideologie" ihren realen Status als Lohnempfänger anpassen und sie daher in die Schicht des Proletariats eingehen werde oder dass sie ein autonomes mittelständisches Sozialbewusstsein noch entwickeln und damit als eine selbständige Klasse zum vermittelnden Glied im proletarisch-bürgerlichen Klassendualismus werden würde. Beide Erwartungen haben sich nicht erfüllt, weil eben jene schwer ortbare mittelständische Schicht die anderen Klassen in sich aufzusaugen beginnt. Es gibt kein soziologisches Mittelstandsproblem mehr, weil es heute zur Problematik der Gesamtgesellschaft geworden ist, die sich zu einer mittelständisch-bürgerlichen Einheitsschicht zu nivellieren beginnt, zu der die "falsche Ideologie" ebenso gehört wie die Tatsache, dass weder Einkommenslage noch Berufszugehörigkeit auf die Dauer ausschlaggebend werden für die Selbstzuordnung innerhalb einer festgehaltenen veralteten Prestigeschichtung der Gesellschaft.

Diese aus der Analyse der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft gewonnenen Einsichten scheinen mir die Frage aufzuwerfen, ob es bei einer internationalen vergleichenden Forschung über soziale Schichtung und Mobilität wirklich genügt, die gleichen Kriterien in der Bestimmung der sozialen Schichten und des Umfanges und der Reichweite sozialer Auf- und Abstiege anzuwenden oder ob nicht die Bedeutsamkeit der Schichtungsgesetzlichkeiten in der Dynamik der verschiedenen Gesellschaften so unterschiedlich ist, dass mit diesen in gleicher Methode und Definition erhobenen Daten über soziale Schichtung und Mobilität doch sehr verschieden wichtige Vorgänge für das soziale Leben einer bestimmten Gesellschaft erfasst werden. So scheinen mir in Deutschland die aus der sozialen Schichtung sich ergebenden Spannungen und Entwicklungsgesetzlichkeiten verhältnismässig bedeutungslos z.B. gegenüber den Spannungen aus der Interessengegensätzlichkeit der intimen primären Gruppierungen einerseits und der abstrakten bürokratischen Grossorganisationen andererseits. Eine international vergleichende Forschung über soziale Schichtung und Mobilität kann also nicht an der Frage vorbeigehen, welche Rolle denn soziale Schichtung sowie sozialer Abstieg und Aufstieg überhaupt noch in der gesamten Entwicklungsgesetzlichkeit der jeweiligen Gesellschaft spielen, und wird dabei zweifellos zu sehr gewichtigen Unterschieden kommen.

FUSSNOTEN

1. L. Neundörfer, "Die Auswirkungen der Flüchtlingsfrage auf die westdeutsche Sozialstruktur", in"Das deutsche Flüchtlingsproblem", Ztschr. für Raumforschung, Bielefeld 1950; ders., Unser Schicksal, Frankfurt 1948.

Literaturhinweis:

Diese Thesen sind in folgenden Veröffentlichungen an einen umfangreichen empirischen Material dargestellt worden:

1) Helmut Schelsky, Wandlungen der deutschen Familie in der Gegenwart, Ardey-Verlag, Dortmund 1953.

2) Arbeitslosigkeit und Berufsnot der Jugend, herausgegeben vom Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbund, erarbeitet von der Sozialwissenschaftlichen Arbeitsgemeinschaft unter der Leitung von Prof. H. Schelsky, Bund-Verlag Køln 1952, 2 Bände.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/22

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE
24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September, 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale
et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification
and Social Mobility

Des Obstacles à l'Ascension sociale par les Etudes

par

Sylvain DE COSTER
Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles

Des Obstacles à l'Ascension sociale par les Etudes

par

Sylvain DE COSTER
Université de Bruxelles.

I.

Des statistiques figurant dans les travaux dont la bibliographie suit cette communication, montrent qu'en Belgique et en France l'ascension sociale par les études constitue une opération malaisée malgré l'existence d'institutions destinées au contraire à la favoriser. Tout se passe comme si les enfants des classes ouvrières et moyennes sortent difficilement de leur condition sociale familiale. Des obstacles se présentent donc, qui entravent le phénomène de la capillarité sociale. Ce fait s'explique si l'on préfère à l'examen des statistiques une investigation qualitative, entreprise grâce à la méthode des complémentaires et à l'enquête sociale approfondie dans l'observation d'un milieu scolaire qui réunit des adolescents entraînés dans la capillarité sociale. Ce milieu type est l'Ecole Normale Charles Buls à Bruxelles, qui constitue pour la population de l'agglomération bruxelloise (soit 1.000.000 d'habitants ou la huitième partie de la population belge) un établissement destiné à assurer un type d'ascension par les études.

Pendant deux ans, dans le cadre du service médico-psycho-social de cette école, Madame GRAFFAR-FUSS a entrepris un vaste travail de recherche dont les résultats ont été publiés dans deux ouvrages, intitulés: le premier: ENQUETE MEDICO-SOCIALE SUR UN GROUPE D'ADOLESCENTS (Archives belges de Médecine sociale, 1948); le second: L'ASCENSION SOCIALE PAR LES ETUDES (Archives belges de médecine sociale, 1949).

L'investigation a porté sur les étudiants flamands et francophones âgés de 15 à 22 ans. Elle a permis de décrire les caractéristiques de l'étudiant soumis à la capillarité sociale (caractéristiques sociales, médicales, psychologiques et pédagogiques) d'une part, et les modalités du phénomène de l'ascension d'autre part. Dans son second travail, l'auteur a pu étendre son observation sur trois générations successives, ce qui lui a permis de déceler les traits fondamentaux du phénomène. Ces traits montrent tous que la capillarité sociale est soumise historiquement à un ensemble de conditions qui n'étaient que partiellement connues - pour notre pays - avant l'investigation résumée ici. Enumérons, à titre explicatif, six de ces conditions.

1ère condition: L'ascension sociale par les études dépend en premier lieu de l'attraction des grandes villes. Les générations passent successivement du village reculé au chef-lieu de la province; à un stade ultérieur la famille s'installe dans un quartier populaire de la capitale; lorsque l'ascension est terminée, elle aboutit à la fixation dans un quartier bourgeois ou résidentiel. La satisfaction de la capillarité sociale a lieu à l'aide d'un déplacement géographique.

2ème condition: Le déplacement géographique est doublé d'une limitation progressive et volontaire des naissances.

3ème condition: Ces deux traits s'accompagnent d'un trosième, l'évolution dans la profession des parents, qui passent de l'état de cultivateur à celui de travailleur manuel, puis d'ouvrier qualifié, enfin d'employé.

4ème condition: Ces modifications psycho-sociales des familles s'accompagnent évidemment d'une évolution des revenus, puisque la recherche d'une amélioration des conditions de vie préside à l'origine de la capillarité sociale. Contrairement à ce que l'on pourrait croire, l'ascension sociale - aux stades intermédiaires - n'améliore pas les revenus réels; elle n'entraîne que l'évolution des signes extérieurs du bien-être. L'amélioration réelle n'a lieu que dans 25 % des cas.

5ème condition: Par contre, l'état intellectuel des parents s'améliore. A la première génération, les parents n'ont pas fait d'études; à la deuxième, ils ont bénéficié de l'enseignement primaire; à la troisième, de l'enseignement moyen (souvent du degré inférieur). Ainsi l'ascension est sollicitée par l'état intellectuel des parents, que ceux-ci désirent dépasser au profit de leur progéniture diminuée progressivement en nombre.

6ème condition: La capillarité sociale pour aboutir à la troisième génération, demande l'intégrité médico-sociale de chaque génération. La maladie, les accidents médicaux et sociaux, la mort de l'un des membres de la famille, freinent ou suppriment l'effort d'ascension.

L'énoncé de ces conditions fait apparaître clairement que l'ascension sociale par les études constitue en tout état de cause une opération difficile. Celle-ci s'étend dans le temps et est soumise à des fluctuations. Elle n'est satisfaite réellement non point après l'effort de trois générations, mais seulement à la quatrième. Il y a lieu d'observer aussitôt que l'état psychologique et moral des familles réalisant l'ascension sociale enveloppe des conditions d'éducation détestables pour les enfants. L'effort d'ascension est à chaque génération en retard sur l'état culturel (intellectuel, moral et social) auquel aboutit l'enfant grâce à ses études. Aux dernières générations, l'effort des parents pour leur enfant unique exige bien souvent le travail hors du foyer du père et de la mère. L'enfant baigne dans des conceptions utilitaires, son développement n'est pas harmonieux; il ne trouve jamais ou très rarement dans sa famille les ressources intellectuelles, morales et esthétiques compatibles avec ses études. L'étudiant souffre d'une atmosphère dont les préoccupations intellectuelles sont bannies. Un conflit de générations, plus grave qu'ailleurs, oppose, dans la famille, l'enfant à ses parents, auxquels il reproche leur caractère fermé, l'absence de relations sociales, le manque de préoccupations intellectuellement élevées. (+)

II.

On aura remarqué, à mesure que notre examen se poursuivait, que derrière les phénomènes sociaux exposés, se situent des phénomènes d'une autre nature qui sont proprement des phénomènes psychologiques. La volonté des êtres humains est présente dans l'ascension sociale par les études. Il importe dès lors de s'interroger sur les opinions. Je veux dire que la résistance à l'ascension, que les échecs révèlent, ne peut être d'une manière simpliste inscrite seulement au déterminisme social. Les causes des faits sont, en ce domaine, complexes de nature. L'examen de ces causes, grâce à l'enquête sociale approfondie des cas individuels, révèle des mobiles souvent divers.

Il y aurait lieu, à propos de cette dernière analyse, de raconter par le détail une série d'observations que, faute de place, nous ne pouvons point exposer. Ces observations font apparaître des facteurs appartenant,

---

(+) Les renseignements précédents sont puisés dans: A. Graffar-Fuss L'ASCENSION SOCIALE PAR LES ETUDES (Archives belges de Médecine sociale, etc.) P. 254 et suivantes.

d'une part, à la classe sociale d'où l'individu prend le départ et, d'autre part, à la classe sociale dans laquelle il désire s'intégrer. Dans les deux cas, ces facteurs peuvent se scinder en facteurs apparents et immédiatement décelables et en facteurs obscurs et malaisés à saisir. Il n'est point possible d'énumérer l'ensemble de ces facteurs, nous allons toutefois signaler ceux qui nous paraissent les plus évidents.

1. FACTEURS DE RESISTANCE CHEZ CEUX QUI S'ELEVENT.

1er groupe: Facteurs apparents.

1°- Le coût des études progressivement plus élevé à mesure que l'enfant avance en âge constitue un obstacle grave. Les bourses, les prêts aux études ne sont que des palliatifs. Les associations d'étudiants n'ignorent point l'importance de ce facteur. L'examen des cas particuliers révèle combien ce facteur peut apparaître brusquement dans l'histoire des familles, là surtout où deux enfants font des études.

2°- L'incidence du coût des études, ainsi que des revenus des parents, sur la possibilité matérielle des études est signalée chaque fois que des accidents mettent en péril l'intégrité des familles. La maladie d'un membre de la famille, y compris une maladie grave de l'enfant, dont les soins sont longs et coûteux, ruine parfois l'effort d'une ou de deux générations. Outre que ces accidents constituent une entrave surtout matérielle à la poursuite des études des enfants, il importe d'insister sur les conséquences psychologiques et morales qu'entraînent les difficultés pécuniaires. L'inquiétude des parents retentit sur l'enfant s'il est bien doué et de moralité élevée. Dans un certain nombre de cas, c'est l'enfant lui-même qui refuse de reprendre l'effort, l'accident surmonté, pour des motifs supérieurs: le refus d'accepter les privations des parents.

Sous la même rubrique l'on peut classer la rupture du groupe familial consécutive à la mésentente des parents. Une famille atteinte de capillarité sociale est souvent unie dans la poursuite de l'idée commune: l'union affective constitue, dans ces ménages, le terrain qui permet la continuité de l'effort de tous les membres de la collectivité.

3°- On doit signaler que les difficultés des études croissent avec l'âge des étudiants, du fait qu'une sélection progressive laisse présents dans les classes - peu à peu - les seuls élèves vraiment doués. C'est, dès lors, dans les études inférieures et notamment de 6 à 15 ans que l'effort d'ascension semble être récompensé pour le plus grand nombre de ceux qui l'entreprennent. Les échecs scolaires, surtout à partir de 12 ans, abattent la volonté, révèlent peu à peu les insuffisances caractérielles et les aptitudes réelles aux études. La progression des difficultés rend plus vifs les échecs, arrête l'effort, produit des ratés et stérilise le désir des parents.

4°- Au cours des études, la conscience d'appartenir à une classe sociale déterminée perturbe l'effort d'ascension. Comme l'effort est entrepris par l'enfant du point de vue intellectuel et par les parents du point de vue matériel, l'on se trouve rapidement dans une situation familiale disharmonique susceptible de produire des conflits à l'intérieur de la famille, qui se répercutent sur la situation de l'enfant dans les écoles (et notamment dans les études secondaires, normales, etc...). La conscience de faire partie d'un groupe social disgrâcié, conscience que la vie quotidienne développe, accuse psychologiquement les traits distinctifs des classes sociales et engendre des facteurs d'inadaptation scolaire. Au cours de notre pratique, nous avons dû intervenir de nombreuses fois - à la demande des parents, à la

demande aussi de grands adolescents - pour supprimer ou minimiser l'influence de l'état d'esprit affectif créé par l'inadaptation de ce type. Ce phénomène, ainsi que celui de la crise d'originalité juvénile dans ses relations avec l'inadaptation scolaire, mériterait à lui seul une étude approfondie.

Dans d'autres cas, la conscience de la classe sociale se développe à la longue chez les parents et les autres membres de la famille au détriment de l'étudiant pour qui les sacrifices matériels sont consentis. Elle conduit à des réactions d'une gravité parfois exceptionnelle où l'enfant bien doué devient la victime de l'incompréhension de parents plus soucieux de leur bien-être que des progrès spirituels de leur enfant. Ici encore, la pratique m'a personnellement révélé la nature psychologique de ces réactions qui sont souvent l'expression d'obscures modalités de l'instinct parental.

2ème groupe: Facteurs profonds.

1°- L'évolution psychogénétique des enfants et des adolescents s'opère à partir d'une différenxiation de l'origine sociale. Cette différentiation entraîne deux conséquences:

a) Il est admis psychologiquement, d'après les recherches faites selon les échelles d'intelligence, que les écarts des niveaux de langage et d'intelligence entre les classes sociales ou les groupes professionnels (enfants d'ouvriers, de la bourgeoisie, de la ville, de la campagne, de la grande ville ou de la petite ville, etc.) se rapprochent jusqu'à disparaître après la puberté, dans le cas où les enfants entreprennent des études secondaires. Cette constatation, faite dès le début de ce siècle, traduit un état réel qu'il n'est point permis de nier.

b) Les travaux récents, auquel il a été fait allusion au début de ce rapport, montrent toutefois l'état incomplet des investigations citées. La raison de ce fait s'explique: les recherches ont été conduites dans une direction unilatérale qui a gauchi les phénomènes décelés. Somme toute, l'on a omis de déceler l'existence des facteurs affectifs et des facteurs sociaux, - d'une part; l'on a omis d'étudier les faits sur des générations successives - ainsi que l'a fait Termann aux Etats-Unis - d'autre part; l'on s'est contenté enfin de faire des constatations à des moments donnés de l'évolution psychogénétique sans les relier à leur causalité réelle.

La complexité des faits révèle au contraire que si les écarts se rapprochent du point de vue intellectuel jusqu'à se confsondre, les écarts d'origine sociale et leurs répercussions affectives se disjoignent de plus en plus. L'évolution psychologique constitue dès lors à la fois un facteur favorable et un facteur de résistance.

2°- Ce facteur doit d'ailleurs s'interpréter à la lumière de l'évolution caractérielle des adolescents. La puberté et la crise d'originalité juvénile conduisent à un comportement que la situation sociale porte à des extrêmes signalés depuis l'activité du Docteur HEALY, mais à laquelle aucune étude d'ensemble bien positive n'a encore été consacrée. Réactions de timidité et d'acceptation des sentiments d'infériorité d'une part, réactions d'agressivité voire de brutalité compensatoire, d'autre part. Les difficultés caractérielles produisent une inadaptation individuelle, mais elles suscitent à leur tour l'incompréhension des professeurs peu décidés à pratiquer auprès des adolescents une pédagogie d'accompagnement plutôt qu'une pédagogie de la contrainte. Notre pratique révèle des échecs d'ascension dus au comportement des adolescents, dus à un comportement artificiellement difficile, mais incompris par les éducateurs.

3°- Il y a lieu d'ajouter à ces deux facteurs, la conscience des adolescents en proie à la capillarité sociale, du manque de prestige de leur origine sociale. Les frustrations dues à l'habillement ont été signalées par de nombreux psychologues de l'adolescence. Ces frustrations de nature symbolique accusent l'intensité des facteurs précédemment signalés.

4°- Il y a enfin les chutes de la volonté qui arrêtent le bien-doué, particulièrement pendant l'adolescence. Monsieur DE CRAECKER les a signalées dans son ouvrage sur les biens doués d'après les travaux de l'Ecole de Terman. Notre pratique montre qu'il ne s'agit point en l'occurence de caractéristiques propres à la jeunesse américaine, mais qu'elles marquent également la jeunesse belge.

2. FACTEURS DE RESISTANCE DUS A L'EXISTENCE DE LA CLASSE SOCIALE OU L'ON VEUT ABOUTIR.

Il n'est point malaisé, maintenant, d'énumérer parallèlement les facteurs de résistance propres à la classe sociale dans laquelle on désire s'intégrer. Il suffit de reprendre les données déjà fournies pour établir celle-ci.

J'ajouterai seulement le commentaire suivant.

A mesure que l'on a affaire à des groupes sociaux plus hautement hiérarchisés, l'on entre dans des collectivités de mieux en mieux fermées, c'est-à-dire rétives au recrutement de membres nouveaux. La cohésion de ces groupes, dont les membres sont de moins en moins nombreux, n'est pas due seulement à la puissance progressivement plus grande de l'argent, mais encore au prestige, au résidu de culture intellectuelle, esthétique et morale immédiatement disponible pour les enfants, à l'entr'aide automatique de leurs membres quand il s'agit de conserver de génération à génération le monopole des relations sociales et des caractères de la classe sociale.

Contrairement à ce qu'une idéologie politique facile a pu faire croire au public, ces facteurs ne sont pas susceptibles de s'opposer à la mobilité sociale. C'est pourquoi les facteurs de résistance propres à ceux qui opèrent l'ascension sont à coup sûr plus déterminants que ceux relatifs aux classes sociales où l'on veut s'intégrer.

III.

Les considérations précédentes prouvent que l'analyse psychologique peut apporter à l'investigation sociologique un apport précieux.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE.

1. - HEUYER, PIERON, Mme PIERON, SAUVY: Le niveau intellectuel des enfants d'âge scolaire. Institut national d'ét. dém., Paris, P.U.F. 1950, 8°, 283 p.

2. - Institut supérieur de Pédagogie, Morlanwelz: Rapport sur le niveau d'instruction primaire en Hainaut. Charleroi, 1947.

3. J. COLLARD: "La première orientation au sortir des écoles primaires officielles". Travaux du Séminaire de Sociologie, Liège 1951.

4. - A. GIRARD: "Une enquête sur les besoins des familles" Population oct. - déc. 1950.

5. - A. GIRARD: "Mobilité sociale et dimension de la famille" Population - janv. - mars 1951

6. - J. BEAUSSIER: "Etudes secondaires et classes sociales" L'Observateur, sept. 1951.

7. - P. MINON: "L'orientation des jeunes au sortir des humanités anciennes" Travaux du Séminaire de Sociologie, Liège T.I.

8. - Institut national de Statistique et des Etudes économiques: "Enquêtes sur la situation familiale et sociale des étudiants en France" Paris, 1951.

9. - A. GRAFFAR-FUSS: "Enquête médico-sociale sur un groupe d'adolescents" Archives belges de médecine sociale, etc. 1948.

10. - OGBURN (W.F.) and NIMKOFF (M.F.): Sociology. Boston, 1946.

11. - CENTERS (F.): The psychology of social classes. New Jersey 1949.

12. - DE CRAECKER (R.): Les enfants intellectuellement doués. Paris 1950

13. - ROGOFF (N.): Les recherches américaines sur la mobilité sociale Population, oct. - déc. 1950.

14. - WARNER (M.L.), NECKER (B.), ERELS (K.): Social class in America. Chicago, 1950.

15. - S.DE COSTER et J. RUYTINCKX: Du droit de participer à la Vie Culturelle. Ligue de l'Enseignement - Document n°137 - 1952

16. - en préparation:

S.DE COSTER et G. GIOSSENS: "La variabilité pédagogique des adolescents de 12 à 15 ans (un volume).

S. DE COSTER et G. VANDERELST: "Les facteurs psycho-sociaux de l'ascension sociale par les études (un volume).

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/23.

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIÈGE

24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS

24 August - 1 September 1953.

Sect. I.

Stratification sociale et Mobilité sociale.

Sect. I.

Social Stratification and Social Mobility.

HIGHER CIVIL SERVANTS IN FRANCE

by

Thomas Bottomore,

London School of Economics.

HIGHER CIVIL SERVANTS IN FRANCE

by

Thomas Bottomore,

London School of Economics.

I. Introduction.

The present paper is concerned with an elite, the French higher civil service, and with the social origins and social status of its members. The paper is based on material so far available from research which I am directing in France, and which itself forms part of a more comprehensive study of social stratification and mobility undertaken by the Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques of Paris.

The importance of the administrative elite in modern industrial societies is not likely to be contested. Public administration of a vast range of public services is one of the basic conditions of life of such societies. Higher civil servants have, therefore, a considerable and increasing power, which is enhanced in democratic countries by the permanence of the administration compared with the impermanence of governments. This circumstance is particularly influential in France, where there have been in the past 150 years rather frequent changes of political regime as well as a rapid succession of governments under each regime.

For the sociologist who is interested in social stratification the modern development of the administration presents many problems deserving careful study; the transformation of the middle classes, the emergence of new elites and changes in the balance of power between elites. Higher civil servants may be regarded either as members of the existing upper class, or, together with their counterparts in private administration, as a new social class (the "managerial" class) which is steadily achieving a predominant position in society. The outlook and behaviour of the administrative elite is influenced by the social origins of its members, as well as by its own social function. If the great majority of its members come from the upper class it is likely to form, along with other elites, a scarcely distinguishable part of this class, whereas if its members are drawn in substantial numbers from several social classes it is more likely to constitute an independent elite and perhaps the nucleus of an emerging social class.

From the point of view of social mobility, public administration, where entry is by competitive examination, must be regarded as an important channel of social ascent. The possibilities of ascent are, of course, affected not only by the rules governing recruitment and promotion within the administration itself, but also by the conditions of access to education and particularly higher education.

A great deal could be learned on these questions from comparative studies of the higher civil service in different societies, and the present research will I hope contribute to making such studies possible at a later date. In a short paper of this kind I cannot discuss in detail the various problems I have mentioned. I propose, therefore, after some brief comments on the history of the French civil service, to examine two matters; first, the changing social status of higher civil servants, and secondly, the social origins and educational background of higher civil servants appointed since the reform of the French civil service in 1945.

II. A historical note.

In the words of a recent French writer [1] "L'administration de la France moderne a été pensée deux fois, par Richelieu d'abord, par Bonaparte ensuite". The administrative apparatus which Napoleon created and established between 1800 and 1802 had two features which remained characteristic of the French administration at least until 1945; it was highly centralised, and it required from civil servants political loyalty to the regime and the govern ment of the day. M. Chavanon refers to "..le souci du premier Consul d'imposer un parfait loyalisme à tous les fonctionnaires et même à tous-ceux qui leur sont comparables".[2] The insistence on political loyalty was one influence impeding the attainment of Napoleon's other aim, the "carrière ouverte aux talents". Throughout the 19th century, and in the early part of the present century, every demand for a reform of the civil service (which meant, above all, statutory regulation of conditions of entry and employment) was met by the argument that nothing could be done which would limit the authority of the government over its officials. Lefas, writing in 1913, concludes his survey of attempted reforms with the words, "..pas un progrès, depuis 1830, dans le régime auquel les fonctionnaires sont soumis",[3] and Chardon, writing in 1908, says "Depuis cent ans, tous les partis ont vu clairement que le bien de la nation commandait de donner plus de garanties aux fonctionnaires.... Et toujours, au moment opportun, quelqu'un, parfois un anonyme, s'écrie, "Et l'autorité du gouvernement ! "... L'ombre de Louis XIV surgit; les projets s'évanouissent; les défenseurs se terrent comme des lapins". [4]

The insecurity and subservience which marked the civil servant's career were due principally to the changes of regime and the instability of governments. Each new regime, and each new ministry, tried to strengthen its position by purging the civil service, and installing its own political supporters in the administration. Furthermore, each individual minister, on taking up office, felt obliged to surround himself with a group of advisers and sycophants (the 'cabinet ministeriel'), whose nominal duty it was to transmit his instructions and projects to the permanent officials of the ministry and to exercise a general supervision over the work of the ministry, but who were, in many cases, simply awaiting a suitable reward, in the form of a permanent post in the administration, for their political influence (or that of their family) in the minister's constituency. This kind of corruption and favouritism reached a peak towards the end of the 19th century, and evoked a vigorous opposition, both in par-

liament and outside, where it was the chief stimulus to the growth of the civil service trade unions.[5]

It seems likely, however, that insecurity was the lot chiefly of the middle and lower grade civil servants. Several writers have pointed out that the top civil servants, who belonged to families of the "grande bourgeoisie", survived all changes of régime and government. J.J.Weiss, in an article in the Revue Bleu, November 1882, says, "Combien il me serait facile, l'Almanach impérial et l'Almanach national à la main, de montrer que durant trente-cinq ans, à travers tant de vicissitudes, de Louis-Philippe en République, de République en monarchie impériale, de monarchie impériale en République ....les mêmes départements ministériels se sont invariablement transmis les mêmes favoris, ornés seulement, à chaque révolution, d'un ruban de plus et d'un grade plus haut."[6] A recent writer, M. Beau de Loménie, has traced the history of the bourgeois dynasties since their emergence under the Consulate and has shown how firmly they installed themselves in the high administration.[7]

It is certain that after the foundation of the Ecole libre des Sciences politiques in 1871, the highest posts in the administration, in what are called the grands corps (Conseil d'Etat, Inspection des Finances, and Cour des Comptes) and in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, became a virtual monopoly of the Parisian grande bourgeoisie. From 1877 onwards almost all the successful candidates at the examinations (concours) of the grands corps and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were diplômés of the Ecole libre; thus, for example, in the years 1899- 1936, 116 out of 120 in the Conseil d'Etat, 209 out of 218 in the Inspection des Finances, 83 out of 94 in the Cour des Comptes and 249 out of 284 in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And it is well known that the students of the Ecole libre came almost exclusively from upper class Parisian families.[8] The fees at the school, which was a private institution, were high, and there were no scholarships available before 1938- 39.

