

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **A WEBERIAN APPROACH TO CLASS ANALYSIS**

**Richard Breen**

---

#### *Introduction*

In the broad project of 'class analysis' a great deal of effort goes into defining class and delineating the boundaries of classes. This is necessarily so, because class analysis is 'the empirical investigation of the consequences and corollaries of the existence of a class structure defined *ex-ante*' (Breen and Rottman 1995b: 453). By starting from a particular definition, sociologists can assess the extent to which such things as inequality in life chances among individuals and families are structured on the basis of class. This approach stands in contrast to one that discovers a class structure from the empirical distribution of inequality in society (Sørensen 2000 labels this the 'nominal classifications' approach). In class analysis the theoretical underpinnings of the version of class that is being used have to be made clear at the outset, and the concept of class has to be operationalized so as to allow claims about class to be tested empirically. If we examine the two main varieties of contemporary class analysis – namely Marxist class analysis, particularly associated with the work of Erik Wright and his associates, and the neo-Weberian class analysis linked to the use of the class schema devised by John Goldthorpe – we find that these two tasks are central to both.

In this chapter I will discuss some of the issues involved in seeking to pursue class analysis within a broadly Weberian perspective. I begin by outlining Weber's own views on social class, as these are presented in *Economy and Society*. This serves to set out the broad parameters within which Weberian class analysis operates and to suggest the extent and limits of its explanatory ambitions. I go on to discuss, in very general terms, what sort of operationalization of class is suggested by the work of Weber and then to outline the Goldthorpe class schema, which is widely held to be Weberian in conception (for example, Marshall *et al* 1988: 14). The chapter concludes with a discussion of some of what I see as the fundamental objections to a neo-Weberian approach to class

analysis and with some clarifications about exactly what we might expect a neo-Weberian class classification to explain.

*Social class in the work of Max Weber*

In capitalism it is the market that determines the life chances enjoyed by individuals. Life chances can be understood as, in Giddens's terms, 'the chances an individual has for sharing in the socially created economic or cultural "goods" that typically exist in any given society' (1973: 130-1) or, more simply, as the chances that individuals have of gaining access to scarce and valued outcomes. Weber (1978: 302) writes that 'a class situation is one in which there is a shared typical probability of procuring goods, gaining a position in life, and finding inner satisfaction': in other words, members of a class share common life chances. If this is what members of a class have in common, what puts them in this common position? Weber's answer is that the market distributes life chances according to the resources that individuals bring to it, and he recognized that these resources could vary in a number of ways. Aside from the distinction between property owners and non-owners, there is also variation according to particular skills and other assets. The important point, however, is that all these assets only have value in the context of a market: hence, class situation is identified with market situation.

One consequence of Weber's recognition of the diversity of assets that engender returns in the market is a proliferation of possible classes, which he calls 'economic classes'. Social classes, however, are much smaller in number, being aggregations of economic classes. They are formed not simply on the basis of the workings of the market: other factors intervene to transform economic relationships into social relationships, and the one singled out by Weber for particular attention is social mobility. 'A social class makes up the totality of class positions within which individual and inter-generational mobility is easy and typical' (Weber 1978: 302). Weber suggests that, as a matter of empirical fact, four major social classes can be identified under capitalism, between which social mobility is infrequent and difficult but within which it is relatively common. The first distinction is between those who own property or the means of production, and those who do not, but both groups are 'further differentiated ... according to the kind of property ... and the kind of services that can be offered in the market' (Weber 1978: 928). The resulting four classes are the 'dominant entrepreneurial and propertied groups'; the petty bourgeoisie; workers with formal credentials

(the middle class) and those who lack them and whose only asset is their labour power (the working class).

It is well known that Weber saw class as only one aspect of the distribution of power in society. In a famous definition, power is 'the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests' (Weber 1978: 53), and status groups and parties, along with classes are, for Weber, the major phenomena of the distribution of power in society. The distinction between them concerns the different resources that each can bring to influence the distribution of life chances. While membership of each will overlap, none of these dimensions can be wholly reduced to the other. Each of them can be a basis for collective action, but, in fact, status groups and parties are more likely to fulfil this role than are classes. For parties, collective action is their *raison d'être*, while membership of a status group is more likely to figure in individuals' consciousness, and thus act as a basis for collective action, than is membership of a class. Whether or not members of a class display 'class consciousness' depends on certain contingent factors: it is 'linked to general cultural conditions ... and especially linked to the transparency of the connections between the causes and the consequences of the class situation' (Weber 1978: 928-32). Different life chances, associated with social class membership, do not themselves give birth to 'class action': it is only when the 'real conditions and the results of the class situation' are recognized that this can occur.

