

72-990

GIVANT, Michael, 1942-
ALIENATION FROM BUREAUCRATIC WORK: CLASSICAL
THEORY AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1971
Sociology, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

 COPYRIGHT BY
MICHAEL GIVANT

1971

**ALIENATION FROM BUREAUCRATIC WORK: CLASSICAL THEORY
AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH**

by

MICHAEL GIVANT

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University
of New York.**

1971

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 7, 1971

date

Joseph Gusman
Chairman of Examining Committee

May 7, 1971

date

Benjamin B. Ringer
Executive Officer

Patricia Kendall

Carl J. McNeil
D. Arthur
David Lytle
Supervisory Committee

FOREWARD

The subject of this study is modern man's alienation in bureaucratic work. The subject of man's alienation from work spans much of the social sciences and may be as old as human history. Sociologists, philosophers, economists, historians and novelists have dealt with this problem.

We have tried to present alienation from work as a sociological and human problem, specifically located in bureaucratic, industrial and capitalistic society. We have attempted to isolate the elements of the social structure of work that appear to create and intensify alienation from work. We also have attempted to specify men's awareness or lack of awareness of their condition in view of such work structures.

This study is essentially a comparison of classical theory and empirical research on the subject of work and alienation from work. We will first present what the 19th and early 20th century classical theorists had to say about work. We then will discuss specific levels of bureaucratic work by contemporary researchers and theorists. We will then compare the classical theorists ideas to the modern researchers. In this sense we will be able to see the development of change, if any, of alienation from work since the latter part of the 19th century.

In this study we hope to show how institutional reality sets the conditions for work and its meaning for men. We would also hope that our study shows the institutional limitations for men to find intrinsic meaning in bureaucratic work to whatever degree that theorists and researchers can describe their contemporary reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	A Methodological Note	
	The Concept of Alienation	
II.	CLASSICAL THEORIES OF WORK.....	18
	Karl Marx	
	Max Weber	
	Thorstein Veblen	
	Karl Mannheim	
	Georg Simmel	
	Emile Durkheim	
III.	A PARADIGMATIC ANALYSIS OF CLASSICAL THEORY.....	72
	Industrial Capitalism	
	Irrationality	
	Fetishism of Commodities	
	Tools and Products	
	Exploitation and Brutalization	
	The Metropolis as Market Center	
	Social Psychological Results of Industrial Capitalism	
	Monsterism	
	Instrumental Meaning	
	Overcompensation	
	The Industrial Division of Labor	
	The Separation of Physical and Intellectual Labor	
	The Machine Process	
	Increasing Specialization	
	Social Psychological Consequences of the Industrial Division of Labor	
	Salesmanship Replaces Workmanship	
	Loss of Autonomy and Mastery of the Production Process	

Consumption and Life Style as Overcompensation	
The Structure of Industrial Bureaucracy	
Office, Rules, Careers	
Rationality and Specialization	
Hierarchy and Impersonality	
Social Psychological Consequences of Industrial Bureaucracy	
Careerism and Self-Rationalization	
Fetishism of Rules--Loss of Perspective	
Dehumanization	
Conclusion	
IV. THE POLICY MAKING EXECUTIVE.....	100
The Protestant Ethic	
The Institutionalization of the Protestant Ethic	
The Policy Making Executive as Organization Man	
The Process of Executive Work	
The Executive's Inner Conflicts	
Women and Children First?	
Of Subordinates and Superiors	
The Corporate President - A Profile	
The President and His Subordinates	
The Psychodynamics of the Executive Role	
The Corporation as Father Surrogate	
Subordinates: Doers of Work and Proteges	
The Narcissistic Attitude	
"You Promote the Guy Who Takes His Problem Home With Him"	
Classical Theories of Executive Work	
V. MANAGERS - NON POLICY MAKING EXECUTIVES...	144
The Lonely Crowd at Work	
Two Meanings of Work	
Captains of Consumption - Personalized Glad Handers	
The Marketable Personality	
Self-Rationalization in Work	
Autonomy Versus Alienation	
The Organization Man at Work	
Management Not Work	
The Managerial Demiurge	
Servants of Decision Makers	
Classical Theories of Managerial Work	

VI.	ADVERTISING AND MASS MEDIA OCCUPATIONS	188
	Competition and Insecurity	
	The Memo	
	The Advertising Man	
	The Commercial Artist	
	Classical Theories of Advertising and Mass Media Work	
VII.	THE WHITE COLLAR WORKERS: SALESMEN AND CLERKS	230
	Salesmen	
	The Social Structure of Sales Work and Self- Definition	
	Skill and Know How	
	Presentation of Self and Bureaucratic Encroachment	
	Structured Competition	
	Professionalization and Ethics	
	An Ego Confirming Social Character?	
	"Merely" a Clerk	
	Machine Oriented	
	The Strain of the Machine Orientation	
	Social Status and Recruitment to Clerical Work	
	Convergence of the Machine Orientation and Social Status	
	Work Load	
	Positive Work Attitudes	
	Negative Work Attitudes	
	Class, Status and Work	
	Job Status	
	Two Forms of Alienation	
	The Telephone Company	
	Classical Theories of Sales and Clerical Work	
	Conclusion	
VIII.	AUTOMOBILE WORKERS	292
	Assembly Line Technology	
	Methodology of the Major Studies	
	The Intrinsic Nature of Assembly Line Work - The Immediate Job	
	Mechanical Rhythm and Pacing	
	Repetitiveness-Monotony and Speed	
	Skill and The Extreme Division of Labor	