Not until 1945 was a thoroughgoing reform of the civil service finally accomplished. The main features of this reform,[9] as it affected the higher civil service, were, the passing of an act regulating conditions of employment, the remodelling of the higher educational system by the creation of Instituts d'Etudes Politiques in Paris (where the Ecole libre des sciences politiques was taken over) and elsewhere, and the centralisation of recruitment to the higher civil service by the foundation of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration which is now responsible for holding a single annual examination on behalf of all the ministries (with a few exceptions). There are two categories at the examination, one for graduates, the other for existing civil servants in lower grades who wish to enter the higher civil service and who need not be graduates. The successful candidates at this examination are appointed as probationary civil servants, and have then to complete a three year course of study at the E.N.A. before being given permanent appointments. I shall discuss the significance of this reform in Part IV of this paper.

III. The social status of higher civil servants.

Under the ancien régime many high administrative posts had become hereditary offices in the possession of families of the aristocracy and the grande bourgeoisie. The social status of these officials was derived from their status as nobles, or from their connections with the court, the fact that they could be regarded as belonging to the king's household. After the Revolution a régime of election to public offices was instituted, but this did not survive the accession of Napoleon to power. Taine has admirably described the change wrought by Napoleon in the administration:

"A présent que les hommes naissent à terre et tous de niveau, enfermés dans un cadre universel et uniforme, la vie sociale ne peut plus leur apparaître que comme un concours, un concours institué, proclamé et jugé par l'Etat; ..... (les) prix sont ses emplois, tous les emplois de l'Etat, politiques, militaires, ecclésiastiques, judiciaires, administratifs, universitaires, tous les titres, honneurs et dignités dont il dispose, tous les grades, depuis le dernier jusqu'au premier de sa hiérarchie.....Selon que la place est plus ou moins haute, elle confère à son possesseur une part plus ou moins grande des biens que tous les hommes désirent et recherchent, argent, autorité, patronage, influence, considération, importance, prééminence sociale; ainsi, selon de rang qu'on atteint dans la hiérarchie, on est quelque chose ou peu de chose; hors de la hiérarchie, on n'est rien." 10)

Thus, from the beginning of the 19th century, the social position of higher civil servants was secure; they were at the top of the most important hierarchy. During the rest of the century they were able, on the whole, to maintain their high status. Professor W.R. Sharp, writing in 1931, says: "Indeed, down to a generation ago, public employment enjoyed a prestige equalled by perhaps no other profession or industry. Whether of aristocratic or bourgeois lineage, every family felt it must place at least one of its sons in the service of the State." 11) Their status began to decline, however, towards the end of the 19th century; in the words of M. Piétri, "En 1870 encore, le fonctionnaire, c'est l'Etat lui-même. Il puisse, dans l'appui qui lui vient d'en haut, dans la considération dont il se trouve entouré, un prestige et une autorité que nul ne lui conteste.... Depuis lors, et par une insensible dégression, le voici qui perd son éclat. Sa qualité s'affine, mais son rang decroît." 12) The decline in status was partly reflected in the difficulties of recruiting to the civil service from the beginning of this century. Professor Sharp quotes a French writer as saying, "Before the war the father might say to his son, 'If you don't work hard at your studies you will be good only for business'; today, he tends to reverse his admonition: 'If you are not studious you will have to resign yourself to becoming a fonctionnaire'." 13) M. Moufflet writes: "Les concours donnant accès aux carrières publiques sont aujourd'hui désertés. On voit parfois, pour dix places offertes, trois candidats se présenter." 14)

The change has been accounted for in various ways, but it seems that three factors were important. First, in France as in

other industrial countries, the development of the economic system in the 19th century brought into existence a great number of new administrative and professional occupations which provided alternative careers for those who had traditionally entered the higher civil service; at the same time the importance of the State declined relative to other associations, and particularly private business. Secondly, and accompanying the development of industrial capitalism, there took place a change in social values so that wealth and income came to predominate over rank and official position as the main determinants of social status. 15) And thirdly, although higher civil servants had never, since the early part of the 19th century, been highly paid, their real income has fallen significantly in the present century as a consequence largely of the inflations following two world wars. At the time of the Consulate the top civil servants received 25.000 francs a year (equivalent to between 12 and 15 million francs of 1950), while those at the bottom of the civil service scale received only 350 - 400 francs a year. 16) By the end of the 19th century the highest salaries had already been considerably reduced, and they continued to fall, as is shown by a comparison of pre-1914 with post 1945, made by M. Hamiaut, 17) and summarised in the following table:-

Table I.

Office	Annual Salary in 1949 francs	
	1913 or 1914	1949 or 1950
Cour des Comptes, 1er président	3.450.000	1.400.000
Conseil d'Etat, Vice-président	2.875.000	1.400.000
Ambassadeur	4.600.000	1.262.000
Directeur de ministère	2.875.000	1.122.000
Gardien de bureau	115.000	133.000

These figures show not only the consistent fall in the incomes of higher civil servants, but also the compression of the civil service income range. The incomes of the most highly paid civil servants were, in 1800, about 70 times as great as those of the lowest paid; in 1913 they were about 40 times as great, and in 1949 about 10 times as great. M. Raymond Aron has drawn attention to the same phenomenon in relation to the general level of wages; he writes, "... at the end of 1946 the proportion of the wages of a Paris workman to the salary of a conseiller d'Etat .... was about 1 to 5, whereas at the beginning of the 19th century the proportion was 1 to 25 and at the beginning of thr 20th century 1 to 10." 18) A number of other studies show that the incomes of higher civil servants have fallen relatively as well as absolutely, that is to say, compared with the incomes of professional men, businessmen and managers in private industry, and administrators in the nationalised industries. 19)

It is difficult to estimate the total effect of these changes upon the present social status of higher civil servants, and no research material is yet available which would enable us to make a direct evaluation. It seems fairly certain, however, that their status reached its lowest level in the 1930's, and that it has risen since 1945, despite the continued fall in remuneration, with the growth of planning and the extension of the influence of the State. But it is interesting to discover from an enquiry carried out at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris in 1951 that of 65 candidates for the Ecole Nationale d'Administration who were interviewed, 60% said that they only wanted to enter the higher civil service in order to get positions subsequently in private industry or commerce. 20)

Also apparent is the changed relation of the administrative elite to other elites and to the grande bourgeoisie. In the 19th century most higher civil servants themselves belonged to the grande bourgeoisie, by birth or by marriage, by their wealth (as distinct from their incomes), and frequently, by their mode of life and their social outlook. This situation has changed, and higher civil servants probably no longer have the same close links with the grande bourgeoisie. The younger ones, moreover, think of themselves as belonging to a managerial or professional group rather than to the old upper class. These are my own interpretations, derived partly from conversations with civil servants appointed since 1945, and they will need to be corrected and extended when more data becomes available from current research. One factor which has certainly had an important effect on status is the change in the social origins of higher civil servants, and I propose to conclude this paper by giving a brief account of the research done in this field.

IV. The social origins and education of higher civil servants recruited since 1945 through the Ecole Nationale d'Administration.

The "carriere ouverte aux talents" was never a reality, except perhaps in the twenty years following 1789; the bourgeois dynasties soon installed themselves, in the administration as well as in industry, banking and commerce. The civil service reform of 1945 was an attempt to make it a reality in one important sphere of activity. It is too early yet to attempt a definitive assessment of the success of this reform, but interesting to examine the first results. 21)

A study was made of a sample of candidates, and of all the successful candidates, at the examinations of the E.N.A. from 1945 - 51. The subjects were graded into eight occupational categories, 22) (adapted from a scale used by the Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques), according to their fathers' occupations. The detailed results of this study are given in my article referred to in footnote 21). They can be summarised as follows; most of the candidates come from families in four occupational grades I, II, III and V, and more than half (54.5%) from the first two grades. Very few come from the families of independent farmers, skilled & semi-skilled workers, or agricultural workers, and none at all from families of unskilled workers; yet these occupational grades comprise nearly 60% of the adult male population of France.

In the case of successful candidates the disproportion is still more striking, since 65% come from families in the first two occupational grades, which comprise only 9% of the adult male population. It was found, in comparing candidates in the two different categories of examination, that whereas in the graduates examinations 62% of candidates and 75% of successful candidates came from families in the first two occupational grades, in the civil servants examinations the proportions were only 38% and 39% respectively. I concluded this part of my article by saying, "The greatest change (in the social origins of higher civil servants) has resulted from the institution of the civil servants examination, but as civil servants account for less than half the total number either of candidates or of successful candidates, the numbers of higher civil servants recruited from the lower occupational grades are still small in relation to the total. If present trends continue there will still be no more than 3% of higher civil servants recruited from the three lowest occupational grades... which together constitute one third of the adult male population." It is worth emphasising, on the other hand, that even on the broadest interpretation not more than half and probably less than a quarter of the higher civil servants appointed since 1945 through the E.N.A. examinations, come from families belonging to, or connected with, the grande bourgeoisie, and this is a great change from the situation in the 19th century.

Further research showed that an important factor limiting the social area of recruitment to the higher administration, and one which was not greatly affected by the reform of 1945, is the restricted access to higher education. At the examinations of the E.N.A. those candidates with a university degree or diploma had a considerably higher success rate than others, and candidates who possessed in addition a diploma of an Institut d'Etudes Politiques were still more successful.

Table II.

Educational Qualifications	Proportion of candidates successful at the E.N.A. examinations 1945- 51 %
None	0.6
Baccalauréat	3.8
University degree or diploma	10.3
University degree and diploma of an Institut d'Etudes Politiques	14.2

The main route into the higher civil service obviously lies through the universities, even for the civil servant candidates, since many of them are, in fact, graduates and these have much better chances of success than the non-graduates. The social selection of higher civil servants is, therefore, largely influenced by the prior selection of students, first in the lycées and afterwards in the universities. There is, unfortunately,

little information about educational selection in France, but a general impression can be gained from two recently published studies, and from an analysis made in the course of the present research. [23] In the lycées studied only about 5% of the pupils come from families of industrial workers (skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled), and none from families of agricultural workers.[24] In the universities, about 3% of students come from families of industrial workers, and less than 1% from families of agricultural workers. My own analysis of the social origins of students at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris in four post-war years showed that 73% come from families in the upper two occupational grades, none from families of unskilled and agricultural workers, and less than 1/2 % from families of skilled and semi-skilled workers.

If this is a substantially accurate picture of selection for higher education it is not surprising that there are still comparatively few higher civil servants recruited from the lower occupational grades. Furthermore, it appears that in France as in Britain, entry to high status occupations is becoming increasingly dependent upon high educational attainments, and in this case the character of future recruitment to the higher civil service (as well as to other professions) will be mainly affected by the extent to which educational opportunity is equalised for all occupational grades.

V. A note on further research.

The results presented in this paper are provisional as well as limited in scope. Very little research has been done in France on the development of any of the professions, and there is only one study devoted entirely to the French civil service. [25] An important part of the current research will, therefore, be concerned with the development of the higher civil service and its place in the system of stratification. For the more recent period it is hoped to obtain valuable information from a study of the social origins and careers of approximately 1,500 of the present top civil servants. Other research will be directed to tracing the careers of all those who entered the grands corps during the present century, since there has been, in the past, an important interchange of personnel between these corps (especially the Inspection des Finances) and private industry, banking and commerce.

It will be necessary to investigate two particular problems. The first is that of social mobility over several generations. The analysis of the social origins of post-war entrants to the higher civil service shows that few of these entrants come from working class families. It may be, however, that the entrants from families in occupational grades III or V had grandparents who were industrial or agricultural workers, and it has been suggested that one of the important routes of social ascent in France is that of industrial worker or small farmer (father), instituteur (son), and finally one of the higher professions (grandson). In future research, therefore, an attempt will be made to encompass three generations in studying social mobility.

The second problem is that of educational selection. I have shown the importance of higher education for entry to the higher civil service, and some complementary studies of educational selection seem to be indispensable for a proper understanding of the character of recruitment to the higher administration itself. If data are not available in this field they will have to be obtained as part of the current research.

Finally, it is proposed to conduct a number of attitude studies, with a view to estimating the relationship of the administrative elite to other elites and to different social classes.

FOOTNOTES

1) Michel Debré, "La mort de l'Etat républicain".

2) Christian Chavanon, "Les Fonctionnaires et la fonction publique", Cours de l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, 1950- 51. Paris, Les cours de droit.

3) Alexandre Lefas, L'Etat et les fonctionnaires, Paris 1913.

4) Henri Chardon, Les fonctionnaires, Paris 1908.

5) See Lefas, op.cit. chapter 3. Lefas quotes a speech made by M. Steeg in the Chamber of Deputies, on the 8th May 1907, "La plupart des hauts emplois de l'administration, en tout cas ceux qui fatiguent le moins et rapportent le plus, ne sont donnés aujourd'hui comme hier, ni aux fonctionnaires les plus anciens ... ni ... a ceux qui ont fait preuve d'intelligence, d'activité et de compétence dans leur carriere. Ils reviennent à de jeunes attachés qui après avoir fait le gracieux ornement de l'antichambre ministérielle vont occuper les meilleurs postes dans l'administration et dans les sous-préfectures."

6) Quoted by Augustin Hamon, Les maîtres de la France, Paris, Vol. II, p. 212.

7) E. Beau de Loménie, Les responsabilités des dynasties bourgeoises, Vols. I & II, Paris.

8) Pierre Bouffard, "Le recrutement des cadres de la nation" in Revue de Défense Nationale, January 1950: "Aussi ... ses élèves recrutaient-ils essentiellement parmi les classes aisées de la capitale." Beau de Loménie (op.cit. vol. II, p. 119) describes the Ecole libre as "une sorte de séminaire politique où toute la haute société réactionnaire allait envoyer ses fils prendre des leçons..." I hope to publish later an exact analysis of the social origins of students of the Ecole libre at different periods.

9) See Réforme de le Fonction publique, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1945.

10) H. Taine, Les origines de la France contemporaine: Le régime moderne, vol. I, pp. 305- 306.

11) W. R. Sharp, The French Civil Service, New York, 1931, p. 6.

12) Francois Piétri, Preface to André Moufflet, "Monsieur Lebureau et son âme," Paris, 1933.

13) W. R. Sharp, op.cit., p. 87.

14) André Moufflet, op.cit. p.7.

15) Cf. H. Truchy, "L'élite et la fonction publique" in Revue politique et parlementaire, December 1927, pp. 339-348. "(In the 19th century) .... Le rang social ne dépendait de la richesse de l'homme, ni même de sa valeur personnelle; il était assigné par la situation que l'homme occupait et le milieu familial auquel il était agrégé par naissance ou par mariage..... Or la fonction publique conférait le rang social, et certaines fonctions le tout premier rang....."; Th. Barnier, Au service de la chose publique, Paris, 1926, p. 118, "... le critérium de l'envie des foules et, partant, de son respect, est de moins en moins dans l'honneur des charges publiques et de plus en plus dans la fortune."

16) Chavanon, op.cit.

17) Marcel Hamiaut, "La dévaluation monétaire 1914- 50 a écrasé la hiérarchie de la fonction publique", in Revue de Science et de Législation financieres, Oct.- Dec. 1950, pp. 605- 625.

18) Raymond Aron, Social structure and the ruling class, in the British Journal of Sociology, March 1950, p. 15.

19) See, for instance, M. Jouanny "L'administration telle qu'elle est" in Revue administrative, March- April, 1951, and Jan.- Feb. 1952.

20) Pierre Lelong, Politique et fonction publique, Thèse 1952, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris.

21) The material on social origins is presented very briefly since it has already been published and discussed elsewhere; see Thomas Bottomore, La mobilité sociale dans la haute administration francaise, in Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie, Vol. XIII, 1952.

22) The occupational categories are:-

I. Employers and independent professional men
II. Higher civil servants, managers and technicians
III. Artisans and shopkeepers
IV. Independent farmers
V. Lower grade civil servants and clerical workers
VI. Skilled and semi-skilled workers
VII. Agricultural workers
VIII. Unskilled workers

23) These are discussed in my article; see footnote 21).

24) It should be remembered that besides the lycées there are non-State secondary schools, particularly Catholic schools, which also send pupils to the universities.

25) W. R. Sharp, op.cit. This book, moreover, is principally concerned with problems of bureaucracy, and not with those of social stratification and mobility.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/24.

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE
24 aout - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September 1953.

Sect. I.

Stratification sociale et
Mobilité sociale.

Sect. I.

Social Stratification and
Social Mobility.

TRENDS IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY OF POSTWAR RESEARCH

by

Erwin O. Smigel,

Indiana University.

TRENDS IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY OF POSTWAR RESEARCH x)

by

Erwin O. Smigel,

Indiana University.

Many American sociologists have been engaged in research about numerous occupations, their significance for society, and the relationship of specific jobs to peoples' lives. Exactly what occupations have been studied, and what relationships were investigated, and what techniques were used in these investigations have not been recently examined. The main purpose of this paper is to survey the postwar field of occupational sociology in the United States and perhaps find answers to these and other questions.

Origins of Occupational Sociology

Some of the increased interest in occupations on the part of both the general public and the sociologist had its origin in the development of modern techniques of mass production. Emerging capitalism and the industrial revolution converted "callings" into "jobs", and multiplied the number of different occupations to 22.028 by 1949. 1) This minute division of labor has established the need for greater cooperation and integration and has led to the new specialization of management (16) with obvious implications for greater attention to vocations.

Popular interest in occupations was further stimulated by two world wars, which heightened the need for quick production of military equipment, demanded the immediate and proper placement of industrial and military personnel, and created keen competition for labor. Certain classes of workers who possessed critically needed skills or who were employed in strategically important occupations such as farming, were deferred (54) from military service. Men in "non-essential occupations" were subject to the draft and some were sent to the front. Many jobs acquired the reputation of being safe, and became at least one factor for consideration in job choice and in increased interest in occupations.

War was not the only catalyst; depression also helped spark lay interest in occupations. Millions of unemployed men had time to reflect on their career mistakes; they were reminded of their own helplessness and "work" took on new proportions. These and other historical events stimulated the study of work and made it culturally acceptable.

Precedent for the sociological investigation of occupations can be found at the end of the nineteenth century in the works of Spencer (56) and Durkheim (17), and in the nineteen-twenties in the studies of Bogardus (4), Sorokin (55), Donovan (14) and Hughes (32), and in the thirties in the in-

x) Acknowledgement is due Professors C. Kirkpatrick, J.H. Mueller, and H.J. Meyer for their numerous suggestions.

1) Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Vol. 1, Definition of Titles (Washington, D.C.: U.S.Government Printing Office, 1949).

vestigations of Brown (5), Waller (61), Sutherland (59), Cottrell (9) and Davidson and Anderson (12).

Sociology did not immediately take full advantage of this favorable setting. However, additional stimulus was offered the sociologist by business which, while not specifically interested in the study of occupations, was interested in the broader area of work. Business, which continued to expand and to assume increasingly greater responsibilities, looked for aid. The economist, who had prior claim to the study of work, and the newly initiated psychologist had already been called in for consultation. Mayo's famous experiments at the Hawthorne works of the Western Electric Company (53) in the middle twenties, eventually focused attention on the sociologist and presented him with further opportunities to study industry and occupations. Results of the Hawthorne investigations were sufficiently well received so that other industries became interested and the sociologist now found new and profitable careers within industry open to him. In addition, research grants supplied by business but administered by the universities became more plentiful.

In 1936, Henry Pratt Fairchild (18), in his presidential address to the American Sociological Society, called for the study of business. Though some studies of industries and occupations were being pursued about this time, it was not until World War II that an appreciable increase in research in industry and occupations appeared. Additional support came from the establishment of a number of industrial relations centers associated with major universities which specialized, on an interdisciplinary plan, in the study of work. Since 1945, Gardner (22), Moore (48), Whyte (65) and Miller and Form (43) have written texts in Industrial Sociology and many universities have begun to offer courses in this area which tended to increase the interest in occupational sociology. Recently, The American Journal of Sociology devoted two entire issues 2) to the publication of current research and thinking in industrial and occupational sociology. Today, in the United States, the sociologist has not only the proper cultural setting for investigation, but is receiving encouragement from government, business and the universities.

Much of the interest in the sociology of work has focussed on industrial sociology, about which many books and articles have been written (46), (47), (3). This paper, however, is focused primarily on occupational sociology, because of the increased interest in this area and the relative paucity of information concerning the scope and content of this field (37) (21).

In terms of actual situations it is extremely difficult to separate the various branches of the sociology of work. Academically, however, such a separation is not only possible but may be useful. While there is necessarily some overlapping between areas, there is a core of research in each which indicates the difference in emphasis between them. The distinction between occupational and industrial sociology is pointed out by the course descriptions used at Indiana University.

---

2) American Journal of Sociology LIV, No.4 (1949) and LVII, No. 5 (1952).

Industrial Sociology: Sociological analysis of the relationship of modern industrial organization and of labor and management organizations to the political system, the social class system, and other aspects of the larger society and the community; of the formal and informal organizations within industry; of intergroup conflict and processes of adjustment.

Occupational Sociology: Analysis of the professions and occupations; the study of the range, history, social origins and typical career patterns of selected occupations; the social characteristics of occupational and professional groups; the influence of factors such as sex, education and minority group membership upon the selection of a profession or occupation.

In order to survey the field of occupational sociology, the following steps were taken: 1. M.A. and Ph.D. dissertation titles for the years 1946-1951 as listed in the American Journal of Sociology were examined to judge whether or not they could be classified as occupational sociology and to determine the specific interests of graduate students in this area. 2. A list of current studies in sociology for 1953 was obtained from the American Sociological Society, and these titles were similarly examined and classified. 3. A survey of the book reviews in the American Journal of Sociology and the American Sociological Review was undertaken as indications of the type and extent of books in this area. These books will be referred to where necessary to supplement the discussion. 4. The most important step in this survey was the classification into pertinent categories of the articles on occupational sociology published in four major American sociological journals: The American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, Social Forces, and Sociology and Social Research, for the years 1946 through 1952.

Analysis of Theses for 1946 - 1951

Current interest in a field is often reflected in the work of graduate students. Table I indicates that approximately 9 per cent of the total number of theses in sociology for 1946 - 1951 were classified as occupational sociology.

TABLE I PH.D. AND M.A. THESES IN SOCIOLOGY AND IN THE SPECIFIED FIELD OF OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY, 1946 - 1951

	GRADUATE THESES		
Year	Sociology N	Occupational Sociology N	Occupational Sociology %
1946	150	11	7.3
1947	156	14	9.0
1948	308	32	10.4
1949	363	29	8.0
1950	472	44	9.3
1951	427	35	8.2
Total	1876	165	8.8

Five universities (Chicago, Columbia, Wisconsin, Illinois and New York) produced about 50 per cent of the 165 dissertations in occupational sociology in the six year period under observation; 28 per cent of those came from the University of Chicago. Sixty-five per cent of all dissertations in this area concerned themselves with specific occupations, such as medicine or mining; 30 per cent dealt mainly with general areas in occupational sociology, such as occupational status or mobility, and five per cent with specific classes of workers, such as part time workers.

TABLE II. THESES (1946 - 1951) AND ARTICLES (1946 - 1952) DEALING WITH SPECIFIC OCCUPATIONS CLASSIFIED BY THE EDWARDS SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCALE

Edwards Socio-Economic Occupation Scale	Theses %	Articles %
1. Professional persons x)	57.0	58.0
2. Proprietors, managers and officials	16.8	18.0
3. Clerks and kindred workers	2.8	3.0
4. Skilled workers and foremen	11.2	3.0
5. Semi-skilled workers	2.8	8.0
6. Unskilled workers	3.8	1.0
Military x)	5.6	9.0
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0
Total number of articles or theses about specific occupations	(107)	(100)

x) Military as an occupation was added to the list, but not scaled.

Table II discloses an interest in the professional out of proportion to his number in society. The clergy, the teacher and members of the medical profession received the most attention. Comparing 1946- 1948 theses to 1949- 1951 theses, some growth of interest in labor is disclosed. An examination of changes in occupations studied by year, however, points to a greater interest in the study of the lawyer, teacher, medical professions and the military.

Forty-nine of the 165 dissertations were not concerned primarily with a specific occupation but with a problem related to occupations. The themes receiving the most attention were: occupational status with 26,5 per cent of the dissertations, occupational choice with 18.4 per cent, occupational trends and occupation and ethnic groups with 16,3 per cent each. An examination of the data by year, despite a slight dip in the study of occupational status, suggests no significant trend.

Analysis of Current Projects in Occupational Sociology for 1953

The list of current sociological research for 1953 3) is composed of

3) .... Current Sociological Research, 1953: A Report Compiled from the Census of Research Being Conducted by Members of the American Sociological Society. American Sociological Society, New York University, Washington Square, New York (1953).

641 items; 64, or 10 per cent can be classified as dealing with occupations. The titles of these projects indicate that 46, or 72 per cent, of the studies are concerned with specific occupations, and that one third of the 44 per cent interested in the professions are studying some phase of the medical profession - either the nurse or the physician. Interest in the military and business also continues; however, there are very few studies of clerks and unskilled laborers.

The current methods and thoughts of American sociologists are perhaps best reflected in the work published in the leading journals of sociology. A survey of occupational sociology articles printed in these journals was undertaken in order to determine recent trends in this field. The papers to be included in this survey were determined by the impressionistic judgement of this writer within the limits of the definition of occupational sociology. Accuracy was increased by the judgement of an associate 4) and bibliographical lists 5) which had been consulted.

The selected studies were analyzed with reference to each of the following characteristics: the author's frame of reference, the source of data, methods of analyzing the material, the objective of the research — applied or pure, the type of occupation studied, themes related to occupations, and major conclusions. The following material will be presented in that order.

Frame of Reference

Since the manner in which a problem is approached is of recognized importance, an effort was made to determine the various theoretical orientations 6) of occupational sociologists. A difficulty arose in attempting to classify the social structural frame of reference. This orientation had to be divided into descriptive social structural and social structural, to separate the research of those who used the frame of reference to describe and those who used it to explain.

In over 35 per cent of the studies surveyed, more than one approach to the subject was used in the same article. When this occurred, one frame of reference was considered primary, and the others secondary or tertiary. In some cases no explicit theoretical orientation could be ascertained. In fact Table III indicates this was true of 25 per cent of all articles. Furthermore, many other studies seem to employ loose and incompletely thought out theoretical orientations. However, there is a definite trend away from investigations

---

4) Mr. Robert Hardt acted as judge and also helped with most other phases of this investigation.