This review of Weber's writings on social class serves, not least, to establish some limits to the ambitions of a Weberian class analysis. Perhaps most importantly there is no assumption that patterns of historical change can be explained in terms of the evolution of the relationship between classes, as is the case with Marxist historical materialism. Nor is there any supposition that classes are necessarily in a zero-sum conflict in which the benefits to one come at the (illegitimate) expense of the other. Indeed, there is no assumption in Weber that class will be the major source of conflict within capitalist society or that classes will necessarily serve as a source of collective action. Rather, the focus is on the market as the source of inequalities in life chances. But this is not to say that a Weberian approach takes market arrangements as given. Weber writes that markets are themselves forms of social action which depend, for their existence, on other sorts of social action, such as a certain kind of legal order (Weber 1978: 930). But in understanding how

market arrangements come to be the way they are, one cannot simply focus on classes and the relationships between them. The evolution of social forms is a complex process that can be driven by a wide variety of factors, as Weber himself illustrates in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, where ideas are allotted a central role in the development of modern capitalism.

Weber's comments on class are rather fragmentary: there is, for example, very little in his work addressing questions of class conflict.<sup>1</sup> This being so, it may, on occasion, seem easier to define a Weberian approach by what it is not, rather than what it is, and almost any class schema that is not avowedly Marxist could be considered Weberian. Indeed, the boundaries between the Marxist and Weberian versions are themselves often rather less than sharp. But, as I hope to show, there is a distinctive element to a Weberian class schema and this determines both how we should go about constructing it and how we should evaluate its performance as an explanatory factor in class analyses. But I see no virtue in seeking to follow Weber's writings 'to the letter' (even supposing that it were possible to do so), and the approach I outline here, which I call neo-Weberian, may not be the only one to which Weber's own rather unsystematic remarks on class could give rise.

#### *The aims of class analysis*

Understood as a general project, class analysis sees class as having the potential to explain a wide range of outcomes. A principal aim, of course, is to examine the relationship between class position and life chances, but class analysis is seldom restricted to this. Class is commonly held to have various other possible consequences, which we might distinguish under three broad headings. First, there are outcomes that are largely unconscious or involuntary: an example is class differences in morbidity and mortality, other examples are attitudes and tastes. Secondly, there are outcomes that involve conscious behaviour but not class-conscious behaviour. Because a set of individuals shares a common class position they tend to behave in ways that are similar, but they do not do this because they are aware of their shared class position. Rather, class position is a determinant of the individual's conditions of action and similar actions could be expected among those who have similar conditions of action (see Weber 1978: 929). Thirdly, there is class conscious behaviour. This can occur when, as Weber says, individuals become aware of 'the connections between the causes and the consequences of the class situation'.

In principle, then, not just variation in life chances but in a whole range of action, behaviour, attitudes, values and so forth can be taken as objects that class might help to explain. But the link between classes and their consequences cannot simply be an empirical matter: there must be some theory or argument for why classes, defined in whatever way they are, are salient for the explanation of these outcomes, and, in particular, for the explanation of variation in life chances. This is a point we shall revisit in this chapter. But now I turn to the question of how Weber's ideas on social class might be operationalized.

*The development of a Weberian class schema*

To a Weberian, class is of interest because it links individuals' position in capitalist markets to inequality in the distribution of life chances. As we have seen, variations in market position arise on the basis of differences in the possession of market-relevant assets. One possible approach to constructing a Weber-inspired class schema might then be to group together individuals possessing the same or similar assets. After all, Weber defines 'class situation' as the sharing of a 'specific causal component of ... life chances' (1978: 927) and it might therefore seem reasonable to define classes in terms of such causal components of life chances. In this sense, the explanatory variables in a neo-classical earnings function would serve to delineate at least some classes.

In fact, such an approach to the study of class is not usually adopted – because what is important is not the possession of assets *per se* but their implementation in the market. For many reasons there is not a deterministic relationship between the resources that individuals bring to the market and what they receive in return. So the focus shifts to market situation and to identifying a set of structural positions that can be grouped together as classes. As Sørensen (1991: 72) puts it, classes are 'sets of structural positions. Social relationships within markets, especially within labour markets, and within firms define these positions. Class positions exist independently of individual occupants of these positions. They are "empty places"'. The question for all forms of class analysis is how – on what basis – we should distinguish these positions.

One way of approaching this question would be to start by asking what it is that class is meant to explain. If the primary purpose of a class schema is to capture how social relationships within markets and firms shape life-chances, then classes could be defined so as to maximize the statisti-

cal association between them and the distribution of life chances. Label this strategy (i). Such an approach might be seen as being half-way between purely inductive ('nominal' in Sørensen's term) class classifications and the approach more usually adopted in class analysis. I am not aware of any class schema that follows this practice, but something similar has been suggested as a method for constructing social distance or social dominance scales (Prandy 1999, Rytina 2000). Alternatively, the principle on which classes are defined could be viewed, implicitly, as a theory about how relationships in markets and firms are linked to the distribution of life chances. This is strategy (ii). In either case, the boundaries that we draw to categorize positions in firms and labour markets should have a claim to being the classification that best captures the distinctions that are relevant to explain variation, in this case, in life chances. But this raises the possibility that if our purpose is to capture how position in the system of production influences, let us say, voting behaviour, or some types of collective action, then a quite different principle might be appropriate.

The alternative way of approaching the problem (strategy (iii)) is to use a principle or set of principles that claim to capture, in some way, a fundamental set of distinctions within the production processes of society, of which inequalities in life chances would be consequential but not constitutive (in the sense that the classes are not defined so as to explain variation in life chances). In Marxism, classes are (or, at any rate, were) fundamental in the sense that the relationship between classes drives historical change.<sup>2</sup> Another justification for considering a certain classification principle as fundamental (though perhaps not as fundamental as in historical materialism) might be that it distinguishes classes that have, for example, particular political importance, perhaps as the poles around which conflict in society is organized. But in these, and similar, cases, although the class structure would not be defined specifically with reference to the distribution of life chances, life chances might still be distributed on class lines.

Understood in this way, there is no such fundamental basis for a Weberian class classification. The single defining characteristic of Weber-inspired class analysis is that classes are of interest insofar as they shaped life chances, and strategy (ii) is thus the one that is followed in constructing a neo-Weberian schema. However, as an empirical fact, it emerges that such schemata do often prove to be good predictors of behaviours, actions, attitudes, preferences, and so forth, of the kind I discussed

earlier. Class analysis should therefore explain not only why certain distinctions of position within labour markets and firms lead to differences in life chances, but also why a categorization of positions developed for this purpose should also explain variations in a range of different outcomes. But before taking this issue any further, it may be useful to put the discussion on a more concrete basis by examining a class schema that is usually held to be neo-Weberian.

*The Goldthorpe class schema*

The class schema developed by John Goldthorpe and his associates (Goldthorpe 1980; Erikson, Goldthorpe and Portocarero 1979; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992) has been extensively used in empirical class analysis during the past 20 years. Initially, the schema was presented as distinguishing occupations on the basis of their market and work situations.<sup>3</sup> Market situation refers to an occupation's sources and levels of income, its associated conditions of employment, degree of economic security, and chances, for its holders, of economic advancement. Work situation refers to an occupation's location within systems of authority and control in the production process (Goldthorpe 1980: 40). Occupations that typically share common market and work situations were held to constitute classes and occupants of different classes were held to enjoy different life chances.

In his later work, however, Goldthorpe has provided a slightly different set of principles on which the same class schema is based. 'The aim of the class schema is to differentiate positions within labour markets and production units or, more specifically ... to differentiate such positions in terms of the employment relations that they entail' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 37). Now classes are held to capture two main distinctions: between employees and employers, and among employees according to the nature of their relationship with their employer. The important distinction here is between positions that are regulated under a labour contract, and those that are regulated by a 'service' relationship with the employer. Under a labour contract there is a very specific exchange of wages for effort and the worker is relatively closely supervised, while the service relationship is more long-term and involves a more diffuse exchange. It is typically found in circumstances where the employee has valuable, specialised knowledge (asset specificity) or where direct supervision is not feasible or is undesirable (monitoring difficulty). 'A service relationship can thus be understood as the means through which an employing organization seeks to create and sustain ... commitment'

(Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 42). These means include a salary and fringe benefits and, 'important prospective elements – for example, salary increments on an established scale, assurances of security ... pension rights ... and ... well defined career opportunities' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 42).