5) ... International Index to Periodicals: New York: The W.W.Wilson Company; Menzel, Herbert. The Social Psychology of Occupations: A Synthetic Review, unpublished M.A. Thesis, Indiana University, 1950; ... Index to the American Sociological Review, Vol. I - XV, 1936- 1950 New York: American Sociological Society, 1951, pp. 16, 17, 27.

6) All frames of reference listed in Table III, perhaps with the exception of prediction (No. 8), imply a theoretical orientation.

using no explicit theoretical framework -- to be exact, a thirteen per cent decrease in articles having no theoretical orientation.

TABLE III. PRIMARY FRAMES OF REFERENCE UTILIZED IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY ARTICLES, 1946 - 1952

Type of Frame of Reference	Period First (Jan.1946-June 1949) %	Second (July 1949-Dec.1952) %	Both (1946- 1952) %
1. Institutional and Social Structural	19.1	21.7	20.3
2. Descriptive Social Structural	11.7	14.5	13.0
3. Historical	10.6	8.4	9.6
4. Psychological	5.3	12.0	8.5
5. Role Theory	4.3	9.7	6.8
6. Ecological	3.2	6.0	4.5
7. Social Process	5.3	2.4	3.9
8. Prediction	4.3	3.6	3.9
9. Social Problem	3.2	1.2	2.3
10. Culture-Personality	2.1	2.4	2.3
11. None	30.9	18.1	24.9
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Articles	(94)	(83)	(177)

The two most frequently employed frames of reference were the institutional-social structural and the psychological. When categories 1 and 2 are combined, it is seen from Table III that 33.3 per cent of all articles used some form of the institutional or social structural approach, and the combination of categories 4, 5 and 10 reveals that 17.6 per cent used some ty of psychological framework which is the next most frequent orientation. The psychological orientation also shows the greatest increase in use when the first half of the survey is compared with the second half.

Source of Data

Sixty-six per cent of the studies examined utilized primary sources o data for their researches and the remainder resorted to secondary sources. Comparison of the first period with the second period of this survey suggests a trend in the direction of increased employment of primary sources. In fact the use of primary data increased ten per cent while the use of secondary dat decreased a like amount, and the most striking changes in the past few years in the techniques of obtaining information is seen in the 15 per cent increas in the use of the interview and the ten per cent decrease in participant observation.

Type of Analysis-Statistical or Nonstatistical

TABLE IV. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES UTILIZED IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ARTICLES, 1946 - 1952

Type of Technique	Period First (Jan.1946- June 1949) %	Second (July 1949- Dec.1952) %	Both (1946 - 1952) %
Analytic Statistics	10.6	25.4	17.5
Descriptive Statistics	33.0	37.3	35.0
Non-Statistical	56.4	37.3	47.5
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Articles	(94)	(83)	(177)

Statistical methods are becoming increasingly important as a technique for the analysis of social data, although occupational sociologists do not make full use of this method. Table IV indicates that a high proportion of the investigations did not use any statistics and that many other studies employed only descriptive statistics. The present trend, however, appears to be in the direction of greater use of quantitative methods; when articles published in the first period are compared with those of the second period, an increase of almost 15 per cent in studies using analytic statistics is found, and a 19 per cent decrease in non-statistical studies is observed.

Types of Sample

The articles surveyed are almost equally divided between random sampling, non-random sampling and no explicit sampling. Table V indicates, however, that the trend appears to be toward random sampling, and strongly away from no explicit sampling.

TABLE V. SAMPLES FOUND IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY ARTICLES, 1946 - 1952

Type of Sample	Period First (Jan.1946- June 1949)	Second (July 1949 - Dec. 1952)	Both (1946- 1952)
	%	%	%
Random	25.6	38.6	31.6
Non-Random	27.6	34.9	31.1
No Explicit Sample	46.8	26.5	37.3
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Articles	(94)	(83)	(177)

Objective of the Research

With the increased use of more rigorous methods of investigation discovered in the second period of this study, a corresponding rise in the number of pure as distinguished from applied sociological studies is also discovered. While it is probable that most investigations are both applied and pure, an article was placed in one category in preference to the other on the basis of a greater leaning in one direction. Table VI shows the major change from applied studies in the first period to pure studies in the second.

TABLE VI. PURE AND APPLIED OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY 1946 - 1952

Primary Purpose	Period First (Jan.1946 - June 1949) %	Second (July 1949- Dec.1952) %	Both (1946- 1952) %
Pure	40.4	75.9	57.1
Applied	59.6	24.1	42.9
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Articles	(94)	(83)	(177)

Occupations and Themes Studied

Of the 177 articles, 99, or 56 per cent, dealt with specific occupations; the rest discussed various areas of occupational sociology. Each occupation studied was classified according to a socio-economic scale devised by Alba Edwards 7) for the U.S.Bureau of the Census. Table II, in which these data are presented, reveals that over 73 per cent of the theses and articles surveyed were interested in occupations in the two highest socio-economic levels. However, some difference in emphasis between the dissertations and articles is noted for the lowest three socio-economic status levels. The survey of articles indicates fewer studies of clerical and sales personnel and of unskilled laborers, but more studies of semiskilled laborers.

While many writers describe specific occupations, most were also interested in these occupations as an avenue toward broader areas of occupational sociology. To help determine these areas, a list of major subjects other than specific occupations was devised. Each article was read to determine its primary theme; if more than one theme was discussed, then secondary and tertiary themes were also listed. Often a subject which was considered primary in one article was secondary or tertiary in another; most papers had more than one field of interest; in fact, 413 themes were listed for the 177 articles; Table VII lists the articles on the basis of their primary themes.

---

7) Edwards, Alba M., A Social- Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers in the United States (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938).

TABLE VII. MAJOR AREAS STUDIED IN OCCUPATIONAL SOCIOLOGY ARTICLES. 1946 - 1952

Area Studied	Period First (Jan.1946- June 1949) %	Second (July 1949- Dec.1952) %	Both (1946- 1952) %
Career	21.3	25.3	23.2
Occupational status and mobility	7.4	21.7	14.1
Ethnic group and occupations	16.0	10.9	13.6
Working force	10.6	10.9	10.7
Occupational role and personality	11.7	4.8	8.5
Occupational images	6.4	7.2	6.8
Occupational comparisons	4.3	3.6	3.9
Methodology	3.2	4.8	3.9
Client-professional relations	4.3	1.2	2.8
Occupational culture and ethics	2.1	2.4	2.3
Miscellaneous	12.8	7.2	10.2
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number of Articles	(94)	(83)	(177)

However, no important differences occurred in the relative frequency with which a theme was used when the total number of times a theme appeared was considered rather than the number of times the theme was the primary one.

Reclassification of the 28 major themes under original consideration produced ten broader areas of interrelated subjects. This combination revealed that 23.3 per cent of the articles dealt with some aspect of careers; 14.1 per cent with some phase of occupational status, and 13.6 per cent with race and ethnic group as related to occupations. The next three areas in order of their importance are: working force studies, relationship between occupational role and personality, and images of occupations.

Although more articles were published in occupational sociology in the first period than in the second, this need not be interpreted as indicating a lessened interest in the study of occupations. On the contrary, the loss in number is more than made up in the quality of the studies. Some additional trends can also be found in an examination of Table VII. For example increased attention was given the investigations of careers, but the largest increase in articles in the second period concerned the relationship between occupations and status. Some of the research findings from these two areas of major interest to the occupational sociologist will be presented; however, examples

will not necessarily come from the four journals surveyed or the time period spanned.

Careers

The growing interest in the study of occupational careers does not mean that sociologists have begun to agree. Even on such a basic matter as the determination of occupational choice we find a multitude of hypotheses. Ginsburg et. al. (23) offer the view that occupational choice, "is a process; the process is largely irreversible; compromise is an essential aspect of every choice." Miller and Form (43) write that individuals create "their occupational goals through a compounding of work experiences, observation and expectation". These goals are formed by role-taking devices with the family acting as the primary model. This observation agrees with Faris' (19) suggestion that there is a strong relationship between family continuity and career knowledge. Weinberg and Arond (64) indicate the part the larger environment may play in the selection of an occupation; they found that professional boxers are recruited from the poorest socio-economic groups. Wance and Butler (62) point to the differential influence of environment on job heritance with their discovery of greater occupational inheritance among miners than among most non-agricultural occupations.

The role of financial resources in recruitment and occupational choice comes up for consideration when the Muellers (49) and Mulligan (50) observe that at Indiana University the absence of talented students from skilled and white collar groups is probably due to financial limitations, but the absence of talented students from farming and unskilled labor groups is due more to cultural factors than to purely economic factors. Meyer and Smigel (42) demonstrated the differential effect of the economic factor on the job hunting of unemployed veterans. Manis (39) further questions its completeness as an explanation for job choice by pointing to the importance of psychic income in the careers of teachers.

In the United States, a country of heterogeneous population, a great deal has been published about discrimination in employment suffered by racial or ethnic groups. Kornhauser (36) discusses the effect of race on the career of the Negro labor leader; Noland and Bakke (51) conclude that there are two kinds of jobs: Negro jobs and white jobs. Observation alone indicates that minority groups tend to concentrate in specific occupations, and the theory has been advanced that much of this is due to ascription, which plays an important role in career choice and, according to Collins (8), in career advancement.

Merton and Goode (41) suggest a number of other factors which must be considered for an understanding of career choice. For example, they wonder what effect an image of an occupation has on the selection of that occupation; they ask how intelligence or other individual psychological factors determine recruitment or occupational choice; they inquire also about the role social and social-psychological factors -- such as direct contact with an occupation-- have in determining choice. They find little research on the part occupational associations play in affecting occupational choice.

Some articles are available which discuss the role of informal and formal group affiliations in determining career patterns. In his study of academic promotions, Hollingshead (30) found membership in the power in-group important for advancement. Dalton (11) discovered the existence of an informal process of selection in the factory on the basis of such factors as religion, club membership and political belief. Hall (25), in his study of the medical profession, learned that both the informal and formal organizations are important for the physician's career. He concluded that specialized medicine is no

longer an independent profession, but has become so interdependent that the physician must rely on the organization if he is to practice successfully. Hughes (34) and Mills (45) agree with Hall and generalize that most professions are now practiced in organizations.

Ginsburg et al. (23) and Miller and Form (43) disagree over the stages of the process of occupational choice. Ginsburg's three stages of choice determination are the fantasy period, the period of tentative choice, and the realistic choice period. This classification omits the important trial employment empirically found by Miller and Form. They constructed five stages of socialization and adjustment to work which they call: the preparatory work period -- the child learns about work from the home and the school; the initial period -- the youth learns from part-time jobs while at school; the trial period -- a period of transition and many jobs; the stable period -- the adult finds a major job and sticks to it; and finally the retirement period -- adjustment to the loss of youth and the loss of employment. Other investigators, such as Wilson (66) and Hall (26) have studied the more specific stages in professional careers and the meaning of specialization in these professions.

This discussion merely touches on the work in this area. However, much more research is needed. Menzel (40) asks a number of simple, basic questions regarding careers in every occupation. For example, "What preparation is necessary for entry into the occupation ?" "How are promotions and advancement accomplished ?" "How secure are jobs once they are obtained ?" While a great deal of work concerning career choice, recruitment, specialization, career patterns and retirement has been accomplished, a great deal more must be done, for conflicting evidence and unanswered questions remain.

Occupational Status and Mobility

The survey of articles pointed to the great interest in various phases of occupational status and mobility. An attempt will be made briefly to call attention to a few of the many problems in this area.

Occupation is used by many sociologists as an index to class status. A number of reasons for its use are offered by Moore (48) and Warner (63). The fact that an occupation combines several of the more important criteria involved in determining status position is generally regarded as the best single reason for its employment as a status index. However, Hatt (27) warns against the employment of old occupational indices not designed to meet new problems. Lipset and Bendix (38) are critical of the use of the present job as an index, because it does not necessarily express the variety of work experiences which usually precedes the present occupation. Knupfer (35) finds that very few specific occupations can be ranked at the same time, not only because of the fatigue of the judges, but also because so few occupations are familiar to the judges. She also warns that, "distinctions in the middle of the scale are apt to be hazy." Despite these and other criticisms, occupation as an idex to stratification is widely employed.

Social scientists have been interested in rating occupations for some time. One pioneer, Counts (10), completed his study-- using students as judges -- over a quarter of a century ago. Since then, there have been numerous other studies of this type. Deeg and Paterson (13) for example, repeated Counts' investigation 21 years later, and found that, "the social status of occupations has changed very little."

While aspirations of students may not have changed much, the question of the chances of their attaining high status jobs remains. Centers (6) and Hollingshead (31) find occupational mobility difficult to achieve, and that

most movement is into the middle status levels because of the increase in white collar jobs. Hildebrand (29) also recognizes that mobility is becoming more difficult; some of this he finds is due to union policy which tries to protect the jobs of union members. Lipset and Bendix (38) discover some mobility within manual and non-manual ranks, but little mobility between them.

Chinoy (7) found that automobile workers did not believe they could get ahead; this invites attention to the disparity between the American ideal of an open class society and reality. Stone (57) discovered that it was not possible to generalize for all classes of workers when he compared store clerks, for whom mobility was possible, and some factory workers, for whom this possibility greatly diminished.

The study of vertical mobility becomes more complex when the dimension of horizontal occupational mobility is added, for the two are often hard to distinguish. Hatt (27) and Becker (2) feel that this aspect of mobility needs further study. The complication increases with the question of whether or not our society is undergoing a process of destratification. Some writers, such as Drucker, (15) believe that our industrial society is based on and ruled by status which is derived from the place of work. Others, such as Adams (1) and Foot (20) believe that stratification is diminishing. These contradictory findings need investigation, as do many other problems in the area of occupational status. Perhaps this accounts for some of the interests in the field. 8)

Summary

A bird's eye view of trends in occupational sociology indicates that investigations in this area are becoming methodologically more rigorous and theoretically more sophisticated. There has been an increase in research in careers, on occupational status and mobility and more work is being done on the military (58) as an occupation in itself and as an effect on career choice or career patterns. Concern with working-force studies (28) (60) and the professions continues. Research dealing with the relationship between ethnic and racial groups and occupations and between personality and occupations has declined, but a hard core of interest remains. Hughes (33) and his students, among others, are beginning to meet the need for comparisons between occupations. Lastrucci's (37) criticism of the sociology of occupations as unidirectional and his plea for research on the interrelationships between specialization and social differentiation have in part been answered. For example Gouldner's (24) study of "progressive" labor leaders and Parson's (52) work on the physician are both concerned with interrelationships between the larger social system and occupational behavior.

Although progress has been made there are still areas where few studies can be found. This survey disclosed little research on: the relationship of the client to the profession or occupation, occupation and crime, inter-occupational relations, occupational associations, professionalization, images of occupations and cross-cultural comparisons. Further work in these areas can prove fruitful, not only for occupational sociology but for general sociology as well.

8) For a bibliography covering the general area of social stratification see Pfautz, Harold W., "The Current Literature on Social Stratification: Critique and Bibliography", American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (1953), pp. 391- 418.

Bibliography

1. Adams, Stuart. "Regional Differences in Vertical Mobility in a High Status Occupation", American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), 228-235.

2. Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher", American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), 470- 477.

3. Blumer, Herbert. "Sociological Theory in Industrial Relations," American Sociological Review, 12(1947), 271- 278.

4. Bogardus, Emory S. "The Occupational Attitude", Journal of Applied Sociology, 8 (1924), 171- 177.

5. Brown, Esther L. Nursing as a Profession. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1936.

6. Centers, Richard. "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata", American Sociological Review,13 (1948), 197- 203.

7. Chinoy, Ely. "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers", American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), 453- 459.

8. Collins, Orvis. "Ethnic Behavior in Industry: Sponsorship and Rejection in a New England Factory", ibid. LI (1946), 293-298.

9. Cottrell, W.Fred. The Railroader. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1940.

10. Counts, George S. "The Social Status of Occupations", School Review,33 (1925), 16- 27.

11. Dalton, Melville. "Informal Factors in Career Achievement", American Journal of Sociology, LVI (1951), 407-415.

12. Davidson, P.E. and Anderson, H.D. Occupational Mobility in an American Community. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press,1937.

13. Deeg, M.E. and Paterson, D.G. "Changes in the Social Status of Occupations", Occupations, 25 (1947), 205- 208.

14. Donovan, Frances R. The Saleslady. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

15. Drucker, Peter F. "The Employee Society", American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (1953), 358- 363.

16. The New Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

17. Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Tr.by George Simpson, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.

18. Fairchild, Henry Pratt. "Business as an Institution", American Sociological Review, 2 (1937) 1- 8.

19. Faris, Robert E.L. "Interaction of Generations and Family Stability", ibid. 12 (1947), 159- 164.

20. Foote, Nelson N. "The Professionalization of Labor in Detroit", American Journal of Sociology. LVIII (1953), 371- 380.

21. Form, William H. "Toward an Occupational Social Psychology", Journal of Social Psychology, 24 (1946), 85- 99.

22. Gardner, Burleigh B., and Moore, David G. Human Relations in Industry. Rev. Ed. Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1950.

23. Ginzberg, Eli, Ginsburg, Sol. W., Axelrad, Sidney and Herma, John L. Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

24. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Attitudes of 'Progressive' Trade Union Leaders", American Journal of Sociology, LII (1947), 389- 392.

25. Hall, Oswald. "The Stages of a Medical Career", ibid. LIII (1948), 327- 336.

26. _____ "Types of Medical Careers", ibid. LV (1949), 243-253.

27. Hatt, Paul K. "Occupation and Social Stratification", ibid., LV (1950), 533- 543.

28. Hauser, Philip M. "The Labor Force as a Field of Interest for the Sociologist", American Sociological Review, 16 (1951), 530- 538.

29. Hildebrand, George H. "American Unionism, Social Stratification, and Power", American Journal of Sociology, LVIII (1953), 381- 390.

30. Hollingshead, August B. "Ingroup Membership and Academic Selection", American Sociological Review, 3(1938), 826- 833.

31. _____ "Trends in Social Stratification: A Case Study", ibid. 17 (1952), 58- 64.

32. Hughes, Everett C. "Personality Types and the Division of Labor", American Journal of Sociology, XXXIII (1928), 754- 768.

33. _____ "The Sociological Study of Work: An Editorial Forward", ibid., LVIII (1952), 423- 426.

34. _____ Review of Mills, John. The Engineer in Society in ibid., LIII (1948), 402- 403.

35. Knupfer, Genevieve. Indices of Socio-Economic Status: A Study of Some Problems of Measurement. New York: Genevieve Knupfer, 1946.

36. Kornhauser, William. "The Negro Union Official: A Study of Sponsorship and Control", American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), 443- 452.

37. Lastrucci, Carlo L. "The Status and Significance of Occupational Research", American Sociological Review, 11(1946), 78- 84.

38. Lipset, Seymour M. and Bendix, Reinhard. "Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns", American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), 494- 504.

39. Manis, Jerome G. "A Quantitative Note on the Academic Role", American Sociological Review, 16(1951), 837- 839.

40. Menzel, Herbert M. The Social Psychology of Occupations: A Synthetic Review. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Indiana University, 1950.

41. Merton, Robert K. and Goode, William J. Provisional Outline of Research Problems, October 1950 - January 1951. University Seminar 417- 418, The Professions in Modern Society, Columbia University, 1950-51.

42. Meyer, Henry J. and Smigel, Erwin O. "Job-Seeking and the Readjustment Allowance for Veterans", American Journal of Sociology, LVI (1951), 341- 347.

43. Miller, Delbert C. and Form, William H. Industrial Sociology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

44. Miller, S.M. "The Rise of Industrial Sociology", Sociology and Social Research, 36 (1951), 90- 96.

45. Mills, C. Wright. White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

46. Moore, Wilbert E. "Current Issues in Industrial Sociology", American Sociological Review, 12(1947), 651- 657.

47. _____ "Industrial Sociology: Status and Prospects", ibid. 13 (1948), 382- 391.

48. _____ Industrial Relations and the Social Order. New York: The Macmillan Company, Revised Edition, 1951.

49. Mueller, Kate H. and Mueller, John H. "Socio-Economic Background of Women Students at Indiana University", Educational and Psychological Measurement, 9 (1949), Part 1, 321- 329.

50. Mulligan, Raymond A. "Socio-Economic Background and College Enrollment", American Sociological Review, 16(1951), 188- 196.

51. Noland, E. William and Bakke, E. Wight. Workers Wanted: A Study of Employers' Hiring Policies, Preferences and Practices in New Haven and Charlotte. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

52. Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.

53. Roethlisberger, F.J. and Dickson, William J. Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947.

54. Smith, Mapheus. "The Differential Impact of Selective Service Inductions on Occupations in the United States", American Sociological Review, 11 (1946), 567- 572.

55. Sorokin, Pitrim A. Social Mobility. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1927.

56. Spencer, Herbert. Principles of Sociology, Vol. III. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1909.

57. Stone, Robert C. "Mobility Factors as they Affect Workers' Attitudes and Conduct toward Incentive Systems", American Sociological Review, 17 (1952), 58- 64.

58. Stouffer, Samuel A. et. al. The American Soldier: Combat and its Aftermath, Vols. 1 and 2. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.

59. Sutherland, Edwin H. The Professional Thief. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

60. Turner, Ralph H. "The Nonwhite Male in the Labor Force", American Journal of Sociology, LIV (1949), 356- 362.

61. Waller, Willard W. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932.

62. Wance, William and Butler, Richard. "The Effect of Industrial Changes on Occupational 'Inheritance' in Four Pennsylvania Communities", Social Forces, XXVII (1948), 158- 162.

63. Warner, W. Lloyd, Meeker, Marchia and Eells, Kenneth. Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949.

64. Weinberg, S. Kirson and Arond, Henry. "The Occupational Culture of the Boxer", American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), 188- 196.

65. Whyte, William Foote. Industry and Society. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946.

66. Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man, A Study in the Sociology of a Profession. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/25.

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIÈGE
24 août - 1er septembre 1953

Sect. I.

Stratification sociale et
Mobilité sociale.

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I.

Social Stratification and
Social Mobility.

CROSS NATIONAL INQUIRIES AND GROUP STUDIES ABOUT SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND VERTICAL MOBILITY IN THE NETHERLANDS

by

Professor Dr. F. van Heek,
University of Leiden.

CROSS NATIONAL INQUIRIES AND GROUP STUDIES ABOUT SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND VERTICAL MOBILITY IN THE NETHERLANDS

by

Professor Dr. F. van Heek,
University of Leiden.

I. Preparatory Work.

In pursuance of the working conference on social stratification and vertical mobility held in 1951, the Board of the Institute for Social Research in the Netherlands decided in April 1952 to start the necessary preparations for an inquiry concerning these subjects in our country. A research committee was appointed and a provisional working scheme delimited. On this basis subsidies were applied for from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Institute for Scientific Research in the Netherlands. After these subsidies had been granted in August 1952, the research proper could be started.

II. Subjects of Inquiry.

The committee decided to investigate the following problems so far as the available funds permit:

(1) The social hierarchy in the Netherlands as it is appreciated by the nation as a whole. Allowance was being made for the impossibility of establishing a social hierarchy for the whole of the Netherlands, in which case an investigation of limited local areas would have to be made.

(2) What are the factors deciding individual positions within the present Dutch social hierarchy ?

(3) Would it be possible to investigate the changes in the Dutch social hierarchy during the period of mature capitalism ?

(4) Would it be possible to assess the frequency, distance and intensity of vertical mobility of the Dutch population ? This problem requires differentiated treatment, particularly from a socio-structural and geographical point of view.

(5) What are the factors affecting this vertical mobility ?

It was only natural that the first investigations should be directed towards the possibilities of a cross-national inquiry into the social hierarchy in this country. For this purpose data were collected concerning small local inquiries already completed. These inquiries led to the conclusion that occupational prestige is without doubt the best standard for the ranking of the social hierarchy. Further it appeared that in spite of

the inevitable local and social differences there was so much agreement as to the ranking of the several occupations that a cross national inquiry seemed justifiable.

The sample for this inquiry was composed by the Netherlands Statistical Institute on the ground of its vast experience in the field of this part of social research. The number of persons to be included in the inquiry was fixed at 500, which number proved to be large enough to bring out with sufficient clearness the influence of the factors sex, age, religion, geographical locality, material welfare and social position.

At the moment of writing this paper the above cross national inquiry has been started. After completion of this inquiry a cross national inquiry into the vertical mobility will be carried out, as far as the available funds permit. The required minimum size of the sample for such an inquiry is estimated at 2.500 persons. The intention is to make this study as exactly comparable with the English studies as possible.

The Dutch research committee is of the opinion that the cross national inquiries into social stratification and mobility will not appear to full advantage without investigations of concrete occupational groups held simultaneously with the national inquiries or shortly after. For it is only by group studies that a clear light can be thrown on the intertwining of factors affecting social promotion and demotion. However valuable the cross national inquiry may be for yielding basic data concerning the frequency and degree of vertical mobility, it only considers socio-metrically established strata, and not groups with a historic socio-economic structure of their own. The above considerations have induced the Dutch research committee to conduct, if possible, an inquiry into the rate of mobility in the following concrete groups:

(1) Various academic independent liberal professions, e.g. physicians, lawyers, chartered accountants. Their addresses will be supplied by their respective professional societies. A representative sample will then be composed.

(2) Various chiefly non-liberal academic professions: e.g. engineers, clergymen, economists, sociologists.
A sample will be composed as for group 1.

(3) Managing directors of companies enjoying official quotation at the Amsterdam Stock Exchange and managing directors of private companies with a capital of more than D.fl. 200.000 employing more than 300 labourers. For this group the data will have to be collected from other sources, as most of the managing directors in the Netherlands have become more than tired of the official inquiries of the last few years. For that reason their names and addresses will be taken from the Stock Exchange Guides, after which the occupations of their fathers and fathers-in-law will be ascertained via the civil registrar's office in their place of residence, which will be requested to supply data as to the occupation of the father and father-in-law at the time of the managing director in question entering into marriage,

as well as the father's occupation at the birth of the managing director. The private companies not enjoying official quotation at the Stock Exchange will be selected on the advice of local experts.

(4) Civil servants.

The various public services will be requested to supply data.

(5) Highly skilled labourers (typographers and tool repair workers). These groups have been chosen to trace the opportunities of vertical social promotion for manual labourers under the most favourable conditions. Data will be collected by means of an inquiry in the business concerned.

(6) Recipients of public assistance.

A special investigation will be made of this group, because, as is well-known, the frequency of long distance downward mobility is not sufficiently brought out by inquiries into the former occupations of persons employed in the lowest occupational strata, neither is it by inquiries into the occupations of their fathers and grandfathers. For in Holland it not often happens that a socially strongly degraded person tries to find a job as a labourer.

These data will be gathered via the public social services.

(7) In view of the limited funds and the data already available, compiling inquiries based on previous studies will be conducted into the old-established class of independent shopkeepers, the administrative staffs of private undertakings and the semi-skilled and unskilled labourers.

(8) The research committee attach the greatest importance to the co-operation of social psychologists in the individual case studies of certain types of social promotion and demotion. Attention will be paid to the study of "extreme types" and average types.

(9) As far as the available funds permit, an inquiry will be conducted in a municipal area with an exceptionally high frequency of long distance vertical mobility for the purpose of applying the method of extreme types as a counter-investigation to the study made in the Enschede municipal area, where the frequency of long distance vertical mobility was extremely low.

(Cf. the relative paper on "The method of extreme types as a tool for the study of vertical mobility", section I, 1.

Dr. G. Kuiper is acting as first research worker in the development of above-mentioned studies.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/26

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE
24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale
et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification
and Social Mobility

SUMMARY OF A STUDY OF SOCIAL MOBILITY AT THE PHILIPS WORKS, EINDHOVEN

by

Dr. Ida E. van Hulten

Sociologisch Institut
University of Leiden.

Skrivemaskinstua
Stortingsgt. 18
Oslo

SUMMARY OF A STUDY OF SOCIAL MOBILITY AT THE PHILIPS WORKS, EINDHOVEN

by

Dr. Ida E. van Hulten

Sociologisch Institut

University of Leiden

Definitions.

Considering the society as a superposition of groups of equal social status, i.e. groups that associate on terms of equality, or that have equal social prestige, movement from one group to the other, upward and downward, is theoretically always, and practically often possible. Thus social mobility is a change of status. A person or group can derive their status from different sectors of social life: the economic sector (income), the political sector (political party, one's function therein), descent (nobility or old family), family (marriage). In our Western society occupation stands for social status in most cases (functions in politics are mostly one's occupation too; level of income and occupational prestige run concurrently, or they ought to; membership of most political parties in the Netherlands does not change one's social prestige generally, except that of the Communist Party, in a negative sense, and perhaps that of the Liberal Party the other way round; church membership is seldom connected with social class). However, it is possible, especially in a group with much mobility, that a rise or fall is attained in one sector without a proportionate change in another sector, e.g. the father of the family makes an occupational career, while family life remains cast in the same mould, so that the children carry on their occupations on the original level of their father's. The style of life has not been adapted to the style that is usual in the father's new social level. If one bases an inquiry after mobility on an occupational stratification, as was done in this study, one should differentiate between incomplete social mobility (occupational only), and complete social mobility (change of status in all sectors equally). This difference should only be made when one refers to social mobility during the life of one person.

Looking at the more general type of social mobility as a process in more generations, one can differentiate after the starting point of the son's career with respect to the father's status. either the son starts at the same level as his father occupied during his life, and rises through his own career: this we call "internal promotion", or the son starts at a higher level: this is usually the case when the son has received more education than the father. In the first case the rise is more the person's own work; in the second case the father resp. the parental family plays an important rôle, if only financially. Not every "internal promotion" is a rise in respect to the father.

Finally allowance must be made for the fact that not every improvement of position or advancement in rank means a social rise in respect

to the starting point of one's career: with many functions goes a "normal career" (Geiger).

The Inquiry's Milieu.

Eindhoven was a town of ± 140.000 inhabitants in 1950; the Eindhoven part of the Philips concern had ± 23.000 employees. This electrotechnical industry, erected at the end of the last century, has known its first great expansion after World War I, a great decline in the thirties, and after World War II a great revival. 1950, the year of the inquiry, was a hausse period.

The unskilled labourers are mainly recruited from the present working population (Eindhoven is an old industrial town, with textile and cigar industry), and from the surrounding densely populated agrarian area. Managing, technical and commercial employees and formerly skilled labour too, are attracted from elsewhere, chiefly from the provinces Holland and Utrecht. These groups, for the greater part Protestant with their own way of life and ideas, form an element that is hard to assimilate in the thoroughly Roman Catholic province of North-Brabant. They are alluded to as "import", and they have somewhat the air of colonists. The sudden contact of these groups might be called a "shock of cultures". A third element is formed by the R. C. "import", that belongs to neither group. These groupings often cut through hierarchical strata. The heterogenity of a part of the Philips personnel is still heightened because many people are temporarily sent out to other countries or part of the concern in the Netherlands. This constellation made research for an occupational hierarchy difficult. General social shiftings, notably the degradation of prestige of routine clerical work and the increase of that of highskilled manual labour added to the confusion, inherent to a highly dynamic, socially mobile industrial society.

The Occupational Hierarchy.

For grading the occupations was used the "social-psychological" method, i.e. the ranking is obtained from the subjective opinions of a group of persons that is representative for the group that is to be investigated upon its social mobility, in this case Philips employees of the 5 classes [1] into which the scale was broken up. For technical reasons not more than 50 persons could be interviewed. They were asked to rank some 70 occupations as to their prestige (making three groups, of high, middle and of low prestige). From the combined answers was computed a scale: each interviewee gives n answers, and ranks p occupations "high", q occupations "middle" and r occupations "low"; for each interviewee $N = p + q + r$, in which formula p is substituted by $\frac{1}{2}(p + 1)$, q by $p + \frac{1}{2}(q + 1)$, and r by $p + q + \frac{1}{2}(r + 1)$. For all interviewees together $R = a - b + 100$, in which formula R = ranking number of the occupation in the hierarchy, a = percentage of answers putting an occupation in the class "high", b = the percentage of answers putting an occupation in class "low".

As a result of the small number of interviewees not all the ranking numbers of the occupations are statistically stable. For its purpose: a standard of measuring the occupational mobility, it is satisfactory, though, because only a division into 5 classes was to be had, not a detailed grading of all separate occupations. Moreover, the 70 occupations of the list re-

---

1) The word Class is here used for the Dutch "rangstand" which means something between hierarchical ranking and "estate" and has no "weltanschauliche" or affective attachments.

presented but a small part of the total quantum of occupations of this mobility research, so that interpolation and interpretation remained the chief problem in codifying them. This could be done by the researcher in the right way, because she lived in the place during a full year, and made all interviews herself. Essentially the problem was how to fit several occupations into the hierarchy of the Philips Works, which is itself composed of several separate hierarchies. For the scale see Appendix Ia.

Female occupations were not included in the scale because for them different measures are valuable. They were ranked according to own observation, mostly on a basis of required schooling. See Appendix Ib. This could be done because most interviewees used this measure, more or less consciously. This is typical for a modern rationalistic society where the old consciousness of "estate" has disappeared, not in the least by great social mobility. Difficulties began with ranking independent retailers, craftsmen, farmers etc. for whom this measure does not, or at least did not, hold in the Netherlands. Another difficulty was making clear the difference between prestige of occupations and of esteem of persons.

As long as one maintains a classification into 5 groups this Eindhoven scale does not greatly differ from a scale of 57 occupations, made by 500 people from all over the country. The few great differences are found at the bottom of the scale.

The Social Mobility.

This was measured by a questionaire among ± 15.000 male Dutch employees of 20 years and older. Over 3.200 answers were obtained. The factors questioned after (geographical origin, social milieu, career) were correlated with rise and fall on the social scale by x^2 method. Other data were obtained from free remarks on the questionaire and personal accounts.

The mobility of the group is great, with rising in the middle groups always greater than dropping. See Appendix 2.

Class I.

This class includes all "managing groups", namely all academically trained people (3/4 of the sample) and persons of the same level who have worked their way up, or are working in functions for which other qualities than academical education are required (mostly administrative and commercial employees).

Almost the whole group is "imported" from the North, and predominantly non-Catholic.

Mobility toward the group is great: as against 1/3 whose fathers come from the same class, (the "stayers") there is a still greater group from IIb, whereas classes IIa and IIIa have also added their part. In general the "stayers" are in all respects bound to their own social circle: grandfather and father-in-law usually are from class I; before marrying the wives practised an occupation for which much education is needed; academically trained women are found only in this group. Their friends are also of the same circle.

The risers too have their family in their own original circle. Great mobility upwards is more easy in the non-technical sector, specially that by way of internal promotion. This is caused by the difference in educational methods: a higher technical education cannot be obtained at home, whereas administrative certificates can.

In the "remarks" the subject education has most interest, people like to tell how they achieved it: by scholarships, financial and other sacrifices of parents and themselves.. Cases of great internal promotion

(the total number in the group is 20 %) are only found with older persons with many years of service. This does not mean that such careers are no longer possible, only that they are, as a matter of fact, a long process and are obtained by extraordinary effort and sacrifice. Opportunity declines, however, a) by the tendency to supply ever more education, academical included, to ever more groups of the population; b) by the growing bureaucracy of the concern, a process which is inevitable because of its size.

Whether there are relatively many academians from the lower classes at Philips cannot be ascertained, but it is probable, because they work in professions that in this form are new (the "pragmatische Intelligenz" of Geiger) and so do not claim professional codes bound up with social class. Moreover, the risen academians are often a positive selection as to intellect, and by the difficulties they had to overcome.

It should be mentioned that occupational mobility from independent middle class to academical salary-earning occupations is not always an economic progress; the traditional esteem for a grade works well.

IIa.

To this class belong many heads of departments for whom an extended secondary education and experience are required, and higher assistants of engineers etc. Thus the group exists for a great part of older people with many years of service. Though less than in class I. the group is principally composed of "import" and non-Catholics.

Social mobility downwards is small; rising very great, specially from IIb. (almost $\frac{1}{2}$). Internal promotion is greater than in the other classes: 33 %.

Rising is not bound up with the sector of occupation. For level of grandfather and wife the same as in class I. holds. The father-in-law's class is often different: it appears that part of the IIb. women (a class with great spread of income and social status) had occupations that were either higher or lower than the average for this class, while the men, probably because they were already detached from their milieu when coming to Eindhoven, regarded more the occupational level of their partners than their home status. Friends are mostly found in the original circle.

In the "remarks" few signs of discontent are found. Many had initially wanted another profession, among whom many who wish back their independent business. There are younger people who think they would have risen higher without war and military service.

Together with classes IIb. and IIIa. the whole group belongs to the category that takes much supplementary education after having joined the concern (77 %). No statistically relevant connection is found, however, between this education and social climbing as to the father's level. Evidently this education usually plays its rôle in maintaining oneself in one's occupation and following one's normal career. Besides, direct social rising surpasses internal promotion to such a degree that later courses are quantitatively obliterated by the better preliminary training with which one began.

IIb.

This is a heterogeneous group of younger employees with secondary school or somewhat less, and a smaller group of older people that fall apart into a) those with secondary education who did not advance; b) a group that has, as to the technical sector, passed the barrier between non-manual and manual work (foremen, calcualtors, designers), and in the administrative sector has advanced from office "labourer" to "official" (terms of Rottier

and Nuyens: De beambte in de Onderneming). Almost half of the group has risen from the lower classes; falling down to the class is much less (13 %). 21 % has promoted internally, often in the technical sector. More than half of the group is from the North, not yet half of it is non-Catholic. The Brabant element increases when going down the social scale.

The group "droppers" appears to be somewhat specific: it consists of relatively many persons from the cities in Holland and Utrecht; their fathers had their own business; their education is above the average, their age lower; so one can conclude that part of them has been fallen down temporarily and will perhaps reach their father's level. The "risers" from IIIb are mainly Roman-Catholic, and have had relatively little education. 83 % has had supplementary education or takes it just now.

Different factors promote dissatisfaction in the group:

1) Younger people feel duped by long periods of living "underground" and military service, independently of their status as to their father. This is typical: the thought suggests itself that people, soon after having taken up a job, turn thier attention solely to the measures of their new surroundings, that are here very much focused on "advancement" while at the same time one is very conscious of not yet being anything, even when one has much more status than at home.
2) Lower clerks often dislike their work; "office" often seems to be the only way when one cannot meet one's aspirations. These aspirations, moreover, often wake only after having taken up a job.
3) People with secondary school often feel the ceiling of academians above them as unjust.
4) Officials risen from skilled labour sometimes are paid less than they were formerly.

On the other hand many like their work, specially technicians, and many are proud of their achievements.

IIIa

These are skilled labourers (doing work for which a theoretical education is needed: mostly metal-working which is estimated much more than building trade work), prospective designers and technical assistants, routine clerks, foremen of unskilled labourers. They are mostly Catholic; yet 1/3 is from the North.

About half of the group has climbed; going down occurred in 1/5 of the cases. The number of younger people is high.

For the "droppers" the same holds as for those in IIb. The grandfather's class is often the same as the father's; the former occupations of the wives are arbitrarily divided among the lower levels; higher occupations seldom occur. The father-in-law's class too is divided over the 3 lower classes: daughters of the lower middle group often do the same work as labourers' daughters, though factory workers are scarce among them.

In general this group seems rather content. Good skilled labourers are scarce, and enjoy a certain esteem and safety. Some people have profited by the war: they learned a good job in Germany, later in the Dutch army, or they were skilled by special Philips courses. Only those who have wanted a "function" and feel passed by, and those who have degraded towards a badly paying "function" because of age or unfitness, are very rancorous. The "prospective assistants" e.o. are either younger people who shall become assistants in due time, or older people for whom this is a satisfactory final job; from the others no commentary is available. Probably the Brabant mentality asserts itself, which means an optimistic character and not too many aspirations. Yet the urge for more education is great: 70 % takes some course or has done so; so the ever growing number of lower technicians will be recruitable from this group.

IIIb.

These are building trade labourers, semi-skilled and unskilled labourers, most of them autochthonous.

More than 60 % has remained on the same level, almost 1/4 is from IIIa. Among these are many sons of small farmers and independent tradesmen (public-house keepers, clog-makers). The "droppers" from IIb are again of the same category as those in IIIa and IIb. They marry relatively often women with some education, the "stayers" more often factory girls.

As to the origin from independent middle class in all discussed groups, this migration to industry often comes off because the home trade cannot be maintained, also because there is no living for all of the children in it, but also because of the small-mindedness and unqualified work in petty business. The "remarks" make us surmise that often children from these marginal trades come to wage-earning jobs under-educated. As to IIIb, those who make remarks must be a positive selection regarding the way in which many unskilled workers try to fill in their questionnaire. In this first group, anyway, aspirations do not fail, even among real factory workers. They have often resigned to their low status, but they feel this as such, and want something better for their children. Here the Philips concern is a great help: it provides all sorts of courses, and support for talented children of all employees. However, for a person who has entered the factory at the age of 14, with no more than elementary school, it remains an almost impossible task to rise above this level.

A personal aspect.

One question that presents itself after all this is: does all this social mobility add to the personal happiness of the people concerned? For it often means a rupture with the old milieu.

Some case-study material gives this impression: the possible cleavage will develop between parents and the child, they allow to study. This is sad, but after some time the child would have his own life anyway, and he will often better assimilate when he frees himself from old ties. It may appear to be a temporary estrangement.

It is different with the much slower and laborious internal promotion. Here marriage is sometimes threatened, if it is contracted in the old social circle; the wife cannot keep pace with her husband, and he seeks consolation in a circle where his work and ambitions are understood and appreciated. When the children too are being well educated, the mother stands quite alone. This is sometimes avoided when the husband consciously makes an "imperfect" rise, and leaves his home life in the old style, even when sending the children to high schools; such types are no real social strivers, but more those who cannot but work very hard.

Among the climbers there are, next to self-assured, out-balanced characters, persons with much feeling of inferiority; they are always preying for shortcomings in themselves, in habits, manners, general education, erudition, and for the reactions of others on these shortcomings. Their whole life may be directed toward the attainment of the much desired style of life: not always without going above their economic capacity they live in a special district of the town, in an expensive house, their children go to special schools, their bookcases are full of literature that is not known by many academians, their pronunciation is corrected etc. All this is often done for the children's sake; how these react is probably first of all a question of talent on their part.

Appendix Ia.

Scale of male occupations.

Occupations marked x are Philips functions.

	Managing director	86	
	Director/owner of large business	94	
	Physician	98	
	Barrister	120	
	Captain ocean liner	135	
	Solicitor (Dutch: notaris)	141	I
	High government official	153	(Upper)
x	Engineer	162	
	Accountant	192	
	Clergyman	205	
	Dentist	206	
	Teacher secondary school (Dutch: Gymnasium or H.B.S.)	224	
	Architect	237	
	High fiscal official	307	
	Police inspector	322	
	Regular army officer (captain)	327	
x	Department head	328	
	Manager small business	341	IIa
	Station-master	365	(Upper middle)
	Broker	370	
	Captain of a coaster	376	
	Middle fiscal official	384	
	Teacher Dutch "Mulo" school	387	
	Shopkeeper (middle size)	389	
x	Technical designer-constructor	395	
	Teacher (primary) technical school	397	
	Hotelkeeper	406	
x	Assistant of department head (with sec. technical school)	413	
	Building contractor	415	
x	(Lower) official	428	
	Wholesale dealer	433	
x	Agent	433	IIb
	Insurance inspector	437	(Lower middle)
	Farmer (great)	457	
	Teacher primary school	458	
x	Foreman (with technical school)	509	
x	Draftsman	513	
	Artisan (independent)	551	
x	Calculator	554	

Revenue-man	603	
Salesman (small business)	621	
Loading-clerk (Dutch Railways)	624	
Shopkeeper (small)	624	
x Auxiliary assistant	631	IIIa
Non-commissioned officer	639	(Upper lower)
Engine-driver (Dutch Railways)	649	
x Skilled metal-worker	672	
x Glass instrument maker	673	
Skipper (inland navigation)	681	
x Foreman (no technical schooling)	690	
Insurance agent	692	
Public-house keeper	693	
Office clerk	733	
Signal-man	733	
x Electrician	738	
Guard (Dutch Railways)	748	
Farmer (small business)	749	
Carpenter	767	
Engine driver	770	
Waiter	773	
Policeman	773	
Sexton	775	
Shop-assistant	791	
Brick-layer	798	
x Glass-blower	801	IIIb
Chauffeur	806	(Lower lower)
Sailor	810	
x Assistant - foreman	810	
Postman	815	
Brakesman	815	
Storehouse-man	815	
Weaver		
Agricultural labourer		
All unskilled labourers		

Appendix Ib.

Female occupations.

1.	Occupations with university education.	
2.	Leading independent business.	
3.	Artistic occupations.	
4.	Teacher industrial (or housewifery) school.	Higher.
5.	Teacher elementary school.	
6.	Head of department (f.i. storehouse).	
7.	Nurse, social worker.	
8.	"Higher administrative"(for which more education is needed: private secretary, book-keeper, librarian; also chemist's assistant, analyst).	
9.	"Lower administrative" (for which little education is needed: shorthand typist Dutch, typist, clerk).	Middle.
10.	Shopgirl, waitress.	
11.	Manual occupations for which some education is required: dressmaker, cook.	
12.	Seamstress.	Lower.
13.	Household.	
14.	Maid-servant.	
15.	Factory worker (unskilled).	

Appendix II

Class father

Class interviewee	I	IIa	IIb	IIIa	IIIb	
I	72	50	77	23	4	226
IIa	16	44	117	46	36	259
IIb	28	100	380	229	217	954
IIIa	6	21	187	269	399	882
IIIb	1	15	114	228	605	963
	123	230	875	795	1211	3284

In percentages

I	32	22	34	10	2
IIa	6	17	45	18	14
IIb	3	10	40	24	23
IIIa	1	2	21	315	45
IIIb	0	2	12	24	63

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/27

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIÈGE
24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS
24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale
et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification
and Social Mobility

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY IN THE U.S.S.R.

by

S. V. Utechin
Oxford University

Skrivemaskinstua
Stortingsgt. 18
Oslo

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY IN THE U.S.S.R.

by

S. V. Utechin

Oxford University

The scientific study of the problem of stratification in Soviet society is of comparatively recent origin. This was due not only to the fact that the treatment of Soviet society as a whole was for a long time left to propagandists arguing the case for or against the Soviet regime. An additional reason was presented by the subject itself; the old Russian social order was rapidly destroyed, and a new order created, in the course of the two Bolshevik revolutions of 1917-8 and 1929-33, and the changes were so swift and incessant that they produced a picture of complete flux which deterred most social scientists from attempting to study the new system. It is widely believed that a prominent place among the reasons for the long delay in an appearance of scientific interest in our problem was taken by the lack of material. I find it difficult to share this view. It is true that the inaccessibility of the object of study for foreign scholars, and the unfavourable political conditions in the Soviet Union for Russian scholars, make the application of certain methods of collecting data impossible, and of other methods difficult, but the problem is surely not more complicated than that of the study of societies of the distant past. And if the scholar cannot peruse the archives or carry out field studies, he has as a substitute for them people who have been able to observe the life of Soviet society, or else who have themselves been members of it. Indeed, even some foreign scholars from time to time get the chance of meeting those who are still members of the Soviet society.

As in the case of the study of stratification in other societies[1] there is as yet no unanimity among the students of Soviet society as to the most suitable criteria for the identification of social strata; a short review of the existing theories of stratification will illustrate this point.

There is first of all the theory which insists on the existence of a basic social uniformity in the Soviet Union. This theory is upheld by those authors who, adhering to the Marxist principles of social research, maintain that the social position of a person or group is determined by their being or not being owners of means of production, and by the form of ownership. The prototype of the theory of social uniformity as far as stratification is concerned is the Stalinist theory of Soviet society, advanced by Stalin himself in 1936[2]. According to this theory, the Soviet society consists of two classes - the working class and the peasants - and of an intermediate stratum - the intelligentsia. None of these three groups is stratigraphically higher than the others. They are all on the same level. Differences in income, influence and prestige do exist between individuals, but they have no theoretical value since they cannot lead to the formation of distinct social classes. This Stalinist view is shared by many scholars outside the Soviet Union. Messrs. Andrew Rothstein[3], Maurice Dobb[4], Alexander Baykov[5], P. Sweezy[6], and S. P. Turin[7]

all accept the Stalinist theory in its entirety. Essentially the same views are held by those authors to whom Soviet society is a specific instance of a socialist society built up in a backward country - Professor G. D. H. Cole[8], Messrs. R. Schlesinger[9], Harper and Johnsen[10], F. Dan (the late Menshevik)[11], etc. To them, the differences of income are a transitory phenomenon, due to the necessity of providing incentives for the more efficient amidst the mass of the unskilled, a phenomenon which will disappear as soon as the country has reached a high level of technical and economic developement, and which, therefore, cannot lead to any class building. Finally, the picture of basic social uniformity is drawn by some of the authors who see in Soviet society a peculiarly Russian kind of socialist society - by, for example, J. F. Normano [12].

Most students of Soviet society, however, do not attach much importance to the explanation that the differences of income, prestige and power observable in the Soviet Union are transitory and non-class-building. Many of them picture Soviet society as consisting essentially of two social strata: the elite and the mass. These dichotomic theories fall into two categories - those which see in this dichotomy a peculiarly Russian feature, characteristic for the Russian society at all stages in its developement, and those which, on the contrary, depict it as the expression of a new kind of social division characteristic for the managerial society which is going to replace the bourgeois society. The main representative of the former group are the late Nazi theorist, Alfred Rosenberg[13], Professor Alfred Weber[14], and Professor Geoffrey Gorer[15]. According to the first, the Soviet elite was racially different from the mass, being of Jewish-Mongol racial make-up while the latter was of the passive Slav element. Professor Weber's kultur sociological theory ascribes the dichotomy to the shapelessness and polarity of the Russian soul, which makes people capable only of dominating or of being dominated and which has prevented the formation in Russian society of a middle class. The Soviet elite is thus merely a new version of the traditional Russian boyars, and the mass, of the Russian muzhiks. Professor Gorer, in his psychoanalytic-anthropological theory, finds the explanation of the Soviet elite's ability to maintain its dominant position in the society in their different manner of upbringing, namely, in the fact that they are not swaddled in infancy.

The authors presenting Soviet society as a managerial society fall into two groups. Some of them, as for example Professor Frederick Schuman[16], depict it as an open society where the elite - which he calls the intelligentsia - consists of the fittest and most efficient members of the society who appropriate most of what is valued but whose ranks are wide open to successful aspirants from among the mass. Professor James Burnham[17] and his followers, on the other hand, stress the increasing difficulties of such permeation from below and the resulting progressive decline in vertical mobility which must result in the eventual emergence of a closed society.

A number of students find a three-tiered model is more suitable for the description of Soviet society. Thus Mr. Towster[18] accepts the Stalinist division into the working class, the peasants, and the intelligentsia, but presents them as three stratigraphical classes with the intelligentsia on top, the working class in the middle and the peasantry at the bottom. A different picture is given by Suzanne Labin[19], who, in the Marxist fashion, presents what she calls the bureaucracy as a collective owner of the means of production on top, exploiting the two lower classes of minor officials and of the working people. Yet another theory is put forward by Professor S. N. Timasheff[20], who contends that since the middle thirties Russian society has been progressively returning to the

"normal" structure - exemplified for him by the familiar structure of Western societies - with an aristocracy on top, a middle class, and labouring classes, though he admits, it is true, the existence of the concentration camp slaves as a distinct group beneath the "normal" structure.

The intensified study of Soviet society in the last few years has led to the creation of a number of theories of stratification which replace the few crude strata of the foregoing theories by a greater number more minutely detailed. One of these finer theories was developed by social scientists in the Soviet Union. It divides Soviet society not into purely occupational classes, as did the earlier Stalinist theory, but into a number of classes singled out on the basis of occupation, prestige and power position. These classes are as follows:

a) The Great Leader - a class consisting of necessity of one person (since Stalin's death this class has ceased to exist).

b) The leaders of the Party and the Government (since Stalin's death this class has acquired greater significance).

c) "The Party and the Government", also referred to as "the political leaders". This class does not include all members of the Party, but only those who are politically active and influential.

d) The notable people (znatniye lyudi) - people who have distinguished themselves in the eyes of the leadership in some sphere of the "Construction of communism".

e) The intelligentsia.

f) The workers.

g) The peasants.

The details of this theory are not usually stated in plain language, but they can easily be discerned by careful reading of recent works such as the symposium "Soviet Socialist Society", published by the Academy of Science of the USSR[21].

Similar criteria for the identification of classes have been used in another more detailed theory, worked out by the Russian emigré scholars Messrs. Redlich and Ossipov[22]. According to them, the Soviet society consists of (a) a very small ruling group; (b) a stratum of notables divided into the three groups of political, intellectual and decorative notables; (c) the apparatus which comprises the middle bureaucracy; (d) the suppliers - specialists in lobbying and fixing; (e) the intelligentsia; (f) the workers and peasants; and (g) the concentration camp inmates.