In fact, the inconsistencies between the early and later formulations of the schema are minor, since it is differences between positions in the nature of the employment contract that give rise to the variations in market and work situation that were relevant in the earlier version. In both cases, the distinctions captured in the schema are held to produce differences in life chances: class position is a determinant of 'experiences of affluence or hardship, of economic security or insecurity, of prospects of continuing material advance, or of unyielding material constraints' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 236).

What does the resulting class schema look like? There is one class of the self-employed and small-employees (petty-bourgeoisie), labeled class IV (the classification uses Roman numerals). This is subdivided first on a sectoral basis, so that IVc comprises farmers and 'other self-employed workers in primary production', and secondly between non-agricultural employers and the self-employed: IVa comprises small proprietors with employees<sup>4</sup>, IVb those without employees. The remaining classes are comprised of employee positions, distinguished on the basis of their employment relations. Classes I and II are made up of those occupations that most clearly have a service relationship: the distinction between them is a matter of degree. So class I comprises higher grade, and class II lower grade, professionals, higher technical, administrative and managerial workers. At the other extreme, members of classes VI (skilled manual workers) and VII (unskilled manual workers) most clearly have a labour contract with their employer. Class VII is itself also divided sectorally: VIIb is non-skilled agricultural workers, VIIa is non-skilled workers outside agriculture. The remaining classes, III (routine non-manual occupations) and V (lower technical and manual supervisory occupations), 'comprise positions with associated employment relationships that would appear characteristically to take on a very mixed form' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 43).

What is strikingly absent from the schema is a class of large employers – the haute bourgeoisie. Nowadays large employers tend to be organizations rather than individuals, but those individual large employers that



exist are placed in class I. Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992: 40-1) justify this practice on the grounds that such individuals are usually owners of enterprises that differ from those of the petty bourgeoisie in legal rather than substantive terms. They are placed in class I rather than IV because 'in so far as such large proprietors tend to be quite extensively involved in managerial as well as entrepreneurial activities, they may be regarded as having a yet greater affinity with those salaried managers to be found in class I who have a substantial share in the ownership of the enterprises in which they work'.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, large proprietors or employers account for 'around 5 per cent of all men allocated to the service class (i.e. Classes I and II) in Western industrial societies, and cannot ... be realistically seen as members of a capitalist elite ... Rather, they turn out on examination to be most typically the owners of stores, hotels, restaurants, garages, small factories or transportation firms' (Goldthorpe 1990: 435).

The resulting class schema gives rise to seven major classes. Its finest disaggregation is an 11-category version (which includes, aside from those already mentioned, a distinction between classes IIIa and IIIb, higher- and lower-grade routine non-manual workers<sup>6</sup>), while the most aggregated version that nevertheless would seem to preserve the essential distinctions of the schema is probably a four-category classification of the service (I and II), intermediate (III and V), petty-bourgeois (IV) and labour contract (VI and VII) classes. These various aggregations of the schema are shown in Table 1.

[TABLE 1 HERE]

Despite Goldthorpe's protestations, there is some justification in labeling his schema 'neo-Weberian' inasmuch as it shares the Weberian focus on life chances and the Weberian modesty about the scope of class analysis. The purpose of the schema is to allow exploration of the 'interconnections defined by employment relations in labour markets and production units ... the processes through which individual and families are distributed and redistributed among these positions over time; and the consequences thereof for their life-chances' (Goldthorpe and Marshall 1992: 382). Furthermore, the class schema makes no claims to identifying groups that act as 'the engine of social change', nor does it suppose that the classes stand in an exploitative relationship one to another, nor that the members of classes will automatically develop class-consciousness and engage in collective action (Goldthorpe and Marshall 1992: 383-4).

*The boundary problem in neo-Weberian class analysis*

A neo-Weberian class schema is a set of principles that allocates positions to classes so as to capture the major dimensions of differentiation in labour markets and production units that are consequential for the distribution of life chances. In assessing a neo-Weberian, or indeed any class schema, it is important to draw a distinction between criticisms leveled at its conceptualization or theoretical basis, on the one hand, and, on the other, its specific implementation, even though objections of both kinds might ultimately be adjudicated empirically. A frequent objection to class classifications is the following: given the apparently enormous diversity of positions in labour markets and economic organizations, how can a class schema, such as Goldthorpe's, especially one with a relatively small number of classes, claim to capture the salient distinctions among positions that are consequential for the distribution of life chances among those who occupy them?<sup>7</sup>