The most recent theory of this detailed type is that evolved by Dr. Inkeles, of Harvard University[23]. He attempts a combination of the Stalinist theory and of the more recent Soviet theory, and pictures the class of the intelligentsia as being sub-divided into four strata, the class of workers into three, and the class of peasants into two, adding at the very bottom the inmates of the forced labour camps. The stratigraphic picture resulting from this is as follows:

a) The ruling elite - "a small group consisting of high party, government, economic and military officials, prominent scientists and selected artists and writers".

b) The superior intelligentsia.

c) The general intelligentsia (which also includes such categories as the middle ranks of the bureaucracy, managers of small enterprises etc.)

d) The working class aristocracy, consisting of the most highly skilled and productive workers.

e) and f) The white-collar workers (the lowest stratum of the intelligentsia) and the well-to-do peasants (well-to-do because of both objective favourable circumstances and individual skill and productivity).

g) The average workers.

h) and i) The average peasant and the "disadvantaged" workers (i.e. those of lower skill and efficiency).

j) The forced labourers.

There is a large measure of agreement between these three detailed schemes, and in many aspects they are complementary. The main deficiencies of the Soviet theory are its failure to include the forced labour camp slaves into the scheme; the absence in it of a distinction between an average skilled worker and an unskilled worker, as well as between a relatively well-to-do and a poor peasant; the lack of professional differentiation of the group of "intelligentsia", into which the bureaucrats and the white-collar workers are included. Most of these failures are corrected by Dr. Inkeles, whose own theory, however, also contains a few mistakes. It is wrong to place the working class aristocracy below the general intelligentsia. The class which he calls general intelligentsia, like the intelligentsia at large in the Soviet theory, contains many groups which should be listed separately; some of them, such as the apparatus and the suppliers, are definitely superior in rank to an ordinary professional man. He has also failed to realize the many essential similarities between the "notable" groups of the intelligentsia, workers and peasants, which warrant the creation of a larger class group of notables. Messrs. Redlich and Ossipov's theory, like the Soviet theory, fails to draw a distinction between the lower and the middle ranks of the working class and the peasantry, or to provide a place for the white-collar workers. On the other hand, it recognizes the functional similarities between the groups of political leaders, superior intelligentsia and "notable" workers and peasants (whom they call "decorative" notables), and includes them into a larger class of notables. It also recognizes the apparatus and the group of suppliers as distinct social groups.

A weakness common to all three of the last-named theories is that, in their reaction against the older, crude and inadequate class groups, they devote all their attention to the singling out of the smaller groups and their position in the hierarchy; they neglect the problem of the most appropriate grouping of these smaller class groups into larger units. The Soviet authors and Dr. Inkeles, when in need of such a grouping, simply use the Stalinist terms, while Redlich and Ossipov avoid the problem altogether. It seems appropriate to divide the whole hierarchy of the lesser class groups into three larger categories. One of the two main dividing lines clearly runs between the inmates of the forced labour camps and labour colonies on the one hand, and the poor peasants on the other. The criterion here is that of the prevalent form of non-economic compulsion to which they are subjected in their life and work: the former are subject to brute physical force, the latter - together with the rest of the society - merely to the threat of such force. Mr. Inkeles clearly recognizes this distinction. The second main dividing line runs between those whose main function in the society - that function which determines their social position - is the exercise of some form of power over other members of the society and those who are only objects of this exercise of power. Thus the main social groups are the slaves, the toilers (trudyashchiyesya) and the ruling class. The stratigraphical system, therefore, is as follows:

I. The Ruling Class.

1) The leaders of the Party and the Government.
2) The notables: a) political
   b) intellectual
   c) decorative
3) The apparatus.

II. The Toilers.
1) The suppliers.
2) The ordinary intelligentsia.
3) The white-collar workers.
4) The average workers.
5) and 6) The average peasants and the lower-skilled workers.
7) The poor peasants.

III. The Slaves.

Dr. Inkeles and the Soviet authors pay much attention to the problem of vertical mobility. According to the soviet theory, the upward movement of the members of the lower classes is easy provided they follow certain conventional routes. An aspiring peasant can become a worker, a member of the intelligentsia or a "notable" person directly, but he cannot become directly, without passing through any intervening stages, a political leader. Nor can a worker do this, for he also must first become either an intellectual or a notable. An aspiring intellectual, on the other hand, may move via the stage of a notable, but he need not and may move to the class of political leaders directly. Upward movement in the four upper classes must always be stage by stage, and no jumps are possible. While accurately describing the actual channels of vertical mobility, this exposition leaves out of account difficulties which are often insurmountable for aspirants. These obstacles are well surveyed by Dr. Inkeles. He describes the factors that appeared during the decade 1940-50, the effect of which was to restrict vertical mobility. These factors were:

1) Regulations which made the award of certain decorations restricted to particular ranks and jobs.
2) The introduction of civilian ranks and uniforms.
3) Changes in the inheritance tax and income tax structures.
4) Restriction on the access to educational opportunities.
5) A tendency to make the access to certain desirable statuses dependent on birth.
6) A shift in the dominant value system in favour of the intelligentsia, particularly the tendency to select candidates for important managerical posts from the ranks of technical and other specialists.
7) The strengthening of the family.

Dr. Inkeles' conclusion was, however, that in spite of these restrictive tendencies, the Soviet society was by 1950 still an open society. Let us now see what has happened since 1950.

The trend depicted by Dr. Inkeles for 1940-50 has also been characteristic for the later years. The general tendency was clearly that of an increasing rigidity of the system. All the factors described by Dr. Inkeles have continued to be operative; such changes as have taken place have only added to their force.

The number of ranks and rank-symbols has been increased, particularly of those distinguishing the "notable" workers and peasants from the average, and the latter from the less successful ones. The system of awarding orders and medals for specified achievements to persons of definite ranks has been further developed; titles such as "Exellent quality worker" have now been introduced. A number of workers have been granted the right of using their own personal trademarks. Several types of school and courses, attached to the factories and attended by workers in their free time, issue leaving certificates which serve to distinguish the grades of skill. Similar devices have been introduced as class-indicating symbols among the peasantry. The elimination of time-wages has made further progress, and the system of bonuses has become more complicated. The enlargement through fusion of collective farms, which has taken place since 1950, facilitated this process on

the countryside. It allowed the use among peasants of many practices hitherto restricted in the main to industry, such as the individual piece-rate system of remuneration. The income-tax structure, together with the virtual absence of the inheritance tax, are producing their first tangible results as sources of unearned income; Stalin's death, for example, has made his son and daughter millionaires who could live on the interest from their father's accumulated royalties. The shift in the value system in favour of the intelligentsia of all ranks has continued; the Stakhanovite "movement", for example, is not only no longer directed against the technical specialists, but the latter are allowed and encouraged to take a leading part in it.

Restrictions of access to educational opportunities have continued. About a quarter of the boys of the age-group 14-19 is yearly called up into the Labour Reserve schools. Tuition fees and the absence of any scholarships or grants for the pupils of the last three grades of the secondary schools are a bar on the way to higher education for the great majority of working class and peasant children. An average annual income of a worker of about 6,000 Rb.[24] is obviously insufficient to maintain a son or daughter at school and to pay the 150-200 Rbs. tuition fee[25]. Even less feasible is a high school career for the child of an ordinary peasant. No statistics of peasant earnings are published, but good collective farms have been reported as having distributed (in addition to a quantity of food which is consumed in the family and cannot therefore be sold) 9,000 Rbs. per annum per family, or 2,000 per working person. The following example of "good" income of kolkhoz peasants has been reported recently by Pravda. Peasants of a model collective farm in the Tambov province received in 1952 1,020 Rbs. per working person, in addition to 680 kg of grain and some vegetables and fruit [26]. The average earnings of the peasants are apparently even lower.

The tendency to select candidates for important managerial jobs from among the country's 5.5 million specialists has also increased. The creation of larger collective farms was followed by the appointment of agricultural specialists with high or secondary education as their chairmen. Already in 1952 there were more than 18,000 specialists among the 97,000 chairmen of the new big kolkhozes[27]. The 19th party congress, held in October 1952, was a striking example of this developement. Data about the education of the participants were published for the first time in the history of the party; they showed that 59,5 % of the delegates were graduates of institutions of university level. The reorganization of the government after Stalin's death was also used for the same purpose; the Minister of the new large Ministry for Heavy and Transport Machine-building, Malyshkin, reported it as an achievement that the overwhelming majority of the leading officials of the Ministry were specialists.[28]

On the other hand, upward mobility is still considerable. It is particularly encouraged between the various classes of workers and peasants. 7-8 million workers (including white-collar) acquired new qualifications, or improved their qualifications in 1951-2 by the means of various evening schools and courses, as compared with 6-7 million a year from 1946 to 1950. A new system of agricultural courses for peasants, with a 3-year curriculum, was introduced in 1950. The average number of students is 2.6 million. Together with the students of shorter courses there were in 1952 about 4.7 million peasants engaged in improving their qualifications[29]. The Labour Reserve schools continue to provide an opportunity for peasant boys to become skilled workers. Their curriculum has been improved in 1951, when a successful completion of the 7-grade school was made a condition for being called up[30]. The number of those called up has dropped by almost 50 %, partly because of this condition and partly because the respective

age groups are much smaller as a result of the population losses at the time of collectivisation[31]. Movement from the toiling class to the status of a notable is also encouraged, but is becoming inreasingly difficult, as is the case with most other upward movements.

It is therefore clear that recent study of Soviet society has resulted in the realisation that it is rigidly divided into three main classes with numerous sub-divisions, forming a complicated social hierarchy. Within this hierarchy vertical mobility is still possible, (even in the space of one generation) but is becoming more and more restricted.

Footnotes.

1. Cf. Harold W. Pfautz, "The Current Literature of Social Stratification. Critique and Bibliography", in The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LVIII, No. 4, January, 1953.
2. J. V. Stalin, Report on the Draft of the Constitution, 1936.
3. Andrew Rothstein, Workers in the Soviet Union, London, 1942, and Man and Plan in the Soviet Economy, London, 1948.
4. Maurice Dobb, Soviet Economic Development, London, 1948.
5. Alexander Baykov, The Development of the Soviet Economic System, Cambridge, 1946.
6. Paul M. Sweezy, Socialism, New York, 1949.
7. S. P. Turin, The USSR. An Economic and Social Survey, London, 1944, (2nd ed., 1945).
8. G. D. H. Cole, The Intelligent Man's Guide to the Post-war World, London, 1947.
9. Dr. Rudolf Schlesinger, Soviet Legal Theory. Its Social Background and Development, London, 1945, and The Spirit of Post-war Russia. Soviet Ideology 1917-1946, London, 1947.
10. Samuel N. Harper and Ronald Thompson, The Government of the Soviet Union, 2nd ed. New York, 1949.
11. F. Dan, The Origin of Bolshevism, New York, 1946 (Russ.).
12. J. F. Normano, The Spirit of Russian Economics, New York, 1945.
13. Alfred Rosenberg, Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts, 31.-32. Aufl. München, 1934. Although the author, like Stalin, can hardly be considered a scholar, his theory (like that of Stalin) has been sufficiently influential to merit its inclusion here.
14. Professor Alfred Weber, Kulturgeschichte als Kultursoziologie, Leyden, 1935.
15. Geoffrey Gorer, The People of Great Russia.
16. Frederick L. Schuman, Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad, London, 1948.
17. James Burnham, The Managerial Revolution, London, 1942.
18. Julian Towster, Political Power in the USSR, 1917-1947, New York, 1948.
19. Suzanne Labin, Stalin's Russia, Eng. trans., London, 1949.
20. S. N. Timasheff, The Great Retreat, New York, 1946.
21. On Soviet Socialist Society, ed. by F. Konstantinov and others, Moscow, 1948 (Russ.).
22. R. N. Redlich and N. I. Ossipov, Essays in Bolshevismology, 6th issue, Frankfurt/Main, 1952 (Russ.).
23. A. Inkeles, "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union, 1940-1950", American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, pp. 465-79.
24. This was the plan figure for 1950 as an average yearly income for the whole category "workers and employees", which includes the top-ranking officials, specialists and the working aristocracy; see Voprosi Ekonomiki, No. 8, 1950, p. 69; the average wage has remained stable since then, cf. S. Schwarz, Labour in the Soviet Union, New York, 1953, p. 256.

25. For the economic conditions in Moscow, see T. Schulz and P. Wiles, "Earnings and Living Standards in Moscow", Bulletin of the Oxford Institute of Statistics, Vol. 14, Nos. 9 & 10, Sept. and Oct. 1952.

26. Pravda, 25. 5. 1953.

27. The figure for specialists is for the beginning of the year; that for the number of farms, for October 1952; Cf. Voprosi Ekonomiki, No. 4, 1953, pp. 96, 100.

28. Pravda, 20. 5. 1953.

29. Voprosi Ekonomiki, No. 4, 1953, p. 100.

30. Ibid., No. 12, 1952, p. 26.

31. C. F. Lorimer, The Population of the Soviet Union, Geneva, 1946, pp. 121, 256.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/28

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE

24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS

24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale

et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification

and Social Mobility

The Theory of Social Classes

by

Dr. Kurt MAYER

Associate Professor of Sociology
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island
U.S.A.

Skrivemaskinstua
Stortingsgt. 18
Oslo

THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CLASSES *

by

Dr. Kurt Mayer
Associate Professor of Sociology
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island
U.S.A.

I

"Probably no area of current sociological interest suffers so much from the disease of overconceptualization" [1] as the analysis of social classes. In part the chaotic condition of social class theory stems from the fact that its subject matter is highly controversial. Ever since the publication of the Communist Manifesto in 1848, the very term "class" has been associated with the notion of class hatred and class struggle, the antithesis of the rulers and the ruled, and the conflict between socialism and capitalism. These political connotations have hardly been conducive to detached, scientific investigations of the phenomena of social stratification. Indeed, in the United States where official doctrine and traditional beliefs tend to deny the existence of classes, the study of social stratification was long neglected as a subject of dubious academic respectability. To be sure, the works of all the Founding Fathers of American sociology contained some scattered discussions of various aspects of social stratification. [2] Yet, with the one exception of Thorstein Veblen, none of the Fathers placed these topics in the center of their field of interest, and their immediate successors paid only the most perfunctory attention to the subject. They were content to share the complacent beliefs of the general public that class distinctions did not exist in America, as well as the popular distrust of the term itself because of its close association with revolutionary "alien" doctrines. [3] It was primarily the shock

---

* An expanded version of this paper will be published in two spesial issues of The Harvard Educational Review (Summer-Fall 1953) devoted to the topic "Social Class and American Education".

1) Harold W. Pfautz, "The Current Literature on Social Stratification: Critique and Bibliography", American Journal of Sociology, 58 (January 1953), p. 392. The present writer is greatly indebted to Prof. Pfautz for his many helpful suggestions and constructive criticism. However, Prof. Pfautz cannot be held responsible for any of the views here presented.

2) Cf. Charles H. Page, Class and American Sociology: From Ward to Ross (New York: Dial Press, 1941).

3) Ibid., pp. IX-XI, cf. also Milton M. Gordon, "Social Class in American Sociology", American Journal of Sociology, 55 (November 1949).

of the "great depression" which jolted American sociologists out of their complacency and forced them to re-examine the fundamentals of the American social structure. During the last twenty years this revival of interest in social stratification has led to a great proliferation of monographs and articles dealing with class phenomena. Unfortunately, this flood of literature has tended to add more confusion than clarification to class theory. Even now most American writers on social stratification are clearly not unaffected by the traditional concepts and consciously or unconsciously attempt to separate the study of stratification in contemporary society from its historical contexts.

II

From Aristotle onward the term "class" has had reference to the differentiation of a society into higher and lower strata, characterized by differential privileges and distinctions of rank and prestige. Traditionally, class analysis has attempted to explain social inequalities as economic in origin and nature.[4] Traditional class theory encountered little conceptual difficulty in its attempt to explain social stratification as economic in origin and nature. It is essentially historical in nature, intended less to provide a descriptive account of the class structure of a given society at a given time than to explain social change as the direct result of changes of economic structure. Certainly Marx and his followers employed the term class as a key concept of a political, action-oriented interpretation of history. Whatever the applicability of their hypothesis to the dynamics of history, the attempt to trace social inequality primarily to economic causes has appeared very plausible. Historically the correlation between economic differences and social cleavages was indeed close and unmistakable. Thus, differential distribution of property and income was directly reflected in differences of rank, honor, and prestige. Each class was characterized by distinct patterns of conduct and specific behavior standards which gave clear recognition to its place in the social hierarchy. At the same time prevailing ideology explained, rationalized, and justified the existing arrangements. Finally, the classes were marked off from each other by severe limitations on intermarriage and social intercourse, by an acute sense of social distance, and by visible symbols of their distinctive ways of life. In short, class divisions were obvious, visible, and tangible. There was no difficulty either in recognizing the criteria of a given individual's class position or in

---

4) "In all states there may be distinguished three parts, or classes of the citizen-body -- the very rich; the very poor; and the middle class which forms the mean." Aristotle, Politics, translated by Ernest Barker (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), pp. 181-81.

perceiving the schematic hierarchy of classes as a whole.

The situation is quite different, however, in modern industrial societies where class symbols are not nearly as consistent and visible. In feudal Europe it was easy enough to distinguish merchants from aristocrats by their distinctive dress, but one would be hard put to it to select people on the streets of, say, the downtown section of an American city and type them with respect to their class position although this might be feasible at both extremes of the scale. Modern social classes are no longer visibly marked off from each other or demarcated by tangible boundaries. They have no legal standing; nor are they organized troups. There are no official, rigid criteria of class position. All the upper and middle class symbols are theoretically accessible to anyone with the necessary wealth to purchase them. Furthermore, the movement of individuals and families from one class to another is free of any legal restrictions. As a result, the manifold differences in authority, power, and prestige which characterize contemporary society are not directly and visibly correlated with the economic inequalities which nevertheless underlie them and are their ultimate cause. Consequently the personal social status of any given individual in this industrial society is not necessarily the exact equivalent of his class position at any given moment in time. It is precisely this difference between class position and social status - i.e. the problem of the interrelation between economic inequality and the differential distribution of power and prestige in contemporary society which has given rise to the conceptual difficulties and confusions which permeate modern class theory.

III

Ironically enough, in view of the great influence which their theories have exercised, the first ones to stumble over this problem were Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and all their doctrinaire followers who completely ignored the status factor. They did not see that in industrial societies rank, prestige, and political power are variables which can play a role quite independent from the economic factors which determine class position. Believing that under the capitalist mode of production money was the chief determinant of social status, Marx regarded all other status elements as transitional survivals from feudalism. Indeed, to this day most Marxists fail to recognize that middle class groups are motivated as much by the maintenance of prestige and status as they are by purely economic considerations.[5] Of course, this great weakness in Marxian class analysis (which has also affected their political tactics adversely), stems from the fact that Marx considered the whole middle class of small businessmen, technicians, and intellectuals a transitory pheno-

5) Cf. Oliver C. Cox, Caste, Class and Race (New York: Doubleday, 1948).

menon. He assumed that these elements would soon disappear in the emergence of only two great classes: the capitalists and the proletariat - those who own all the means of production and those who are exploited.

As we now realize this prediction was erroneous. Although much of Marx' work represents a fairly accurate description of the industrial trends which he witnessed during his own lifetime - - the rapid expansion of manufacturing industries - - he failed to foresee that the later stages of industrial development would result in the growth of a service (tertiary) economy with its concomitant proliferation of clerical, managerial, and professional middle class employees. Thus Marxism, although it has proved enormously appealing as a political philosophy and a program of political action, not only to Europe's industrial workers but to the lower classes of many other countries as well, appears inadequate and defective as a scientific class theory.

If Marxian class analysis is faulty because it fails to take the status factor into account, exactly the opposite error characterizes the class theories of many contemporary sociologists, particularly those writing in the English language. This is especially true of the theories propounded by Professor W. Lloyd Warner of the University of Chicago and his many students and associates who, during the past two decades have undertaken a number of empirical investigations of the class structure of various American communities. Although Warner holds that they cover all aspects of the national class structure, these studies deal primarily with the meaning and operation of status (prestige) systems of local American communities. They differ from earlier analyses in two major respects: Whereas the class theories not only of Marx but of all earlier scholars concerned themselves with the social stratification of total societies and usually employed a historical approach, the empirical studies of the Warner group all focus their attention on specific local communities and use an anthropological approach.[6] These differences are important because they imply an ideological commitment with deep roots in the functional school of anthropology: the explicit assumption that there is no difference between the larger society and the local community.[7]

---

6) Professor Warner is an anthropologist who has turned from the investigation of the Australian blackfellow tribes to the study of contemporary American society.

7) As can be seen from the introduction to his latest community study, Warner is quite emphatic on this point: "To study Jonesville is to study America ..... The social structure governing American capitalism lies within the actions of its people, for the lives of ten thousand citizens of Jonesville express the basic values of 140,000,000 Americans." W. Lloyd Warner et al., Democracy in Jonesville (New York: Harper, 1949), p. XV.

Such an assumption may perhaps be adequate in the investigation of a preliterate tribe, but in a complex industrial society like that of the United States the identification of small local communities with the society as a whole appears definitely unwarranted.

The basic tenets which have informed Warner's class theory were developed in his first community research, the well-known "Yankee City" investigation.[8] Here Warner states that he started out with "a general economic interpretation of human behavior in our society. It was believed that the fundamental structure of our society, that which ultimately controls and dominates the thinking and actions of our people is economic, and that the most vital and far-reaching value systems which motivate Americans are to be ultimately traced to an economic order. Our first interviews tended to sustain this. They were filled with references to the 'big people with money' and to the 'little people who are poor.' They assigned people high status by referring to them as bankers, large property owners, people of high salary, and professional men, or they placed people in a low status by calling them laborers, ditch-diggers and low-wage earners. Other similar economic terms were used, all designating superior and inferior positions." [9]

However, as this interviewing procedure continued, - which required a sample of Yankee City inhabitants to rank their fellow citizens according to their social standing, Warner noticed that the postulated direct relation between social status and economic position did not apply in all cases. Especially some very wealthy individuals were not accorded top social prestige by the local raters. "Great wealth did not guarantee the highest social position. Something more was necessary." [10] Apparently this something more consisted of certain non-economic, largely local status criteria employed by the informants in rating their neighbors; e.g., the ability to "act right", knowing how to spend money, "going around with the right kind of people", as well as area of residence, length of residence in town, and membership in various formal organizations.[11] Instead of investigating the "deviant cases" further, which would have made it possible to analyze the crucial relationship between economic position and social prestige in a precise manner, the whole economic theory of class was abandoned and the following new definition of class based on the subjective evaluations of the Yankee City inhabitants was substituted: "By class is meant two or more orders of people who are believed to be, and are accordingly ranked by the members of the community in socially superior and inferior positions." [12]

---

8) W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941).

9) Ibid., p. 81.

10) Ibid., p. 82.

11) Ibid., pp. 83 ff.

12) Ibid., p. 82.

Obviously this use of the term class represents a radical departure from traditional usage. Indeed, reviewing his Yankee City research in a later context, Warner himself makes this quite clear: "The emphasis for class placement is not on socio-economic categories, although they are powerful factors in determining status, but on the evaluated participation of individuals and families. To understand how these social classes were derived it might be well to add, a social class is to be thought of as the largest group of people whose members have intimate access to one another. A class is composed of families and social cliques. The interrelationships between these families and cliques, in such informal activities as visiting, dances, receptions, teas, and larger informal affairs, constitute the structure of a social class. A person is a member of that social class with which most of his participation, of this intimate kind, occurs." 13) There can be no doubt, then, that Warner's researches do not deal with the class structure of American society at all, but with local status hierarchies and prestige groups.

To be sure, local status systems are no less legitimate research objects than national class structures. Indeed, in a capitalist society there is bound to be a close, reciprocal interrelationship between these two dimensions of social stratification, the empirical investigation of which constitutes one of the most urgent tasks of sociological analysis. Yet this becomes manifestly difficult, if not impossible, when the time-honored concept "class" is appropriated to stand for local "status level" in such a fashion as to swallow up all analytical distinctions between status and class. What is involved here is more than a mere matter of definition. The net result of this procedure has been to change the traditional meaning of an important conceptual tool, thereby throwing the whole sociology of class into serious confusion.

Calling the several status levels social classes, Warner proceeded to divide the population of Yankee City into a six-fold hierarchy. The upper-upper class comprises the town's social elite of long standing. A lower-upper class consists of "nouveaux riches" anxious to be accepted as social equals by the "old families". "Solid" business enterprisers and professionals without aristocratic pretensions make up the upper-middle class. A lower-middle class consists chiefly of clerical workers, small business enterprisers, and some skilled workers. Skilled workers and other "poor but respectable workingmen" constitute an upper-lower class. Finally there is a lower-lower class of unemployed, unskilled, and semi-skilled workers who live in slum areas. The criteria of evaluation employed in distinguishing one class from another are clear only with respect to the differences between the upper-upper and the lower-upper class: family lineage. As far as the distinctions between the other levels are concerned, the

13) W. Lloyd Warner, "A Methodological Note", in St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Black Metropolis (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1945), pp. 772-73.

criteria are vague and unsystematic. Any careful reader cannot escape the conclusion that this six-fold division is actually a classificatory scheme arbitrarily imposed upon the community as a heuristic device by the researchers. It is definitely not a substantive arrangement recognized by the members of the community themselves. Yet Warner stoutly maintains that these classes are not a product of his conceptual scheme but that they are "real", that this is the way which people in American communities actually classify themselves, although it must not be thought that all the people in Yankee City are aware of all the minute inctions made in this book." [14] In order to validate his claim he goes on to prove in considerable detail that members of the same class associate with one another in their daily rounds of social activities, but obviously, if classes are defined as groups of people who have intimate access to each other, the argument is circular and the theory is tautological.

There are several other grave shortcomings which stem from Warner's class divisions in terms of individuals' intimate participation with and social acceptance by one another on a community level, of which only two can be mentioned here. For one thing, this approach is wholly a-historical. The technique of gathering information from selected local informants results in a static picture of the stratification system. Unless it is supplemented by a careful study of historical records, an entirely spurious impression of timelessness results. After all, we know that modern societies change continuously, and for this very reason it has always been the major purpose of traditional class theory to trace and analyze the changes of the class structure. It is clear, however, that Warner's direct transference of the anthropological approach from the study of preliterate tribes who have no recorded history, to the investigation of modern society involves a "trained incapacity" to deal with social change. Even though the Yankee City study concerns one of the oldest towns on our Eastern seaboard with excellent historical archives, Warner's account of its class structure shows no trends whatsoever.

This is true even of his treatment of social mobility, the process by which individuals and families change their class position by moving up or down the social ladder. Despite the fact that Warner explicitly recognizes mobility as a centrally important aspect of class systems, none of his studies contains an adequate, systematic analysis of the extent, frequency, or incidence of social mobility in the communities investigated.

Finally, it is obvious that community reputational analysis is feasible only in small communities where most inhabitants know each other personally, or at least by sight. Certainly any rating procedure where local informants rate the status reputation of their fellow citizens becomes manifestly unworkable in large cities where even neighbors do not know one another. Moreover this method does not permit adequate comparative study of different communities. Concern over the comparability of the class structure of different communities finally led Warner to develop in his latest community research

14) Warner and Lunt, op. cit., p. 91.

an alternative method for class placement, known as the Index of Status Characteristics.[15] Composed of four items: occupation, source of income, house type, and dwelling area, this index is believed applicable to any American community since it supposedly consists of objective criteria, not of subjective evaluations. Actually, two of its components, house type and dwelling area, are still based upon subjective, local criteria. Moreover, weighty objections have been raised by several critics about both the methodological and the theoretical validity of the whole index as an instrument of measurement.[16] We cannot here concern ourselves with the highly technical considerations of its methodological validity and reliability, but we shall have occasion to return below to its theoretical implications.

IV

Warner's work has had great influence, directly or indirectly, upon the development of modern American class analysis. To date he has himself been author or co-author of nine books on American social stratification and has guided or supported several other major studies.[17] Moreover, his theory and methods have been adopted more or less uncritically by a number of sociologists who are pursuing stratification research independently. Most empirical investigations of contemporary social stratification focus their attention upon some local community. Frequently these studies employ some form of the prestige rating technique in order to determine the position of individuals in the status hierarchy. The community is then divided into the familiar six-fold class division, although in some cases where a distinction between "old" and "new" upper class families does not appear warranted, the two top classes are combined into a single upper class and a five-fold class division is adopted.[18]

One cannot quite help suspecting that Warner's approach owes its great popularity less to whatever intrinsic merits his theory may possess than to the deceptive ease with which it can be applied empirically,[19] and also to the appeal which it exercises upon many scholars imbued, consciously or unconsciously, with traditional American beliefs. While not denying the existence of social classes - on the contrary, his writings strongly suggest that he conceives it as one of his primary duties to make Americans aware of the existence of

---

15) Cf. W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949).

16) Cf. Harold W. Pfautz and Otis Dudley Duncan, "A Critical Evalution of Warner's Work in Community Stratification", American Sociological Review, 15 (April 1950); and Seymour M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, "Social Status and Social Structure: A Re-Examination of Data and Interpretations", British Journal of Sociology, 2 (June and September 1951).

17) Among the most noteworthy of these are Allison Davis, Burleigh Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner, Deep South (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941); St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Black Metropolis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945); and August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: Wiley, 1949).

18) See for example Warner's own Democracy in Jonesville, op. cit., and Hollingshead's Elmtown's Youth, op. cit.

19) For a typical example see Mozell C. Hill and Bevode C. McCall, "Social Stratification in 'Georgia Town'," American Sociological Review, 15 (December 1950).

class distinctions[20] - - Warner's theory seems to provide a convenient "refutation" of Marx. Its static concept of the social structure neatly bypasses the possibility of clashing economic interests which, under given circumstances, may lead to organized class action and fundamental changes of the class structure. Limiting its attention to social status, this theory substitutes the pleasant picture of a stable status hierarchy where the only problem concerns the adjustment of individuals to the existing arrangements and their chances to improve their personal position. The danger of this narrow view lies not only in the fact that it presents an unrealistic and inadequate picture of the class structure but also in its use as a possible idological prop for the uncritical defense of the status quo.

The conservative implications of Warner's theory appear most evident, perhaps, in their application to our educational system. Warner has presented his analysis of the role of the public schools in the American class structure in a special volume that has had considerable impact upon the educational world.[21] According to his theory, the public school system fulfills a dual role in our society. It serves first and foremost as a major channel of social mobility, teaching young people the necessary skills "to get ahead." It thereby enables bright lower class children to move up on the social ladder as individuals and find their proper place in the class hierarchy. But insofar as the school system adequately fulfills this purpose it also serves a second function: it helps maintain our present class structure intact. As long as the climb upward on the several rungs of power and prestige "remains open to the children of workers and other members of the lower class, their frustrations will not be sufficient to be explosive."[22]

As several critics have suggested, this raises fundamental questions regarding the role of our educational system.[23] Do not our schools have an obligation also to that large majority of children who will not be able to climb the social ladder? Must they be doomed to the bitterness and frustration of feelings of failure, or are there also other social values which our schools should teach besides the dogma of individual social mobility?

Although Warner is an exponent of the functional-structural theory of society, all his work in social stratification has been essentially descriptive, and his theoretical formulations are really incidental to his empirical work. There is, however, another group of functional-structural sociologists who are more concerned with explaining the existence of social stratification as a universal phenomenon than with the empirical description of specific class structures. How-

---

20) So for example the introductory statements, entitled "What this book is about", to both Democracy in Jonesville, op. cit., and Social Class in America, op. cit.

21) W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated? (New York: Harper, 1944).

22) W. Lloyd Warner and J. O. Low, The Social System of the Modern Factory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 183.

23) Cf. Walter R. Goldschmidt, "America's Social Classes", Commentary, 12 (August 1950), pp. 179-80; and Celia B. Stendler, Children of Brasstown (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949).

ever, the ideological danger of a conservative bias also attaches to this body of stratification theory. These writers[24] present an incisive analysis of the functional necessity for stratification, pointing out that every complex society faces the problem of distributing its members in the positions of its social structure and must therefore motivate them to perform the duties of these positions. Since these positions differ widely in importance and in attraction, and since human beings likewise differ in ability, the rights and perquisites which attach to positions in the social structure must be unequal. "If the rights and perquisites of different positions in a society must be unequal, then the society must be stratified for this is precisely what stratification means. Social inequality is thus an unconsciously devolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons." [25] Social classes, in this view, consist of aggregates or groups of individuals occupying social positions with roughly similar rights, provileges, and prestige, arranged in a hierarchical order. Although structural-functional analysis need not necessarily involve any intrinsic ideological commitments, as Professor Merton has pointed out in a brilliant essay,[26] the fact is that its practitioners are often tempted to confuse the functional necessity of social inequality in general with the indispensability of a particular system of social stratification, overlooking the possibility of alternative arrangements. Despite some explicit disclaimers regarding any such tendency,[27] the functionalist writers have so far always confined themselves to explaining why different positions in the social structure carry different degrees of prestige, and how certain individuals get into those positions. They have not presented any systematic account of changes in the class structure. In the functional approach "social stratification thus becomes essentially an integrating structural attribute of social systems, and interclass relations are typically viewed as accommodative." [28]

V

Although structural-functional conceptualizations, especially those developed by the Warner group, loom large in contemporary class theory they have by no means achieved a monopoly in this field. There are several alternative theories which merit attention. The oldest of them is Thorstein Veblen's classic analysis of the "leisure class." [29] However,

---

24) For representative examples see Talcott Parsons, "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", American Journal of Sociology, 45 (May 1940); Kingsley Davis, "A Conceptual Analysis of Stratification", American Sociological Review, 7 (June 1942); and Kingsley Davis and Wilbert Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification", American Sociological Review, 10 (April 1945).

25) Davis and Moore, op. cit., p. 243.

26) Cf. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949), Ch. 1: "Manifest and Latent Functions".

27) Kingsley Davis, Human Society (New York: Macmillan, 1948), p. 368.

28) Harold W. Pfautz, "The Current Literature on Social Stratification: Critique and Bibliography", op. cit., p. 392.

29) Cf. Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York: Macmillan, 1899).

remarkably little use has been made of Veblen's "native" theory in modern American class research. Only the Lynds have employed some of his concepts and shrewd insights effectively in their analysis of the class structure of an American city.30) Under the influence of Veblen's theory, the Lynds divided Middletown's population into two main classes: those who make their living by the use of their hands, the working class; and those whose work is non-manual, the business class. They then presented a detailed analysis of the differences in the way of life of these two classes. In their second volume they also demonstrate that the analysis of a community's power structure - - who controls whom - can be a very fruitful approach to the understanding of class differences. Following Veblen's suggestion, the Lynds find the key to the community's power structure in the operation of the credit system. The power of the business class rests on its control of the credit structure, since the granting or refusing of commercial credit implies decisions which affect the job opportunities and way of life of large numbers of people. The Lynds traced the community's power relationships not only in the economic system but also in several other institutions: the church, the schools, the press, the political parties, and the social services. They indicate clearly that social prestige is everywhere related to position in the power structure. It is true that the power structure of Middeltown, which is controlled by one dominant business-class family, is not necessarily typical of the situation in other American cities so that their findings cannot be generalized without due caution. Yet their description is still the best concrete illustration of how an impersonal power structure permeates the daily lives of people in an American community. The Lynds have pioneered in drawing attention to one of the most important aspects of the class structure: the control of political and social behavior through economic power. Unfortunately, few other students of American communities have investigated the power structure; but where they have done so, their data strongly confirm the Lynds' findings. 31)

VI

The perennial difficulties of adequately tracing the relationships between economic inequality and prestige differentials in our complex, industrial society have finally led to the development of yet another body of class theory which is rapidly gaining ground among American sociologists at the present time. This theory, which is based mainly upon two unfinished but very fruitful essays of the German sociologist

30) Cf. Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929), and Middletown in Transition (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937).

31) Cf. Hollingshead, op. cit., especially pp. 85-86.

Max Weber,[32] holds that the nature of social stratification is multidimensional and cannot be adequately apprehended by any undimensional approach. Weber has pointed out that society appears to be stratified in a three-fold manner. There is first the economic order which stratifies the population according to their economic position, that is their relationship to the market and the production of material goods and services. Following the traditional terminology, Weber calls the units of stratification within the economic order "classes". Classes are thus aggregates of individuals and families in similar economic positions. Individuals in the same or similar economic position have identical or similar goods and services to offer in the market. In a market economy like ours this also means that their opportunities to "get ahead" occupationally, their prospects of obtaining an education, as well as their chances of attaining prestige and influence as well, will be similar, since all these prospects, which Weber called the life-chances of an individual, depend very largely upon one's economic position. Note, however, that these classes are neither communities nor organized groups but simply collectivities of people possessing similar economic interests. The members of a class may or may not be aware of the similarity of their economic interests and life chances. Even if they are aware of it this may influence their behavior in different ways. It may result in class solidarity and class consciousness, possibly leading to open class conflict, or it may lead only to diffuse common reactions. For example, industrial workers all over the world tend to restrict their output by virtue of a more or less tacit agreement, but whether or not they band together and engage in organized economic and political class action depends on whether they consciously recognize the causal connection between their life chances and the structure of the concrete economic order which determines them. In turn this depends on what Weber calls the "transparency" of the causal connections.

There is a second structure within which stratification occurs, which is based upon the differential distribution of "social honor" - i.e. prestige and esteem. This Weber calls the "social order" but which we prefer to call the status structure, since the units of stratification within this order are status groups. The term "status" as used in this terminology thus has reference to the prestige differentiation of individuals and groups in a society. Since the prestige of an individual or a group must rest upon interpersonal recognition, status structures are usually of a local

32) Cf. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 180-195. The exposition presented above is based upon this essay. See also Talcott Parsons, ed., Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 424,429 for a second systematic discussion by Weber himself. For some recent restatements and applications of this theory see C. Wright Mills' excellent criticism of Warner's first volume in American Sociological Review, 7 (April 1942), pp. 263-71: Pfautz and Duncan, op. cit., Lipset and Bendix, op. cit.; also Paul K. Hatt, "Stratification in the Mass Society", American Sociological Review, 15 (April 1950); and Milton M. Gordon, "A System of Social Class Analysis", The Drew University Bulletin, 29 (August 1951)

character. An individual's place in the status structure depends upon the way in which his behavior is evaluated by the members of his community. However, some status structures may also be nationwide or even international, involving, for example, a person's status as a statesman, as a film actor, or as a scientist. In fact, there are as many status structures as there are distinguishable patterns of interpersonal relations.[33]

It is of paramount importance to realize that the economic order and the status order are closely related but not identical - classes and status groups must be carefully distinguished. However, as Weber points out, "the social order is of course conditioned by the economic order to a high degree, and in its turn reacts upon it."[34]

The reason for this lies in the fact that since economic factors necessarily play a primary role in a market society, people tend to maintain intimate social relations mainly with others in similar economic positions. Social intercourse, intermarriage, and participation in voluntary organizations thus tend to be restricted largely to others in one's own economic bracket. Empirically we find, therefore, that in many cases there is no discrepancy between a given individual's class position and his rank in the status structure. Where discrepancies do occur - - and they are not unusual, of course, - - they cannot be explained in static terms but must be understood dynamically as the results either of an individual's mobility along only one of the stratification dimensions, or of a conflict between the class and status structures as a whole.

The interrelations between class stratification and status stratification are thus dynamic, reciprocal and in constant flux. Status groups tend to grow strong and to hinder and retard the operation of sheer market forces whenever economic conditions are relatively stable. By the same token, significant changes in the economic system tend to inhibit the operation of status restrictions and even to break down exist-

---

33) On this point see Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., p. 249. - As Gregory P. Stone and William H. Form have recently observed, the arrangement of status groups cannot be considered as necessarily hierarchical in all cases. In a given community there may be aggregates of individuals and families, enjoying roughly the same social prestige, although they may not all be in intimate social contact with each other. Thus these writers distinguish between "status aggregates" and status groups". See "Instabilities in Status: The Problem of Hierarchy in the Community Study of Status Arrangements", American Sociological Review, 18 (April 1953). As is evident from their own data, however, the "status aggregates" actually consist of a number of status groups of coordinate rank.

34) Gerth and Mills, op. cit., p. 181.

ing distinctions altogether.[35]

There is, finally, a third dimension of social stratification, the power structure, or as Weber called it, the legal order. Power can be defined as the ability to control the behavior of others, and in the sociologically relevant sense it means especially the control which certain groups are able to exercise over the life chances of others. Now, the unequal distribution of power in a society is intimately linked with both the class and the status structures. Especially the connection between economic position and the ability to exercise power is close, but, as Weber points out, "economically conditioned" power is not identical with power as such. Indeed, in modern society power can be attained also through a political or a military career and can then be used to gain high economic position and high status.[36] Again, the relationship between the distribution of power, class stratification, and status structure is dynamic. In stable periods the correlation among these three variables tends to be very close, but in times of change there may occur numerous discrepancies.

It would seem to the present writer that only a class theory which recognizes these three vertical dimensions as analytically distinct and which intends to trace their interrelationships can provide a realistic understanding of the class structure of complex, industrial societies. That is also the reason why Warner's Index of Status Characteristics, and all similar indexes which combine the status, class, and power aspects in a single scale, must result in grossly oversimplified undimensional schemes which do not permit an adequate analysis of the interrelation between the three stratification variables.

To be sure, empirical studies will have to focus their attention more closely on the one or the other of these dimensions, according to their specific research objectives. If the purpose of a given study is the description of the prestige structure of a particular community, the research will have to investigate primarily social participation and mutual ranking of the local residents, as well as other subjective criteria, in order to discover the various status groups. And such discovery should not be prejudged, of course, by the

---

35) An illuminating example of the operation of cross pressures between class and status systems can be seen in the use of residential restrictive covenants by which high status groups in American communities attempt to keep out "undesirable" groups who have risen in the class structure to the point where they can afford to purchase high status symbols in the form of property in the best residential areas. Here class mobility is defined as a threat to their stability by the high status groups who wield the restrictive covenant as a defensive weapon in a rearguard action.

36) Cf. Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., p. 249.

arbirary imposition of a five-or-six-fold division upon the status structure of the community. Unless the investigators are clearly aware, however, that the local status hierarchy is intimately related to and dependent upon a national class structure, and that changes in the class structure are bound to have repercussions in the local hierarchy, such researches will have little meaning and even less predictive value.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of research is the analysis of a national class structure and its changes, the focus will have to be on objective criteria, such as the source and the amount of income, occupation, and occupational status - - i.e. the degree of independence and security, and similar indexes which mark off the boundaries of the different classes. This type of approach leads, of course, to the fascinating problems of social mobility and class consciousness. Students of the American class structure have long been impressed with the high degree of social mobility and the apparent lack of class consciousness of the American people. The lack of class consciousness is particularly conspicuous in the working class. In sharp contrast to the situation i European countries, sizeable numbers of Americans, who, on the basis of objective criteria, must undoubtedly be considered as working class, regard themselves as members of the middle class. Space does not permit an explanation of the historical reasons which account for both high mobility and low class consciousness, but it is pertinent to refer in closing to a recent attempt to investigate the problem of class consciousness in this country through the use of a nationwide public-opinion survey.[37] This study's stated purpose was to test empirically the hypothesis that similar economic position gives rise to class consciousness in that it results in shared attitudes, values and interests. Yet the author defines classes not as collectivities of people in similar economic position (which he calls strata), but as "psycho-social groupings, something that is essentially subjective in character, depending upon class consciousness (i.e. a feeling of group membership), and class lines of cleavage may or may not conform to what seem to the social scientist to be logical lines of cleavage in the objective or stratification sense. Class as distinguished from stratum, can well be regarded as a psychological phenomenon in the fullest sense of the term. That is, a man's class is a part of his ego, a feeling on his part of belongingness to something, an identification with something larger than himself."[38] As a fresult of this unfortunate definition of class as "class identification" the study does not constitute a test of the stated hypothesis that similar economic position gives rise to similar attitudes, which could have been tested only by an investigation of the correlation between "stratum" position and attitudes. Instead the author asked

---

37) Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949).

38) Ibid., p. 27. Italics are Centers' own.

his respondents to state their class membership and then correlated attitudes with stated class identification. As a result his data merely prove that manual workers, for instance, who regard themselves as members of the middle class, exhibit the same attitudes and opinions as do others who identify themselves as middle class. Yet since the investigator finds a correlation of no more than .67 between occupational status and subjective class identification his findings have comparatively little predictive value. His data do not explain why people who objectively belong to the working class think of themselves as middle-class, nor is there any indication whether such verbal identification would carry over into overt behavior under specific circumstances.

VII

It is precisely such questions and their implications which need further clarification. Although we can no longer accept his answers, the original problem which Marx posed is still with us. "Groups of people do have the economic conditions of their existence in common. By virtue of their common experience with the same exigencies of daily living, they probably think alike in many respects. But, as Marx saw, these factors only facilitate, they do not necessitate organizations and organized common action. It is apparent that in this view the analysis of social class is concerned with an assessment of the chances that common economic conditions and common experiences of a group will lead to organized action." [39] Such an assessment will have to take into account the shift which has occurred in the character of the organization of modern mass society. Class consciousness and class action today is obviously less a matter of individual attitudes and behavior than of the operations of organized pressure groups, corporate bodies, and governmental structures. It seems to this writer that this is the direction in which a fruitful modern class theory must develop and must be tested by empirical research, but it is clear that no progress can be made without a dynamically oriented framework of adequate theoretical concepts.

---

39) Lipset and Bendix, op. cit., p. 248.

ISA/SSM/Conf.2/29

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

CONGRES DE LIEGE

24 août - 1er septembre 1953

LIEGE CONGRESS

24 August - 1 September 1953

Sect. I

Stratification sociale

et mobilité sociale

Sect. I

Social Stratification

and Social Mobility

Educational Attainment and Occupational Advancement

by

Paul C. GLICK

U. S. Bureau of the Census

Skrivemaskinstua
Stortingsgt. 18
Oslo

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

by

Paul C. Glick
U. S. Bureau of the Census

Among the important factors that help to determine the types of work that men perform is the amount of education they have received. Those with a relatively small amount of formal education are more likely to be engaged in manual work than those who are better educated. Furthermore, those who have a better education can be more readily trained to perform specialized duties and are more often selected for supervisory or managerial positions. From a dynamic point of view, the educational background of men is a contributing factor in the determination of the level of the occupational scale at which they begin to work. the rate at which they advance, the height to which they climb by the time they reach their most productive period of life, and the amount by which they are likely to descend the occupational scale in their later years. In this paper, a statistical analysis of these types of relationships between educational attainment and occupational advancement is presented.

The information on which the analysis is based was obtained from the U. S. Census of Population taken in 1950 and consists of cross-classifications of data on age, aducation, and occupation and on age, education, and income. The tables containing the basic data will appear in a forthcoming special report of the U.S. Bureau of the Census entitled "Education".[1]

---

1) In this report, other tables will show age by education further classified by such additional characteristics as ethnic characteristics, marital status, residential mobility, and employment status. The figures are presented for the United States as a whole and for broad regions, with separate figures for males and females. In a special report of the 1940 Census, entitled "Educational Attainment by Economic Characteristics and Marital Status", similar data on employment status, Occupation, marital status, and other subjects were published for native white persons and Negroes. An earlier study was made by Richard O. Lang, entitled "The Relation of Educational Status to Economic Status in the City of Chicago, by Census Tracts, 1934" (Ph. D. dissertation in the Department of Sociology, University of Chicago; published by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1937). In Lang's study, educational attainment was found to be highly correlated with monthly rental paid for rented homes; neither occupation nor income was included among the variables investigated, however.

Cross-sectional versus longitudinal approach. Statistics for a study of this kind can be collected by either of two methods. On the one hand, the shifts in the occupations and incomes of individuals can be traced throughout their working years and the accumulated data can then be analyzed for persons with given amounts of education. This may be called the "longitudinal approach." On the other hand, the shifts in occupations and incomes throughout the working years may be inferred indirectly from an examination of occupation and income distributions for persons in successively older age groups as of one point in time and in given education classes. This may be called the "cross-sectional approach." It is this cross-sectional approach which is employed here.

Both of these approaches have advantages and disadvantages, some of which should be noted. For instance, the longitudinal approach has the advantage of indicating which persons made specified shifts in occupation and income between specified ages, whereas the cross-sectional approach indicates only the net effects on the occupation and income distributions of the varied shifts which persons have made from one age to another. Although the cross-sectional approach does not show specific shifts made by specific persons, it nevertheless reveals the prevailing direction and net effects of such shifts as age advances. Moreover, the longitudinal approach is much more complex to study and may be subject to special types of problems. Detailed work histories for each person must be requested from establishments, which may have destroyed their old records, or from respondents, whose memories of changes in the remote past may be quite faulty. By contrast in using the cross-sectional approach, it is necessary merely to determine the person's current age and his occupation and income during a recent period, in addition, of course, to data on his educational background. Partly because of the greater cost involved in obtaining statistics by the longitudinal approach, there are no data of this type available in the United States on a nationwide basis. During recent years, however, it has been feasible and deemed worthwhile to conduct special studies of the occupational histories of individuals in many sections of the United States. [2)]

---

2) For information on some of these studies, see the following: Gladys L. Palmer, The Mobility of Workers in Six Cities, 1940-1949 (unpublished), University of Pennsylvania Industrial Research Department (January 1952); Donald J. Bogue, A Methodological Study of Migration and Labor Mobility in Michigan and Ohio in 1947 (Oxford, Ohio: Scripps Foundation Studies in Population Research, No. 4, June 1952); Lloyd G. Reynolds, The Structure of Labor Markets (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951); Charles A. Myers and George P. Schultz, The Dynamics of a Labor Market (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951); and Ronald Freedman and Amos H. Hawley, "Migration and Occupational Mobility in the Depression" (Chicago: The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LV, No. 2, September 1949, pp. 171-177).

In neither the lengitudinal nor the cross-sectional approach is it possible to avoid many of the complications which arise because of the changing age, education, occupation, and income structures of the population. For decades, there have been tendencies for more of the population to be found in the older age groups, in the higher education classes, in the nonfarm occupations, and, espacially during recent years, in the higher income groups. These tendencies reflect, among other things, changes in the birth rate and rising standards of living. With some variations, there will undoubtedly be further changes in these variables in the future. Perhaps it will suffice simply to call attention here to these complications and thereby to acknowledge the need for reexamining the relationships between education and occupational advancement as new data become available.

Coverage and other limitations. - Most of the statistics presented in this paper are for men between the ages of 22 and 74 years of age. The great majority of persons employed outside the home are men; moreover, since the patterns of employment of women differ so greatly from those of men, it would not be appropriate either to treat both sexes combined or to extend the paper sufficiently to treat them separately. The age span was limited at the lower end in order to begin the analysis at about the age when most persons have completed their schooling; it was limited at both the lower and the upper ends because much of the work done before age 22 and after age 74 is part-time work and often bears little relationship to the type of work done in the long period of full-time economic act ivity. In addition, by establishing the upper age limit at 74, difficulties in dealing with an open-end class, 75 years and over, were avoided in the detailed work required to prepare Table 10.

Comparative data shown for 1940 on the relationship between age, education, and occupation were tabulated and published only for persons 18 to 64 years old, hence the upper age limit is still further restricted in certain tables where 1950 and 1940 data are shown. The detailed data for 1940 were also tabulated and published only for native white persons and Negroes, whereas the 1950 data include all nativity and racial groups. Since the great majority of persons excluded from the 1940 coverage are foreignborn whites, and since they are heavily concentrated in the older age groups where educational attainment tends to be relatively low, the indicated improvement in educational level between 1940 and 1950 is somewhat less in certain tables than it would have been if the total population had also been covered for 1940.

All of the figures for 1950 were based on a special tabulation of a 3 1/3-percent sample of the population returns. Those in Tables 2,3, and 4 for 1940 were based on a special tabulation of a 5-percent sample. Since these figures are based on samples, they are subject to sampling variability. Inasmuch as all of the resulte shown are for the United States as a whole, for which most of the basic numbers are fairly lange, however, the sampling variability of the figures is quite small, on the average. Furthermore, the figures for

1950 are preliminary and subject to minor changes when the special report on which they are based has passed through its final review. For 1950, most of the totals by age and most of the derived figures were prepared specially for this paper and will not appear in the special report.

Let us proceed now with the analysis of the data presented in the accompanying tables.

Education and age. - From the figures shown in Table 1, the improvement in the educational level of the population during three generations may be deduced. Young men in their late 20's in 1950 had, on the average, a full high school education, that is, had completed 12 years of formal education. Men in the age range 45 to 64 years include most of the fathers of these young men; the fathers' generation had obtained only an elementary school education, that is, had completed only about 8 years of school. The grandfathers' generation, which may be considered as comprising men 65 years old and over, had an average educational attainment that was less than a year below that of the fathers' generation.