One response to this is to say that variation in life chances among individuals or families in the same class is not in itself a theoretical objection to a neo-Weberian class schema since the life chances that someone enjoys depend on a variety of factors apart from class position. From this perspective, differences in life chances among those in the same class should be seen not as class differences *per se* but as differences based on other factors. But the further objection might be advanced that the chosen set of principles is not optimal: that is, there exists another set of principles that does this job better (and this might, but need not, lead to a finer classification of occupations). It might be argued, for instance, that, a scale of occupational prestige better captures distinctions among positions that are salient for life chances. Or occupations themselves could be held to be groups whose life chances are more sharply distinct than is true of classes. Addressing this objection would require both conceptual clarification and empirical analysis. First, one could ask what mechanisms explain variation in life chances arising from these sources. In the case of Goldthorpe's schema, the form of employment relationship is consequential for life chances because of the different rewards and incentives that are associated with each type of contract. Secondly, one could ask how positions come to be differentiated in this way. In Goldthorpe's schema the two kinds of employment contract are attempted solutions to the problems of asset specificity and employee monitoring that confront employers. Alternative principles for the construction of classes should then have underlying mechanisms of both these sorts that had at least the same degree of plausibility. Lastly, we could move to

empirical tests. Given the choice between two theoretically grounded classifications an empirical analysis would ask which of them was the stronger predictor of life chances, while taking into account the trade-off between explanatory completeness and explanatory parsimony.<sup>8</sup>

Objections like this are fundamental, and are distinct from those that could be leveled against a particular operationalization of a set of underlying principles on which both the critic and the defender might agree. Indeed, in their work, Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992) move between seven-, five- and three-class versions<sup>9</sup> of the Goldthorpe class schema and never, in fact, employ the full 11 categories. They note that 'while preserving the underlying idea of the schema that classes are to be defined in terms of employment relations... the differentiation [of classes] ... could obviously be much further extended, were there good reason to do so' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 46, fn. 18). This is consistent with their assertion that the class schema is an *instrument du travail* rather than a definitive map of *the* class structure.

Despite the fact that positions are put into classes according to their relationship to the means of production and then to the kind of employment relationship they display, the Goldthorpe schema is not, in fact, operationalized by measuring these characteristics of positions and assigning them to classes on this basis. Instead, occupations are assigned to classes on the basis of knowledge about their typical employment relations.<sup>10</sup> This has been done for pragmatic reasons. One important benefit is that data that have already been collected can be coded into the schema. This was the case with the national data sets used in the CASMIN (Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations) project, which led to *The Constant Flux* (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992).

But because the type of employment relationship is defined by a number of different features (salary increments, pension rights and assurances of security are among features of the service relationship listed by Erikson and Goldthorpe), the question arises of the extent to which they do in fact occur together within occupations. If, for example, these dimensions of employment relationships were only weakly related to one another this would call into question the operationalization of the underlying concepts in the form of classes. Evans and Mills (1998) address this issue using British survey data to analyze the relationship between nine indicators of the employment relationship. These include whether or not the job

requires the employee to clock on at a set time, the way in which the employee is paid (piece rate, by the hour, performance related etc.), whether the job is on a recognized career ladder, and whether the employee can decide on how fast the work is done. They apply latent class analysis to these indicators and find four latent classes. This is a reasonably good indication, then, that these various aspects of the employment relationship do not vary independently: rather they mainly co-occur in four combinations. Furthermore, inspection of the pattern of the response probabilities for each item within each latent class suggests to Evans and Mills that these four classes correspond approximately to a white collar salariat; a class of lower level managers and supervisors; a routine non-manual class; and a class of manual wage workers. For example, the probability of clocking on is .05 in the first and third of these classes, while it is .54 in the purported lower level managers and supervisors class and .65 in the manual wage workers class. The first and last of these classes might be taken as the two polar types of service and wage labour relationship, with the others representing intermediate classes. And, indeed, Evans and Mills find that there is a very good match between these latent classes and the respondents' Goldthorpe classes: '78 per cent of latent type 1 can be found in Goldthorpe I and II, 95 per cent fall into I, II and IIIa. Similarly, no less than 89 per cent of latent type 4 are to be found in Goldthorpe VI and VIIab, 96 per cent in VI, VIIab and V' (Evans and Mills 1998: 95). These latter results point to the schema's high criterion validity: that is, the extent to which it succeeds in dividing 'the occupational structure in such a way as to identify important cleavages in the job characteristics which are considered theoretically significant by Goldthorpe and his colleagues' (Evans 1992: 213).