Thus, the great upsurge in education of men in the United States has occurred during the lives of those born in the twentieth century. Moreover, the most marked progress was made during the 1940's when the improvement in educational level for young men amounted to nearly two school years, on the average. The proportion of men 25 to 29 who had completed at least some college education jumped from 14 percent in 1940 to 20 percent in 1950. (See Table 2) These facts indicate that a relatively large proportion of the better educated men are in the younger age groups.

Although the present paper is oriented toward the analysis of information on men, it seems worthwile to deviate at this point long enough to call attention to the fact that women in the United States have, for many decades, received more education than men. This fact reflects both the better job opportunities for older boys which induce them to leave school and also the relatively high position which women have maintained in America. The greatest difference in education of men and women is found among those who were finishing their schooling during the 1930's. This fact must reflect the differential effect of the Great Depression of the 1930's on the educational opportunities of young men and women who were approaching the upper grades during that period. On the other hand, financial assistance extended by the federal government to veterans of World War II who wished to resume their education after discharge from military service has, no doubt, been largely responsible for bringing the average educational level of young men almost up to that for women during recent years. The observed improvement in the education of young men may still be less than that which would have been shown if the armed forces overseas in 1950 had been included in the coverage. Furthermore, among those who enter upon college training, men are much more likely than women to complete a full college education.

Education and social class. - The amount of educational training with which persons are equipped affects their manner of living in numerous ways. It influences the types of social groups with which they associate, the roles and statuses they assume in these groups, and often the degree of self-confidence and rationalism with which they face their problems. It also helps to determine the kind of life work which they choose or into which they shift. The experiences of the last two decades in America, however, have included first the Great Depression of the 1930's, then World War II, and currently a sustained period of prosperity. These experiences have greatly affected the educational opportunities and also the careers of vast numbers of persons. They have helped to determine the specific fields of economic activity into which young men have been launched and have affected their chances of making subsequent shifts into other lines of activity. In general, however, men with a certain level of education tend to gravitate to the same broad social class as others in that educational level.[3]

To illustrate, consider for a moment the occupational outlooks of three hypothetical young men just out of engineering school-the first man having graduated in 1933, the second in 1943, and the third in 1953. Because of the economic depression, the first man may have found no engineering position available, accepted employment in a clerical job, and eventually become the business manager for his company. Because of World War II, the second man may have been taken into the armed forces, assigned to duty as a procurement officer, and, on discharge from the military service, accepted a position as a wholesale salesman for a large concern. The third man may be the only one of the three to start and continue in his specifically chosen field, namely, that of a professional engineer. These men are not meant to be representative of all those graduating at the given dates, of course, but their experiences do show the influence on occupational mobility of conditions quite apart from their training and original desires. At the same time, this illustration shows that all three of the college-trained men found employment in occupations with more or less similar status, that is, in "white-collar" work. Thus, even though it is impossible to predict precisely the specific occupation into which a particular person with a certain amount of education will eventually move, the fact remains that occupational mobility tends to be systematically related to educational background, as will be shown in later sections of this paper.

The proportion of men 22 to 74 years old in each of the major occupation groups in 1950 and 1940 and the median years of school completed by men in each of these groups are presented in Table 3. The major occupation groups in all tables have been divided into three broad groups or social classes: (1) Nonfarm "white-collar" workers, (2) nonfarm "manual" workers, and (3) farm workers. The arrangement of major occupation groups within each social class is intended to show as well as possible the sequence of occupations through which men commonly shift. Throughout our discussion from this

3) The writer wishes to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of David L. Kaplan of the U. S. Bureau of the Census in the preparation of this section.

point on, we shall treat the three broad social classes separately, on the assumption that most of the occupational changes take place largely within, rather than between, these broad groupings. Some apparent deviations from this pattern will be noted later, however. Furthermore, service workers were included with manual workers in order to avoid establishing a separate social class for them.

A comparison of the 1950 and 1940 figures in Table 3 shows that substantial changes in the occupational structure have taken place since 1940, notably the sharp reduction in the proportion of employed males engaged in farming and the sharp increase in the proportion engaged as craftsmen and foremen, that is, as skilled manual workers. The table also show that whitecollar workers are clearly the highest in regard to educational level, nonfarm manual workers are generally intermediate, and farm workers generally the lowest.

Occupation and age. - Before discussing in detail the relationship between educational level and occupation, let us take note first of the normal pattern of occupational changes as age increases. Thus, if a man has entered the broad field of white-collar work, he is most likely to begin in a clerical or sales position and to be in a managerial or proprietary position after about age 35. (See Table 4.) If he entered employment as a nonfarm manual worker, he is most likely to be a semi-skilled workman (operative) at 22 and a skilled workman (craftsman) by the time he is 45. And, if he entered as a farm worker, he is likely to be a farm laborer at 22, with a good chance of being a farm operator by the time he is 25. Among some types of workers, such as farmers and professional workers, most of the advancement may occur within one occupation group rather than between occupation groups.

Relatively large proportions of clerical and sales workers, professional workers, operatives, and laborers (especially farm laborers) are under 35 years old. (See Table 5.) By comparison, the peak numbers of craftsmen are 25 to 44 years old and of managers and farmers, 35 to 53 years old; these occupation groups comprise, in large part, men who were educated a longer time ago when it was common for young people not to go as far in school as they do today.

Thus, when studying the relationship between education and occupation for all productive years combined, it is essential to be cognisant of the effects on the data not only of secular changes in educational level and occupational distribution, but also of the normal pattern of occupational shifte of individuals during their working years. It is possible that these several factors interact, in the sense that the rise in education may have been a contributing factor in the changing occupational structure, and vice versa. Such interaction may bring still further changes in the future. For instance, the farm population includes a high proportion of older men who were attracted to farm work when they were young and who have spent many years in farming: in their later years when farming declined in relative importance in the economy, most of them may have still preferred to remain on farms: but among those who wished to shift to nonfarm work,

many probably found it difficult to make the adjustment, even though job opportunities in that field were more inviting and earning levels were above their own. It is possible, however, that the size of the farm population will eventually reach a point of relative stability, after which the age structure - and in turn the educational structure - of the farm population may tend to become more nearly like that of the nonfarm population.

Education by occupation. - We shall focus attention next on the occupational distribution of all adult men in each educational level, without regard to age. (See Table 6) The first education level shown is that for men with fewer than five years of school. This group is sometimes referred to as "functional illiterates," because few of the persons in the group have a sufficiently sound education to comprehend effectively the written material which is so essential in training persons to perform duties in our modern society. About two-thirds of them are over 45 years of age. A disproportionately large number of them are engaged in farming, and a large minority-about one-third-of the farm workers in this least educated group are farm laborers.

If a man has succeeded in reaching the upper half of the elementary grades, he still has only about 15 chances out of 100 of becoming a whitecollar worker. By adding some high school training but not graduating, his chances of being a white-collar worker rise to about 26 out of 100. Half of the men who start high school but do not finish are either skilled or semi-skilled workers.

The man who finishes high school thereby increases his likelihood of becoming a white-collar worker by about fifty percent, as compared with the man who starts but fails to finish high school. Professional and technical workers begin to become numerous when the level of high school graduation is reached. As at all lower educational levels, however, manual workers still predominate among high school graduates, with about half of the graduates falling into this broad categor Among the manual class, the craftsmen move into first position and operatives into second place. Only about one out of twelve high school graduates is in agricultural work, where farm operators outrank farm laborers about four to one.

When men go to college but do not graduate, they can feel fairly certain of obtaining a position in the white-collar field, inasmuch as twothirds of these men are found in that type of work. The great majority of these men who have not finished college are salesmen, clerical workers, managers, or proprietors; only about one-quarter of them are engaged in professional or technical work. Among the minority of college men who are manual workers, approximately half are classified as craftsmen, perhaps usually as highly skilled mechanics. Less than one out of every twenty college men is engaged in farming.

The greatest change in the occupational structure occurs between those who drop out of college and those who finish college. In this transition, the proportion of employed men in professional and technical occupations leaps from only

about 17 percent for those with some college education but without a college degree to 55 percent for those with one or more college degrees. (It is not possible from the data available to determine the contribution of masters' and doctors' degrees to the likelihood of employment in professional or other types of work.) Nearly nine out of every ten college graduates fall into the broad category of white-collar workers. Among those in this broad category, the nonprofessional workers are about equally divided between managers and proprietors, on the one hand, and clerical and sales workers, on the other.

Occupation by education. - Now that we have discussed the occupational distribution within each education level, let us change our perspective and view the educational distribution within each occupation group. Here our purpose is to determine whether there is one educational level which is most characteristic of men in a particular occupation group. (See Table 7.)

The degree to which the occupation groups are concentrated in one or a few education classes varies considerably As would be expected, professional workers are heavily concentrated among men with college training. Professional workers are generally highly skilled and an unusually large proportion of them have been trained during recent years when educational opportunities have been the greatest. The modal education class for the other occupation groups is much less clearly marked. Managers and proprietors, as well as clerical and sales workers, are more often in the category of high school graduates than in any other educational class; craftsmen, operatives, service workers, and farmers are most often elementary school graduates; nonfarm laborers have most often received 5 to 7 years of education; and farm laborers have most often received fewer than 5 yars of schooling. Service workers tend to be more evenly distributed among the education classes, especially below the college level, than any other occupation group. This fact may reflect a greater diversity in the educational requirements for persons engaged in the various specific service occupations than that found for persons in specific occupations in the other group. It also calls attention to the fact that a substantial proportion of service workers are not manual workers.

Education by occupation and age. - This brings us to a discussion of the nature and timing of occupational changes during the span of working years, for men who have attained a certain educational level. The familiar pattern is for a person to climb an "occupational ladder" until he reaches the prime of life and then to step gradually down a few rungs in his later years. If the person has a well-grounded education he can generally step over the first several rungs and start his climbing in the middle of the ladder, so to speak. Thus, where he starts, how high he climbs, and how far and how rapidly he eventually descends the occupational ladder is likely to be a function of the amount of education with which he begins. Of course, the nature and timing of occupational changes depend also on many other things, including the level

of business activity and the types of skills that are in demand at the time each phase of the life cycle is reached, as was pointed out earlier.

In order to keep this part of the discussion within reasonable limits, we shall restrict the analysis to those with fewer than 5 years of schooling and those who have completed the "terminal" years of school, namely, the eighth grade of elementary school, the fourth year of high school, and the fourth (or a subsequent) year of college. Suffice it to say that in general the remaining education groups-those with intermediate amounts of education-exhibit intermediate patterns of occupational shifts with age. However, in many instances, those who started a given type of school but dropped out before finishing follow more closely the patterns of occupational change of those in the next lower education group than of those in the next higher education group. Perhaps this fact reflects a common factor of a social psychological nature which accounts for both persistence in education until desired goals are resched and success in bustiness or professional pursuits.

(a) Functional illiterates. - In the lowest educational class, about one-tenth of all employed man 22 to 74 years old are found. By comparing the second and third columns of Table 6, the overrepresentation of farmers and farm laborers among those with a small amount of education becomes apparent. Thirty percent of these poorly educated men are engaged in farm work, whereas farm workers constitute only about 14 percent of all adult workers without regard to educational class. Farm workers in the United States are, of course, heavily weighted by nonwhite men. Farmers (farm operators) outnumber each of the other occupation groups for both the youngest and the oldest groups of men with a minimum of education. (See Table 8a.) The proportion who are farm laborers declines sharply during the early adult years and the proportion who are farm operators shows a corresponding gain, so that farm operators predominate among farm workers above the age of 30. The overall proportion of farm workers in the age span from 30 to 64 is smaller than that for either younger or older men. These facts suggest the influence of migration, particularly of farm laborers, to nonfarm areas during the young adult years and also reflect the greater tendency for farm workers than for nonfarm workers to remain in the labor force into old age.

Most of the nonfarm workers at the lower end of the educational scale are manual workers. At the younger ages, their predominating occupational attachments are classified as semi-skilled and unskilled work.

In fact, the same holds true throughout the working years, even though a substantial proportion advance into the skilled jobs. At no age, however, do craftsmen outnumber operatives among men in the lowest educational segment. Above the age of 55, about 10 to 12 percent of this educational group are employed as service workers, often as watchmen or guards in factories, these types of duties are commonly reserved for those older workmen who, because of disability

or loss of agility, can no longer perform heavier types of work or tasks requiring a great deal of precision.

In general, therefore, functionally illiterate persons are concentrated in the less skilled jobs, tend to advance slowly, and are probably less well remunerated, on the average, than others in the same broad type of work.

(b) Elementary school graduates. - Let us look next at the figures for men who quit school after having finished their elementary school training, that is, the 8th grade. (See Table 8b.) This is the group in which the semi-skilled and skilled workmen reach their maximum proportions. Below the age of 45 there are more elementary school graduates who are operatives than in any other occupational group. Examples of these semi-skilled workmen include bus, taxi, and truck drivers, brakemen on railroads, apprentices, and factory workers who do work that can be learned in a relatively short time. Above age 45, craftsmen and foremen--who include the more skilled factory workers--exceed each of the other nonfarm occupation groups.

Among elementary school graduates, the proportion of unskilled laborers diminishes before middle age and remains relatively low thereafter, whereas the proportion of service workers goes up during middle and old age. A longitudinal study of occupational mobility of specific persons might show that such changes reflect, in large measure, still more complex shifts, like the movement of men before the prime of life from unskilled labor into semi-skilled labor, thus replacing semi-skilled laborers who move into skilled labor, then,, when the downturn takes place past the prime of life the process may be reversed. In the latter phase, an important number of men (about 9 to 12 percent) in this rather low educational level find their way into a variety of service jobs.

Although the proportion of elementary school graduates who are doing farm work is well below that for men with only a rudimentary education or none, it is still between 15 and 30 percent for each age group; in addition, the number of farm operators exceeds the number of farm laborers by a wide margin at all ages above 25.

In the white-collar class, managers and proprietors first pass the point of constituting more than ten percent among men who have finished elementary school. This point is reached at age 45. Clerical and sales workers in the upper ages barely miss the same mark. These beginnings emerge into much more noteworthy proportions at the next educational level.

(c) High school graduates. - An examination of the figures in Table 8c reveals that high school graduates occupy a transitional position between manual and white-collar predominance. A majority of high school graduates who have not gone on to college and who have not yet reached age 45 are in the so-called manual-worker class. By gradual stages, however, the proportion found in the white-collar class increases with age so that by the age of 45 years, a majority have attained this occupational status. There-

after, the proportion of high school graduates in this upper occupational status remains fairly constant, at about 55 percent of all workers.

This shift from manual to white-collar predominance among high school graduates above age 45 suggests some provocative implications. In the first place, it no doubt reflects past improvement in the educational level of the population. The relative scarcity of college-trained men over 45 years of age has left large numbers of responsible positions open to competition for high school graduates, particularly in clerical, sales, managerial, and proprietary work- - but not in professional and technical work. In the second place, the shift suggests that the average educational level of men in semi-skilled and skilled work is on the increase. To the extent that education facilitates understanding and performance of a job, the increase in educational level, in turn, should raise the productive capacity of such workers and consequently should raise the average remuneration for the type of work performed. And, in the third place, the shift calls attention to the fact that men in each broad field of occupational activity (white-collar and manual work) do not operate within a closed system. There is a certain amount of occupational mobility across the hypothetical line which tends to divide the manual from the white-collar workmen. For instance, many highly skilled mechanics (craftsmen) become promoted to white-collar "desk" jobs as managers or sales representatives. Seniority and proficiency gained from experience on the job can often bring advancement to a man with a given educational background in preference to a better-educated man with less intimate knowledge of the work. Again, numerous skilled workers in industries such as plumbing, electrical work, and construction eventually set up businesses of their own and thus become proprietors.

(d) College graduates. - Finally, we come to the table on the occupational advancement of men with four years or more of college training. These men have foregone several years of full-time employment in order to acquire a college degree. The immediate impression we get from an examination of Table 8d is that nearly all of the men with a college education are employed as white-collar workers. Furthermore, between 50 and 60 percent in each age group are professional or technical workers. Of the remaining white-collar workers, most of those under 30 years of age are in clerical or sales work and most of those over 35 years of age are employed in menagerial or proprietary capacities.

College-trained men who obtain positions as managers or become proprietors of their own businesses are much more frequent among men of middle or older age. Despite the fact of their having a college education, men usually have to spend many years in the accumulation of the required experience or capital to embark on such a position, and these qualifications are ordinarily developed during a lengthy period of apprenticeship or of employment under someone else.

Education and average annual income. As a climax to our discussion of the impact of educational background upon occupational advancement, we shall consider briefly the average annual income and average life-time income of men in the several educational levels. Although it would be possible, through the data presented in the special report on education, to explore the relationship between education and money income through all of the steps taken above with regard to education and occupation, time does not permit such a detailed exploration. It would be especially enlightening, perhaps, to analyze the data separately for the farm and nonfarm population groups, inasmuch as an important proportion of farm income is obtained in kind rather than money: the necessary detail for such an analysis is not available, however.

The figures in Table 9 show that the average income of adult males in the United States in 1949 was about $ 3.000 and that there was a steady progression in average income among successively higher educational levels. (This discussion refers to mean money income from all sources.) Men who had finished elementary school received over two-thirds more income in 1949 than those with less than 5 years of schooling. In turn, high school graduates received about one-third more income than elementary school graduates, and college graduates received about two-thirds more than high school graduates. Thus, persons who have completed a college education have a distinct financial advantage. In many cases, of course, this advantage may be attributable less to superior educational attainment than to more generous financial assistance from parents or other relatives in starting a business operation. The same relatives who can afford to assist young men to complete a college education may also continue to help them financially after graduation or arrange with employers to give them desirable positions.

If a person studies the average annual income figures of adult men by age, he notes that changes from the early years to the peak years are generally much more pronounced for those with a better education and that the decline in income thereafter is much less abrupt. The lowest education classes roughly double their incomes between the youngest age and the peak, then drop off to about the level of the youngest age. A large proportion of those over 65 years of age in this less privileged group receive income only from sources other than earnings, such as old age assistance. Elementary school graduates start out at a level about as high as the lowest education classes reach in their prime but do not rise proportionately as much; however, their incomes also fall in their old age to about the same level as their starting point.

High school graduates have higher average incomes at ages 22 to 24 than any other education class, virtually all of them have completed their schooling and are in the labor market. They double their incomes by the age of 45 to 54, and suffer a smaller decline in income in later years. The figures show that college graduates 22 to 24 years old in 1950 had relatively low incomes in 1949 as compared with high school graduates of the same age; many of the college graduates were still attending school during the preceding

year and earned nothing or only the in-come from part-time employment during the year to which the data relate (the year before the census). Above age 30, however, college graduates command a clear lead in annual income. In their early 30's they receive about $ 5,000 per year and by the time they are 45 to 54 years of age they receive, on the average, almost $ 8,000 per year. Moreover, their average incomes are still above $ 5.000 when they are 65 to 74 years old.

Education and life-time income. - Since there is considerable interest in obtaining a summary indication of the money value of education, a special effort was made to determine the approximate life-time incomes of men by educational level. In preparing these approximations, it was assumed that the survival rates for men 22 years old in each education class in 1950 would remain the same as those for white males in 1949, until the cohort reached the age of 74 years, and that their incomes in future years would be the same as the averages in 1949 for successively older age groups with a similar amount of education. The results are shown in Table 10.

According to the table, the average man living under the conditions set forth would receive a little over $ 130.000 during his economically most active years (ages 22 to 74). Furthermore, the figures range from a little less than half this amount for men with no education to about twice the amount for college graduates.

The figures indicate, in addition, that a man with a complete elementary school education may receive about $ 60.000 more incoms during the most economically active years of his life than a man with no education. Similarly, a man with a high school diploma may receive about $ 50.000 more income than a man who completed only an elementary school education. By contrast, a man with a college degree may receive approximately $ 100,000 more income during this period than a man who quit school after graduating from high school.

These figures suggest that the improved earning power that is associated with additional increments of education more than compensate for the temporary loss of earnings for the average man who is capable of successfully completing such additional schooling. In particular, the cost of a college education and the loss of earning power during the years of college attendance probably do not exceed a small fraction of the financial gain. [4]

4) At present, the U. S. Office of Education is conducting a research project which is to reveal the average cost of a college education. Information is to be obtained from about 35,000 students in about 100 colleges. The results of this study will not be available for several months. Some earlier studies of the cost of training at higher educational levels and comparative income levels by type of degree are cited in the book by Milton Friedman and Simon Kuznets, Income from Independent Professional Practices (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1945), pages 81-84. Since the studies referred to in this book were conducted many years ago, the income figures are quite low as compared with those prevailing today. See also Louis I. Dublin and Alfred J. Lotka, The Money Value of a Man (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1946), p. 63. Dublin and Lotka discuss briefly the study by Everett W. Lord, "The Relation of Education and Income" published by the Alpha Kappa Psi Fraternity, Indianapolis, 1928, which showed that as education increased, peak earnings were reached at older ages.

The fact deserves repetition that the results in Table 10 are only approximations and are subject to the conditions assumed in preparing them. Changes in these conditions would naturally change the findings. In future years the survival rates will very likely improve. The income rates were those for men in 1949 and certainly differ from those which might have been obtained if a less prosperous or more prosperous year had been used as the base. Whether conditions during the next 50 years will be more or less prosperous, on the average, than they were in 1949 is very difficult to foretell. The income figures used however do, reflect the extent of illness, disability, unemployment, etc., which provailed in 1949, a year in which the unemployment rate was higher than it has been in any other year since 1942. Also, since the average income figures used were all based on the experience for 1949, they have the advantage of representing constant dollar values for all periods of life.

Keeping these things in mind, the figures in Table 10 are presented in order that they may be used as an instructive model of what might be expected to happen in the future under a set of conditions that are fairly reasonable by current standards. Improvements in techniques and in source material may make it possible later on to determine with more precision the financial outlook of men with specified amounts of education.

Conclusion. - In this paper we have presented statistical evidence of the positive correlation between amount of education and patterns of occupational advancement for men 22 to 74 years old in the United States. Although the findings reveal few unexpected relationships, they form the basis for a more adequate appraisal of expected consequences of continuing education beyond a specified level than could be made from other available data. The facts presented show that there is a wide occupational distribution of men in each age group for those with a certain amount of schooling, but that definite patterns of occupational advancement are characteristic of men in each education class. Finally, the average incomes of persons per year and during the economically most active years of life for those who have progressed to each educational level suggest that those who are capable of completing successively larger amounts of education are likely to gain a distinct financial advantage from each addition to their schooling.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Paul C. Glick
U. S. Bureau of the Census

Table 1. — MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY PERSONS 22 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950 AND 1940

Age	1950		1940	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total, 22 years and over	9.2	9.9	8.6	8.8
22 to 24 years	11.9	12.2	10.8	11.4
25 to 29 years	12.0	12.1	10.1	10.5
30 to 34 years	11.5	11.8	9.2	9.9
35 to 44 years	9.9	10.5	8.7	8.8
45 to 54 years	8.7	8.9	8.4	8.5
55 to 64 years	8.4	8.5	8.2	8.4
65 to 74 years	8.1	8.3	8.1	8.2
75 years and over	7.9	8.2	7.7	8.1

Source: Computed from Table 9 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education", and from Tables 15 and 18 of Part 1, Volume IV, of 1940 Reports on Population.

Table 2.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950 AND 1940

Age and census year	Total males 22 to 64 years old	Elementary school		High school		College		School years not reported
		Less than 5 years	5 to 8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
22 to 64 years:								
1950	100.0	9.5	34.3	18.2	19.8	7.9	7.4	2.9
1940	100.0	12.7	44.6	16.0	14.3	5.4	5.6	1.4
22 to 24 years:								
1950	100.0	4.8	21.3	23.7	26.5	15.1	6.1	2.5
1940	100.0	6.3	28.9	22.7	27.8	8.3	5.1	0.9
25 to 29 years:								
1950	100.0	5.3	21.6	21.4	29.0	10.8	9.4	2.5
1940	100.0	6.9	34.8	21.7	22.1	6.7	6.8	0.9
30 to 34 years:								
1950	100.0	5.7	25.7	21.0	27.7	8.7	8.7	2.5
1940	100.0	8.0	40.2	20.4	16.7	6.4	7.3	1.1
35 to 44 years:								
1950	100.0	7.9	34.5	19.6	19.6	7.4	8.1	2.8
1940	100.0	11.6	47.9	16.1	11.8	5.3	6.0	1.4
45 to 54 years:								
1950	100.0	11.9	44.1	15.3	13.1	5.9	6.6	3.1
1940	100.0	17.8	51.1	11.4	9.0	4.2	4.7	1.7
55 to 64 years:								
1950	100.0	18.2	46.9	11.4	10.3	4.6	5.2	3.5
1940	100.0	21.3	53.0	8.6	7.6	3.5	4.0	2.0

Source: Computed from Table 9 of special report of 1950 Census of Population entitled "Education", and from Tables 15 and 18 of Part 1, Volume IV, of 1940 Reports on Population.

Table 3.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, AND MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, FOR THE UNITED STATES: TOTAL, 1950. AND NATIVE WHITE AND NEGRO, 1940

Major occupation group	Employed males, 22 to 64 years old			
	Percent distribution		Median years of school completed	
	1950	1940	1950	1940
Total	100.0	100.0	9.9	8.8
Nonfarm:				
Clerical, sales and kindred workers	12.7	13.5	12.3	12.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	11.3	10.1	12.3	12.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7.9	6.3	16/	16/
Operative and kindred workers	20.5	18.2	8.7	8.4
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	20.0	14.8	9.6	8.6
Laborers, except farm and mine	7.7	8.3	7.4	7.4
Service workers, including private household	5.7	6.2	9.5	8.4
Farm:				
Farm laborers and farm foremen	3.2	5.9	7.4	6.8
Farmers and farm managers	10.3	15.9	7.6	7.1
Occupation not reported	0.8	0.8	9.1	9.6

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education", and from Tables 21 and 23 of special report of 1940 Census entitled "Educational Attainment by Economic Characteristics and Marital Status".

Note: The broad categories "Nonfarm" and "Farm" refer to broad types of occupations rather than to industry or residence. The abbreviated occupational titles used in subsequent tables refer to the same major occupation groups as those given in full in this table. The differences between figures for 1940 and 1950 are affected somewhat in certain cases by changes in the occupational classification. For 1950, the data refer to civilian males.

Table 4.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: TOTAL, 1950, AND NATIVE WHITE AND NEGRO, 1940

Age and census year	Total employed males, 22 to 64 years old	Clerical and sales	Managers	Professional	Operatives	Craftsmen	Laborers	Service workers	Laborers	Farmers	Occupation not reported
22 to 64 years:											
1950	100.0	12.7	11.3	7.9	20.5	20.0	7.7	5.7	3.2	10.3	0.8
1940	100.0	13.5	10.1	6.3	18.2	14.8	8.3	6.2	5.9	15.9	0.8
22 to 24 years:											
1950	100.0	16.1	4.0	6.6	27.6	16.2	10.6	4.6	7.0	6.2	1.2
1940	100.0	17.5	3.7	4.7	26.1	10.9	10.9	6.2	11.9	7.2	1.1
25 to 29 years:											
1950	100.0	15.2	6.8	9.6	24.4	19.0	8.1	4.4	4.1	7.4	1.0
1940	100.0	16.5	6.6	7.1	25.3	12.9	8.9	4.8	7.4	9.6	0.9
30 to 34 years:											
1950	100.0	13.5	9.8	9.1	23.0	20.4	7.3	4.5	2.9	8.6	0.8
1940	100.0	15.5	9.7	8.1	22.5	15.6	7.1	4.6	4.8	11.3	0.8
35 to 44 years:											
1950	100.0	11.7	12.7	8.3	20.7	20.6	7.2	5.2	2.7	10.0	0.8
1940	100.0	14.6	12.9	7.1	18.0	17.7	5.8	5.0	3.4	14.7	0.8
45 to 54 years:											
1950	100.0	11.5	14.5	7.2	17.1	20.8	7.3	6.5	2.5	11.6	0.9
1940	100.0	13.2	14.6	6.2	13.0	18.4	5.1	5.2	2.9	20.6	0.8
55 to 64 years:											
1950	100.0	10.9	13.5	6.1	14.9	19.8	7.7	8.5	2.8	14.8	1.0
1940	100.0	11.3	14.3	5.8	9.6	16.0	5.2	6.0	3.6	27.2	0.9

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education", and from Tables 21 and 23 of special report of 1940 Census entitled "Educational Attainment by Economic Characteristics and Marital Status".

Table 5.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY AGE, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	Median age (years)
Total	100.0	6.9	13.5	13.5	25.9	20.6	14.3	5.3	41.2
Nonfarm:									
Clerical and sales	100.0	9.0	16.5	14.6	24.3	18.9	12.5	4.4	39.1
Managers	100.0	2.4	8.0	11.6	28.9	26.2	17.0	5.8	44.7
Professional	100.0	5.9	16.6	15.7	27.6	18.9	11.2	4.0	39.3
Operatives	100.0	9.6	16.5	15.6	26.9	17.7	10.7	2.8	38.0
Craftsmen	100.0	5.7	13.0	14.0	27.1	21.7	14.4	4.1	41.4
Laborers	100.0	9.5	14.2	12.9	24.2	19.5	14.4	5.3	40.5
Service	100.0	5.4	9.9	10.2	22.4	22.5	20.2	9.4	45.9
Farm:									
Laborers	100.0	14.8	16.8	11.8	21.0	16.0	12.1	7.5	38.1
Farmers	100.0	3.9	9.2	10.7	23.9	22.1	19.5	10.8	46.1
Not reported	100.0	9.0	14.2	11.6	22.6	19.4	14.9	8.4	41.8

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 6.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old		Years of school completed					
			Elementary school		High school		College	
	Number[1] (thousands)	Percent	Less than 5 years	5 to 8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more
Total	35,644	--	3,429	12,825	6.618	7,341	2,658	2,774
Percent	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales	4,463	12.5	3.2	6.5	12.7	21.0	26.9	15.1
Managers	4,055	11.4	5.0	7.4	10.8	15.4	22.2	17.9
Professional	2,774	7.8	0.8	1.2	2.5	6.1	17.3	55.0
Operatives	7,111	19.9	21.3	24.5	25.3	17.3	8.3	2.3
Craftsmen	7.044	19.8	12.6	22.1	25.2	22.3	13.1	4.5
Laborers	2,733	7.7	17.9	10.2	6.8	3.9	1.9	0.7
Service	2,122	6.0	8.0	7.2	6.2	5.1	3.9	1.4
Farm:								
Laborers	1,157	3.2	9.9	4.2	2.1	1.6	0.8	0.4
Farmers	3,894	10,9	20.2	15.8	7.7	6.6	4.7	2.0
Not reported	291	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7

1) In this and subsequent tables, the small number of males with schools not reported is excluded.

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 7.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	Years of school completed							Median school years completed
		Elementary school			High school		College		
		Less than 5 years	5 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
Total	100.0	9.6	15.5	20.5	18.6	20.6	7.5	7.8	11.2
Nonfarm:									
Clerical and sales	100.0	2.5	6.0	12.8	18.8	34.5	16.0	9.4	12.3
Clerical	100.0	2.1	6.0	13.4	19.5	36.2	14.9	7.9	12.2
Sales	100.0	2.8	5.9	12.1	18.2	32.8	17.2	11.0	12.3
Managers	100.0	4.3	8.1	15.3	17.6	27.9	14.6	12.3	12.2
Professional	100.0	1.0	1.8	3.5	5.9	16.1	16.1	55.0	16/-
Operatives	100.0	10.3	20.0	24.3	23.6	17.9	3.1	0.9	8.8
Craftsmen	100.0	6.1	15.6	24.6	23.7	23.3	5.0	1.8	9.5
Laborers	100.0	22.4	25.4	22.7	16.4	10.6	1.9	0.7	8.1
Services	100.0	12.9	20.1	23.6	19.2	17.6	4.9	1.8	8.7
Farm:									
Laborers	100.0	29.3	24.2	21.9	11.8	10.0	1.9	0.9	7.6
Farmers	100.0	17.8	23.5	28.6	13.1	12.4	3.2	1.4	8.3
Not reported	100.0	12.3	18.4	20.6	17.3	16.7	7.6	7.0	8.9

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 8a.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH LESS THAN 5 YEARS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Year of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	Age—years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
Less than 5 years of elementary school								
Total	100,0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.6
Managers	5.0	1.1	1.8	2.3	3.8	5.9	6.8	6.6
Professional	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6
Operatives	21.3	23.0	24.6	25.3	23.7	21.9	20.4	12.7
Craftsmen	12.6	6.8	8.9	11.0	11.9	13.8	15.1	10.7
Laborers	17.9	21.0	19.5	18.8	19.5	18.3	16.6	14.2
Service	8.0	3.9	4.9	5.1	5.8	8.1	10.3	11.8
Farm:								
Laborers	9.9	25.5	17.8	12.5	10.6	8.3	6.0	8.9
Farmers	20.2	12.5	16.9	19.5	20.0	19.1	19.5	29.5
Not reported	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.3

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 8b.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 8 YEARS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	Age--years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
8 years of elementary school								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm								
Clerical and sales	7.8	6.2	5.9	5.5	6.8	8.7	9.6	9.7
Managers	8.5	1.7	3.0	4.4	7.6	10.9	11.4	11.2
Professional	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.7
Operatives	23.7	35.6	34.1	31.2	27.6	20.8	16.4	11.2
Craftsmen	23.7	15.1	18.9	22.4	25.0	26.5	24.7	18.9
Laborers	8.5	14.8	12.4	11.3	8.6	6.9	6.7	6.9
Service	6.9	4.3	4.3	4.5	5.5	7.1	9.3	11.6
Farm:								
Laborers	3.5	11.1	6.7	4.3	3.0	2.2	2.3	3.9
Farmers	15.3	9.3	12.9	14.7	14.0	14.6	17.2	23.6
Not reported	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.3

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 8c.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYING MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 4 YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	22 to	25 to	30 to	35 to	45 to	55 to	65 to
4 years high school								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales	21.0	22.0	20.9	20.1	19.8	22.3	22.8	22.6
Managers	15.4	5.1	8.3	13.1	18.5	24.3	24.9	23.7
Professional	6.1	4.9	5.2	5.6	6.1	7.4	8.1	7.8
Operatives	17.3	25.4	22.0	19.7	15.9	10.5	8.9	6.8
Craftsmen	22.3	20.0	24.4	24.5	22.6	20.9	18.5	15.9
Laborers	3.9	6.9	5.0	4.0	3.2	2.5	2.3	2.5
Service	5.1	4.3	4.6	4.8	5.3	5.3	6.3	8.4
Farm:								
Laborers	1.6	4.5	2.2	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.8	1.5
Farmers	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.5	7.1	5.5	6.6	9.6
Not reported	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.1

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education".

Table 8d.-- PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 4 YEARS OR MORE OF COLLEGE, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
4 years or more of college								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales	15.1	26.8	20.0	15.9	13.5	12.3	12.1	10.9
Managers	17.9	8.7	10.7	16.1	20.2	23.0	21.4	16.9
Professional	55.0	49.8	58.1	57.0	55.2	52.9	53.0	55.4
Operatives	2.3	4.1	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1
Craftsmen	4.5	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.2
Laborers	0.7	1.4	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.0
Service	1.4	2.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.6	2.1
Farm:								
Laborers	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.7
Farmers	2.0	0.9	1.0	1.6	2.0	2.2	3.2	5.4
Not reported	0.7	1.3	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.1

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education"

Table 9.-- AVERAGE (MEAN) INCOME IN 1949, FOR MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

	Total males, 22 to 74 years old	No school years completed	Elementary school			High school		College	
			1 to 4 years	5 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more
22 to 74 years	$2,999	$1,359	$1,625	$2,135	$2,685	$3,013	$3,156	$3,878	$5,724
22 to 24 years	$1,857	$ 729	$1,090	$1,366	$1,793	$2,073	$2,229	$1,568	$1,684
25 to 29 years	$2,556	$ 956	$1,379	$1,769	$2,235	$2,555	$2,907	$2,820	$3,090
30 to 34 years	$3,130	$1,042	$1,579	$2,056	$2,605	$2,964	$3,452	$3,983	$5,002
35 to 44 years	$3,505	$1,361	$1,730	$2,346	$2,926	$3,358	$3,959	$4,910	$6,939
45 to 54 years	$3,556	$1,588	$1,927	$2,505	$3,112	$3,588	$4,519	$5,473	$7,907
55 to 64 years	$3,038	$1,705	$1,833	$2,369	$2,812	$3,283	$4,273	$4,918	$7,335
65 to 74 years	$1,882	$1,001	$1,104	$1,463	$1,805	$2,253	$2,921	$3,383	$5,4

Source: Computed from Table 12 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education" and from records.

Table 10.-- ESTIMATED AVERAGE (MEAN) INCOME OF MEN FROM AGE 22 TO 74 YEARS (OR UNTIL DEATH, IF DEATH OCCURS BEFORE AGE 74 YEARS) WHICH WOULD RESULT FROM INCOME LEVELS PREVAILING IN 1949, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR THE UNITED STATES.

Years of school completed	Average income of men from age 22 to 74 years
Total	$132,522
No school years completed	$ 57,788
Elementary: 1 to 4 years	$ 71,717
5 to 7 years	$ 93,184
8 years	$116,477
High school: 1 to 3 years	$135,095
4 years	$165,000
College: 1 to 3 years	$190,310
4 years or more	$267,738

Source: Computed from Table 12 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education", and from records.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Paul C. Glick
U. S. Bureau of the Census

- - - - - -

Table 1.--MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY PERSONS 22 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950 AND 1940

Age	1950		1940	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total, 22 years and over...	9.2	9.9	8.6	8.8
22 to 24 years.....	11.9	12.2	10.8	11.4
25 to 29 years.....	12.0	12.1	10.1	10.5
30 to 34 years.....	11.5	11.8	9.2	9.9
35 to 44 years.....	9.9	10.5	8.7	8.8
45 to 54 years.....	8.7	8.9	8.4	8.5
55 to 64 years.....	8.4	8.5	8.2	8.4
65 to 74 years.....	8.1	8.3	8.1	8.2
75 years and over.....	7.9	8.2	7.7	8.1

Source: Computed from Table 9 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education," and from Tables 15 and 18 of Part 1, Volume IV, of 1940 Reports on Population.

Table 2.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950 AND 1940

Age and census year	Total males, 22 to 64 years old	Elementary school		High school		College		School years not reported
		Less than 5 years	5 to 8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
22 to 64 years:								
1950.....	100.0	9.5	34.3	18.2	19.8	7.9	7.4	2.9
1940.....	100.0	12.7	44.6	16.0	14.3	5.4	5.6	1.4
22 to 24 years:								
1950.....	100.0	4.8	21.3	23.7	26.5	15.1	6.1	2.5
1940.....	100.0	6.3	28.9	22.7	27.8	8.3	5.1	0.9
25 to 29 years:								
1950.....	100.0	5.3	21.6	21.4	29.0	10.8	9.4	2.5
1940.....	100.0	6.9	34.8	21.7	22.1	6.7	6.8	0.9
30 to 34 years:								
1950.....	100.0	5.7	25.7	21.0	27.7	8.7	8.7	2.5
1940.....	100.0	8.0	40.2	20.4	16.7	6.4	7.3	1.1
35 to 44 years:								
1950.....	100.0	7.9	34.5	19.6	19.6	7.4	8.1	2.8
1940.....	100.0	11.6	47.9	16.1	11.8	5.3	6.0	1.4
45 to 54 years:								
1950.....	100.0	11.9	44.1	15.3	13.1	5.9	6.6	3.1
1940.....	100.0	17.8	51.1	11.4	9.0	4.2	4.7	1.7
55 to 64 years:								
1950.....	100.0	18.2	46.9	11.4	10.3	4.6	5.2	3.5
1940.....	100.0	21.3	53.0	8.6	7.6	3.5	4.0	2.0

Source: Computed from Table 9 of special report of 1950 Census of Population entitled "Education," and from Tables 15 and 18 of Part 1, Volume IV, of 1940 Reports on Population.

Table 3.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, AND MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, FOR THE UNITED STATES: TOTAL, 1950, AND NATIVE WHITE AND NEGRO, 1940

Major occupation group	Employed males, 22 to 64 years old			
	Percent distribution		Median years of school completed	
	1950	1940	1950	1940
Total	100.0	100.0	9.9	8.8
Nonfarm:				
Clerical, sales and kindred workers	12.7	13.5	12.3	12.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	11.3	10.1	12.3	12.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7.9	6.3	16+	16+
Operatives and kindred workers	20.5	18.2	8.7	8.4
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	20.0	14.8	9.6	8.6
Laborers, except farm and mine	7.7	8.3	7.4	7.4
Service workers, including private household	5.7	6.2	9.5	8.4
Farm:				
Farm laborers and farm foremen	3.2	5.9	7.4	6.8
Farmers and farm managers	10.3	15.9	7.6	7.1
Occupation not reported	0.8	0.8	9.1	9.6

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education," and from Tables 21 and 23 of special report of 1940 Census entitled "Educational Attainment by Economic Characteristics and Marital Status."

Note: The broad categories "Nonfarm" and "Farm" refer to broad types of occupations rather than to industry or residence. The abbreviated occupational titles used in subsequent tables refer to the same major occupation groups as those given in full in this table. The differences between figures for 1940 and 1950 are affected somewhat in certain cases by changes in the occupational classification. For 1950, the data refer to civilian males.

Table 4.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 64 YEARS OLD, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: TOTAL, 1950, AND NATIVE WHITE AND NEGRO, 1940

Age and census year	Total employed males, 22 to 64 years old	Nonfarm							Farm		Occupation not reported
		Clerical and sales	Managers	Professional	Operatives	Craftsmen	Laborers	Service workers	Laborers	Farmers	
22 to 64 years:											
1950	100.0	12.7	11.3	7.9	20.5	20.0	7.7	5.7	3.2	10.3	0.8
1940	100.0	13.5	10.1	6.3	18.2	14.8	8.3	6.2	5.9	15.9	0.8
22 to 24 years:											
1950	100.0	16.1	4.0	6.6	27.6	16.2	10.6	4.6	7.0	6.2	1.2
1940	100.0	17.5	3.7	4.7	26.1	10.9	10.9	6.2	11.9	7.2	1.1
25 to 29 years:											
1950	100.0	15.2	6.8	9.6	24.4	19.0	8.1	4.4	4.1	7.4	1.0
1940	100.0	16.5	6.6	7.1	25.3	12.9	8.9	4.8	7.4	9.6	0.9
30 to 34 years:											
1950	100.0	13.5	9.8	9.1	23.0	20.4	7.3	4.5	2.9	8.6	0.8
1940	100.0	15.5	9.7	8.1	22.5	15.6	7.1	4.6	4.8	11.3	0.8
35 to 44 years:											
1950	100.0	11.7	12.7	8.3	20.7	20.6	7.2	5.2	2.7	10.0	0.8
1940	100.0	14.6	12.9	7.1	18.0	17.7	5.8	5.0	3.4	14.7	0.8
45 to 54 years:											
1950	100.0	11.5	14.5	7.2	17.1	20.8	7.3	6.5	2.5	11.6	0.9
1940	100.0	13.2	14.6	6.2	13.0	18.4	5.1	5.2	2.9	20.6	0.8
55 to 64 years:											
1950	100.0	10.9	13.5	6.1	14.9	19.8	7.7	8.5	2.8	14.8	1.0
1940	100.0	11.3	14.3	5.8	9.6	16.0	5.2	6.0	3.6	27.2	0.9

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education," and from Tables 21 and 23 of special report of 1940 Census entitled "Educational Attainment by Economic Characteristics and Marital Status."

Table 5.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY AGE, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males 22 to 74 years old	Age--years							Median age (years)
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	
Total.....	100.0	6.9	13.5	13.5	25.9	20.6	14.3	5.3	41.2
Nonfarm:									
Clerical and sales..	100.0	9.0	16.5	14.6	24.3	18.9	12.5	4.4	39.1
Managers.....	100.0	2.4	8.0	11.6	28.9	26.2	17.0	5.8	44.7
Professional.....	100.0	5.9	16.6	15.7	27.6	18.9	11.2	4.0	39.3
Operatives.....	100.0	9.6	16.5	15.6	26.9	17.7	10.7	2.8	38.0
Craftsmen.....	100.0	5.7	13.0	14.0	27.1	21.7	14.4	4.1	41.4
Laborers.....	100.0	9.5	14.2	12.9	24.2	19.5	14.4	5.3	40.5
Service.....	100.0	5.4	9.9	10.2	22.4	22.5	20.2	9.4	45.9
Farm:									
Laborers.....	100.0	14.8	16.8	11.8	21.0	16.0	12.1	7.5	38.1
Farmers.....	100.0	3.9	9.2	10.7	23.9	22.1	19.5	10.8	46.1
Not reported.....	100.0	9.0	14.2	11.6	22.6	19.4	14.9	8.4	41.8

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 6.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old		Years of school completed					
			Elementary school		High school		College	
	Number[1] (thousands)	Percent	Less than 5 years	5 to 8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more
Total.....	35,644	--	3,429	12,825	6,618	7,341	2,658	2,774
Percent.....	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales....	4,463	12.5	3.2	6.5	12.7	21.0	26.9	15.1
Managers.....	4,055	11.4	5.0	7.4	10.8	15.4	22.2	17.9
Professional.....	2,774	7.8	0.8	1.2	2.5	6.1	17.3	55.0
Operatives.....	7,111	19.9	21.3	24.5	25.3	17.3	8.3	2.3
Craftsmen.....	7,044	19.8	12.6	22.1	25.2	22.3	13.1	4.5
Laborers.....	2,733	7.7	17.9	10.2	6.8	3.9	1.9	0.7
Service.....	2,122	6.0	8.0	7.2	6.2	5.1	3.9	1.4
Farm:								
Laborers.....	1,157	3.2	9.9	4.2	2.1	1.6	0.8	0.4
Farmers.....	3,894	10.9	20.2	15.8	7.7	6.6	4.7	2.0
Not reported.....	291	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7

[1] In this and subsequent tables, the small number of males with schools not reported is excluded.

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 7.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old	Years of school completed							Median school years completed
		Elementary school			High school		College		
		Less than 5 years	5 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
Total.....	100.0	9.6	15.5	20.5	18.6	20.6	7.5	7.8	11.2
Nonfarm:									
Clerical and sales...	100.0	2.5	6.0	12.8	18.8	34.5	16.0	9.4	12.3
Clerical.....	100.0	2.1	6.0	13.4	19.5	36.2	14.9	7.9	12.2
Sales.....	100.0	2.8	5.9	12.1	18.2	32.8	17.2	11.0	12.3
Managers.....	100.0	4.3	8.1	15.3	17.6	27.9	14.6	12.3	12.2
Professional.....	100.0	1.0	1.8	3.5	5.9	16.1	16.1	55.0	16/
Operatives.....	100.0	10.3	20.0	24.3	23.6	17.9	3.1	0.9	8.8
Craftsmen.....	100.0	6.1	15.6	24.6	23.7	23.3	5.0	1.8	9.5
Laborers.....	100.0	22.4	25.4	22.7	16.4	10.6	1.9	0.7	8.1
Service.....	100.0	12.9	20.1	23.6	19.2	17.6	4.9	1.8	8.7
Farm:									
Laborers.....	100.0	29.3	24.2	21.9	11.8	10.0	1.9	0.9	7.6
Farmers.....	100.0	17.8	23.5	28.6	13.1	12.4	3.2	1.4	8.3
Not reported.....	100.0	12.3	18.4	20.6	17.3	16.7	7.6	7.0	8.9

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 8a.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH LESS THAN 5 YEARS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old	Age--years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
Less than 5 years of elementary school								
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales...	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.6
Managers.....	5.0	1.1	1.8	2.3	3.8	5.9	6.8	6.6
Professional.....	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6
Operatives.....	21.3	23.0	24.6	25.3	23.7	21.9	20.4	12.7
Craftsmen.....	12.6	6.8	8.9	11.0	11.9	13.8	15.1	10.7
Laborers.....	17.9	21.0	19.5	18.8	19.5	18.3	16.6	14.2
Service.....	8.0	3.9	4.9	5.1	5.8	8.1	10.3	11.8
Farm:								
Laborers.....	9.9	25.5	17.8	12.5	10.6	8.3	6.0	8.9
Farmers.....	20.2	12.5	16.9	19.5	20.0	19.1	19.5	29.5
Not reported.....	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.3

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 8b.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 8 YEARS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old	Age--years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
8 years of elementary school								
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales....	7.8	6.2	5.9	5.5	6.8	8.7	9.6	9.7
Managers.....	8.5	1.7	3.0	4.4	7.6	10.9	11.4	11.2
Professional.....	1.3	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.7
Operatives.....	23.7	35.6	34.1	31.2	27.6	20.8	16.4	11.2
Craftsmen.....	23.7	15.1	18.9	22.4	25.0	26.5	24.7	18.9
Laborers.....	8.5	14.8	12.4	11.3	8.6	6.9	6.7	6.9
Service.....	6.9	4.3	4.3	4.5	5.5	7.1	9.3	11.6
Farm:								
Laborers.....	3.5	11.1	6.7	4.3	3.0	2.2	2.3	3.9
Farmers.....	15.3	9.3	12.9	14.7	14.0	14.6	17.2	23.6
Not reported.....	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.3

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 8c.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 4 YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old	Age--years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
4 years of high school								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales	21.0	22.0	20.9	20.1	19.8	22.3	22.8	22.6
Managers	15.4	5.1	8.3	13.1	18.5	24.3	24.9	23.7
Professional	6.1	4.9	5.2	5.6	6.1	7.4	8.1	7.8
Operatives	17.3	25.4	22.0	19.7	15.9	10.5	8.9	6.8
Craftsmen	22.3	20.0	24.4	24.5	22.6	20.9	18.5	15.9
Laborers	3.9	6.9	5.0	4.0	3.2	2.5	2.3	2.5
Service	5.1	4.3	4.6	4.8	5.3	5.3	6.3	8.4
Farm:								
Laborers	1.6	4.5	2.2	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.8	1.5
Farmers	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.5	7.1	5.5	6.6	9.6
Not reported	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.1

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 8d.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, FOR EMPLOYED MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD WITH 4 YEARS OR MORE OF COLLEGE, BY AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Years of school completed and major occupation group	Total employed males, 22 to 74 years old	Age--years						
		22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74
4 years or more of college								
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfarm:								
Clerical and sales....	15.1	26.8	20.0	15.9	13.5	12.3	12.1	10.9
Managers.....	17.9	8.7	10.7	16.1	20.2	23.0	21.4	16.9
Professional.....	55.0	49.8	58.1	57.0	55.2	52.9	53.0	55.4
Operatives.....	2.3	4.1	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1
Craftsmen.....	4.5	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.2
Laborers.....	0.7	1.4	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.0
Service.....	1.4	2.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.6	2.1
Farm:								
Laborers.....	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.7
Farmers.....	2.0	0.9	1.0	1.6	2.0	2.2	3.2	5.4
Not reported.....	0.7	1.3	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.1

Source: Computed from Table 11 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education."

Table 9.--AVERAGE (MEAN) INCOME IN 1949, FOR MALES 22 TO 74 YEARS OLD, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED AND AGE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1950

Age	Total males, 22 to 74 years old	No school years completed	Elementary school			High school		College	
			1 to 4 years	5 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more
22 to 74 years..	$2,999	$1,359	$1,625	$2,135	$2,685	$3,013	$3,516	$3,878	$5,72
22 to 24 years....	$1,857	$ 729	$1,090	$1,366	$1,793	$2,073	$2,229	$1,568	$1,68
25 to 29 years....	$2,556	$ 956	$1,379	$1,769	$2,235	$2,555	$2,907	$2,820	$3,09
30 to 34 years....	$3,130	$1,042	$1,579	$2,056	$2,605	$2,964	$3,452	$3,983	$5,00
35 to 44 years....	$3,505	$1,361	$1,730	$2,346	$2,926	$3,358	$3,959	$4,910	$6,93
45 to 54 years....	$3,556	$1,588	$1,927	$2,505	$3,112	$3,588	$4,519	$5,473	$7,90
55 to 64 years....	$3,038	$1,705	$1,833	$2,369	$2,812	$3,283	$4,273	$4,918	$7,33
65 to 74 years....	$1,882	$1,001	$1,104	$1,463	$1,805	$2,253	$2,921	$3,383	$5,41

Source: Computed from Table 12 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education," and from records.

Table 10.--ESTIMATED AVERAGE (MEAN) INCOME OF MEN FROM AGE 22 TO 74 YEARS (OR UNTIL DEATH, IF DEATH OCCURS BEFORE AGE 74 YEARS) WHICH WOULD RESULT FROM INCOME LEVELS PREVAILING IN 1949, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, FOR THE UNITED STATES

Years of school completed	Average income of men from age 22 to 74 years
Total.....	$132,522
No school years completed.....	$ 57,788
Elementary: 1 to 4 years.....	$ 71,717
5 to 7 years.....	$ 93,184
8 years.....	$116,477
High school: 1 to 3 years.....	$135,095
4 years.....	$165,000
College: 1 to 3 years.....	$190,310
4 years or more.....	$267,738

Source: Computed from Table 12 of special report of 1950 Census entitled "Education," and from records.