In a later analysis, Evans and Mills (2000) use a much larger set of British data and a similar, though not identical, set of eight indicators of the employment relationship. The results of their latent class analysis this time reveal

A small latent class (1), between 8 and 13 per cent of the population, that are predominantly remunerated with a salary plus some other form of bonus or additional payment; have very high probabilities of not receiving overtime payments; have to give a month or more notice of resignation; and have control over start and quit times. At the other end of the spectrum we find a class (3), between 35 and 45 per cent with the opposite characteristics. ... Between these two groups are a class (2), between 45 and 52 per cent, which are predominantly salaried, tend to receive over-

time payments, have to give more than one month notice to quit and are somewhat mixed with regard to their control over their working hours (Evans and Mills 2000: 653).

Not surprisingly they identify latent classes 1, 2 and 3 with a service, intermediate and labour contract respectively. But, in this case, when they turn to the question of the criterion validity of the scheme, Evans and Mills (2000: 657) conclude that there are some problems with the operationalization of the schema.

The majority of Goldthorpe's class II do not have a 'service' type of employment contract. The dividing line between the service and the intermediate classes appears to run through class II rather than between class II and class IIIa. We also estimate that about a third of class I employees do not have a 'service' contract.

This casts some doubt on the sustainability of the practice of continuing to rely wholly on occupational titles as the basis of the empirical classification, at least in the British case, and at least for the purpose of locating the service class.<sup>11</sup> In the absence of previous analyses comparable to those carried out by Evans and Mills one cannot be sure whether this apparent slippage between occupational titles and the Goldthorpe service class is a recent phenomenon. But one plausible assumption is that an inflation of occupational titles may have led to their becoming poorer indicators of the nature of the employment relationship, as in the increasing use of titles such as 'Manager' for a growing diversity of occupations. Moving to the use of direct measures of the employment relationship might, in any case, confer a benefit. It would allow researchers to determine which of the elements of the relationship were most strongly associated with particular class outcomes, and this would be of obvious value in the search to specify the mechanisms that link class position to these outcomes.

### *Conclusion*

A neo-Weberian approach to class analysis rests on the construction of a schema based on principles that capture the major dimensions of positional differentiation in labour markets and production units that are important for the distribution of life chances. The chosen principle is the theoretical basis, and the corresponding class schema is its operationalization. Given this at least two important lines of empirical inquiry can be pursued. On the one hand, we might want to know how substantively important class is in explaining variation in life chances, particularly in

comparison with other bases of social inequality such as ethnic group membership, gender, and so on. And of course such an inquiry can be extended to make comparisons in the strength of class effects between countries and through time. On the other hand, the existence and strength of the relationship between class and other outcomes, of the kind I listed earlier, are also matters for empirical investigation. But if the classes are meant to capture distinctions that are primarily relevant for the distribution of life chances, then members of a class may or may not behave similarly, hold similar attitudes, or engage in collective action, and so on. Inasmuch as variation in these or other outcomes can be causally traced to variation in life chances, or insofar as those aspects of the organization of labour markets and the production process that shape life chances are also determinants of these other outcomes, then we will find a relationship between them and class. Very often the causal link between life chances and an outcome like collective action will be contingent on other circumstances and then, as Weber recognised, there may or may not be a relationship with class. But in many other cases, there will be a consistent link between life chances and other outcomes. To revert to a point I made earlier: if life chances determine the conditions under which certain types of action are undertaken – including the interests that people have (and which they may express in, say, voting) and the resources they can bring to bear (and which may be important in, say, shaping their children's educational attainment) – then variations in these actions will be structured according to class position. But suppose that in a given case we find no relationship, as when classes are found not to be a basis of any common or collective identity. Should we therefore conclude that class is not important or that the particular classification is inadequate? My answer is that we should conclude that those distinctions that lead to differences in life chances are not ones that serve as a basis for collective identity. But the important point is that these latter sorts of outcome are not constitutive of a neo-Weberian class schema. For example, what are termed *gemeinschaftlich* ideas of class – that is, classes as subjectively real communities – are not, and never have been, a necessary part of the neo-Weberian approach.

But even if these other outcomes are not constitutive of class understood in the Weberian sense, the importance of class as a sociological concept will certainly depend upon how strongly it is related to them, as well as to life chances. If class did not predict significant outcomes it would be of little interest. What is clear, however, is that in many of the areas central to sociological endeavour there is little evidence that the influ-

ence of class is declining and, indeed, some evidence that its influence is growing. Shavit and Blossfeld's (1993) edited collection shows that the influence of class origins on children's educational attainment showed no decline over the course of the twentieth century in thirteen developed nations. The papers in Evans (2000) demonstrate that the much vaunted 'general decline of class voting' is an inaccurate description of the rather complex and cross-nationally varying trends in this phenomenon. Class voting seems to have weakened in Scandinavia, but in Germany, France and elsewhere no such temporal change is evident. Lastly, in the area of social mobility, Breen and Goldthorpe (2001) show that in Britain, during the last quarter of the twentieth century, there has been no change in the extent to which class origins help shape class destinations. This holds true even controlling for educational attainment and measures of individual ability. This result may then be added to the evidence of longer-term temporal stability in patterns of class mobility in Europe reported by Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992).

**References**

- Breen, Richard and David B. Rottman, 1995a, *Class Stratification: A Comparative Perspective*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Breen, Richard and David B. Rottman, 1995b, 'Class Analysis and Class Theory' *Sociology* 29, 3: 453-73.
- Breen, Richard, 1997, 'Risk, Recommodification and the Future of the Service Class', *Sociology*, 31, 3: 473-489.
- Breen, Richard and John H. Goldthorpe, 2001, 'Class, mobility and merit: the experience of two British birth cohorts', *European Sociological Review*, 17, 2: \*\*\*
- Breiger, Ronald L. 1981, 'The Social Class Structure of Occupational Mobility', *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 3: 578-611.
- Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe, 1992, *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Erikson, Robert, John H. Goldthorpe and Lucien Portocarero 1979, 'Intergenerational Class Mobility in Three Western European Societies: England, France and Sweden', *British Journal of Sociology*, 33: 1-34.
- Evans, Geoffrey, 1992, 'Testing the validity of the Goldthorpe class schema' *European Sociological Review* 8, 3: 211-32.
- Evans, Geoffrey, 1999 (ed.) *The End of Class Politics? Class Voting in Comparative Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Geoffrey and Colin Mills, 1998, 'Identifying class structure: a latent class analysis of the criterion-related and construct validity of the Goldthorpe class schema', *European Sociological Review*, 14, 1: 87-106.
- Evans, Geoffrey and Colin Mills, 2000, 'In Search of the Wage-Labour/Service Contract: New evidence on the validity of the Goldthorpe Class Schema'. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51: 641-61.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1973, *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*, London: Hutchinson.
- Goldthorpe, John H. 1980, *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldthorpe, John H. 1990, 'A Response' in Jon Clark, Celia Modgil and Sohan Modgil (eds.) *John Goldthorpe: Consensus and Controversy*, London: The Falmer Press, pages 399-440.
- Goldthorpe, John H. 2000, *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives and the Integration of Research and Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldthorpe, John H. and Gordon Marshall, 1992, 'The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques' *Sociology* 26, 3: 381-400.
- Marshall, Gordon, David Rose, Howard Newby and Caroline Vogler, 1987, *Social Class in Modern Britain*, London: Unwin-Hyman.



- Murphy, Raymond, 1988, *Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Parkin, Frank, 1979, *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*, London: Tavistock.
- Prandy, Kenneth, 1999, 'The Social Interaction Approach to the Measurement and Analysis of Social Stratification', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 19, 9/10/11: 215-49.
- Rytina, Steve, 2000, 'Is Occupational Mobility declining in the US?' *Social Forces* 78, 4: 1227-76.
- Shavit, Yossi and Hans-Peter Blossfeld (eds.), 1993, *Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Sørensen, Aage, 1991, 'On the Usefulness of Class Analysis in Research on Social Mobility and Socioeconomic Inequality' *Acta Sociologica* 34: 71-87.
- Sørensen, Aage, 2000, 'Toward a Sounder Basis for Class Analysis', *American Journal of Sociology* 105, 6: 1523-58.
- Weber, Max, 1978, *Economy and Society (2 vols)* (edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich) Berkeley: University of California Press.

Table 1 Possible Aggregations of the Goldthorpe class schema

<b>11-class (maximally disaggregated) version</b>	<b>7-class version</b>	<b>4-class version</b>
<b>I</b> Upper service class	<b>I</b> Upper service class	<b>I+II</b> Service class
<b>II</b> Lower service class	<b>II</b> Lower service class	
<b>IIIa</b> Routine non-manual employees, higher grade	<b>III</b> Routine non-manual	<b>III+V</b> Intermediate class
<b>IIIb</b> Routine non-manual employees, higher grade		
<b>IVa</b> Small proprietors with employees	<b>IV</b> Petty-bourgeoisie	<b>IV</b> Petty-bourgeoisie
<b>IVb</b> Small proprietors without employees		
<b>IVc</b> Farmers and other self-employed workers in primary production		
<b>V</b> Lower grade technicians and supervisors of manual workers	<b>V</b> Technicians and supervisors	<b>III+V</b> Intermediate class
<b>VI</b> Skilled manual workers	<b>VI</b> Skilled manual	<b>VI+VII</b> Manual class
<b>VIIa</b> Semi- and unskilled manual workers (not in agriculture)	<b>VII</b> Non-skilled manual	
<b>VIIb</b> Semi- and unskilled manual workers in agriculture		

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See Weber 1978: 302-5. The development of neo-Weberian ideas of 'class closure' and of exclusion and usurpation, associated with the work of Parkin (1979, Murphy 1988) draws much more on Weber's discussion of status groups rather than classes. He writes that 'not much of a general nature can be said about the more specific kinds of antagonism between classes' (1978: 930) – which I take to mean that, although there are conflicts between classes, these do not follow a general form but are, instead, conditioned by specific historical circumstances.

<sup>2</sup> It is the exploitation of one class by another that is important for Marxists and, one might argue, inequality of life chances is a necessary and inevitable part of this. But here exploitation, and not inequality of life chances, is the principle that defines classes, and thus, for example, in the basic Marxist two-class model, distinctions in life chances within each class have no role to play in the definition of classes.

<sup>3</sup> Goldthorpe's reluctance to identify his class schema as Weberian is well-known. While acknowledging that the principles of the schema have been largely adopted from Marx and Weber, he writes 'our own approach has often been referred to and discussed as 'Weberian', but we would not regard this as particularly informative or otherwise helpful: ... it is consequences, not antecedents, that matter' (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992: 37, fn. 10).

<sup>4</sup> When applied to the United Kingdom this means less than 25 employees.

<sup>5</sup> There are very many descriptions of the Goldthorpe schema, but the clearest and most detailed is to be found in Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992, chapter 2, while Goldthorpe 2000, chapter 10 provides an extended discussion of the schema's rationale.

<sup>6</sup> IIIa includes occupations such as clerical workers and secretaries in administration and commerce, while IIIb includes sales-persons and personal service workers. Occupations typically held by women in class IIIb are almost invariably regulated by a labour contract rather than a service relationship.

---

<sup>7</sup> Weber overcomes this objection by employing two sets of criteria. Members of a class share common life chances, but social classes are made up those classes between which mobility is common. Breiger (1982) applies this idea to analyze a 17-occupational group mobility table, in which both the pattern of mobility and the underlying class structure (an aggregation of the original 17 categories) are tested for their goodness-of-fit with the original data. However, his approach has not been widely followed.

<sup>8</sup> A more radical critique might be that no such set of principles for the definition of classes exists, and that, although life chances derive in part from the occupation of positions in labour markets and firms, this is not structured according to any enduring ways in which these institutions are organized. This view could easily be subjected to empirical test (and doubtless would pretty easily be found wanting).

<sup>9</sup> The five class version groups together I, II and III into a white-collar class; IVa and IVb into a petty-bourgeoisie; IVc and VIIb into farm workers; V and VI into skilled workers; and VIIa is left as the class of non-skilled workers. The three class version then places IVa and IVb with I, II and III in a non-manual workers class, V, VI and VII in a manual workers class; and retains the farm workers class (IVc and VIIb).

<sup>10</sup> One consequence of this is that the same occupation could be placed in different classes in different countries and, perhaps more importantly, occupations could change their class location over time (Breen 1997).

<sup>11</sup> One difficulty with these analyses that should be mentioned, however, is that they elicit information from employees, whose responses may well relate more to their own position and experiences, rather than to the characteristics of the position that they occupy (for example in questions about the likelihood of promotion). Information about positions might be better collected from employers.