	Surface Mental Attention	
	Tiring Work and Monotony	
	The Social Structure of Work	
	Salary and Steady Work	
	"Who Gives the Orders"	
	"The Group"	
	The Structure of Opportunity for Promotion	
	The Fight for Control	
	The Fight for Meaning	
	Fantasy and Daydreams	
	Classical Theories of Automobile Work	
	Conclusion	
IX.	NON ALIENATED WORK	347
	The State Employment Agency	
	The Printing Industry	
	The Chemical Operator	
	The Gypsum Plant	
	Summary of Non Alienated Work	
X.	THE CONVERGENCE OF CLASSICAL THEORY AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH	380
	The Classical Theorists - Questions and Contributions	
	The Contemporary Researchers - Questions and Contributions	
	Questions and Issues Not Raised by the Researchers and the Theorists	
	Questions Not Raised by Empirical Researchers	
	Questions Not Raised by the Classical Theorists	
	Questions Raised by Neither Group	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	406

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Immediate Conditions and Structures of Work Created by Industrial Capitalism, The Industrial Division of Labor and Industrial Bureaucracy	91-92
II.	Social Psychological Consequences of Work Structures	93-94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this study is alienation from work in industrial society.¹ It is primarily concerned with alienation from bureaucratized work. Certain basic questions are the focus for our study. First, what is alienation in general, and what is alienation from work? How does alienation from work evidence itself? In what occupations does work alienation manifest itself with special severity? What is alienation free work? Does it exist? Under what conditions does alienation through work exist? Under what conditions does alienated work arise, intensify, diminish, or change in content? Is alienation from work generic to the division of labor, industrialism, capitalism, or bureaucracy? How important are these four structures in setting the structure for work and what are the social psychological, economic and political consequences for such work structures as related to the problem of alienation? To what extent do particularly alienating structures of work influence habits of mind, or create specialized types of social character? What human problems are found at work in a society where the predominant form of work organization is bureaucratic? Does a bureaucratized society create certain types of alienation at

different occupational and societal levels?

Our overall purpose then is to explain what alienation from work is; what conditions create, intensify and change it; and to specify the organizations and levels in organizations and society where it exists most intensively. We will first examine the work done on alienation from work by the classical theorists who basically have defined our problem. They are Karl Marx, Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen, Karl Mannheim, Georg Simmel, and Emile Durkheim. We will attempt to specify the economic, social and political institutions in which, according to each classical thinker, alienation occurs. Of course, not all classical thinkers use the term alienation; Durkheim, for instance, used anomie. (We will deal with the relationships between the concept of anomie and alienation in a later chapter.) We shall be forced to juxtapose various meanings of the related terms, and on that basis, construct a common definition of alienation. We shall attempt to specify the various organizational, structural, economic, and characterological dimensions of alienation so defined. To do so we will construct a paradigm that reflects these dimensions and reanalyze the theories of each from the standpoint of the larger paradigm.

We will then examine the contemporary research studies of alienation from work. In many cases the researchers focus directly on work per se rather than on alienation from work. In many cases the concept of alienation is not used in the research studies. We will then be forced to relate these studies to the overall definition of work

structures and alienation as embodied in our paradigm. We will attempt to locate in these research studies the themes used by the classical theorists and attempt to evaluate any findings that their work may have unearthed.

We will finally attempt to see what the classical researchers explained about alienation from work; what the empirical researchers explained about alienation from work; what one group explains that the other does not; and finally attempt to ascertain what neither group explains --if anything. We will attempt also to discover whether any group can better explain particular aspects of this problem. We will attempt to assess weaknesses of individual theorists and researchers, from the standpoint of our comparative analysis.

A Methodological Note

We have chosen to analyze research studies of bureaucratic work rather than work in a general way.² The reasons for this are (a) most work in industrial societies is organized bureaucratically as opposed to slave, feudal and guild systems, (b) we are attempting to see if there is anything generic to bureaucratic work. Thus to include non-bureaucratic work would serve the purpose of "diluting" the possibility of generalizing from our results as well as to question the results themselves. We also might learn little about bureaucratic work.

We have also chosen to focus on five different levels of

bureaucratic work in the following order: (a) the policy-making, (b) the managerial, (c) the advertising, (d) sales and clerical, (e) the manual production or blue collar levels. This is due to two basic factors rather than a simple or arbitrary choice. One is that we are limited by a small number of studies--and an even smaller number of relevant studies.

We have also chosen to examine specific types of studies. This, in part, is based on our specific research problem. The concept of alienation from work, which we shall attempt shortly to explain, is an amorphous and elusive one. To specify with any degree of exactness and precision is an enormous task. For this study to be of any value we have chosen to examine studies which explain the social structure and social psychological consequences of work in terms of those who do the work. We do not wish to rely on studies which do not state the meaning of work in terms of the people who do the work. In this way we feel that we will be better able to compare the type, degree and intensity of alienation from work as it exists in the empirical world to the ideal type conception of alienation from work. In this sense, we hope to be able to "understand" the actions of the actors both in terms of what they say and do, as well as what we can infer is the meaning of their actions. In this way we hope to understand their motivation in work. Thus we must be prepared to be able to see alienation of perhaps different shades, types and nuances then described by the classical theorists. If a major task of the sociologist is to specify

and explain social change we are prepared to locate and specify any change in the concept of alienation from work between the classical theorists and the empirical researchers.

One final note on these studies that we have chosen. With the exception of one major study all are American. One or two others come from France and Britain. This is not planned. It is perhaps a function of the fact that these countries are industrial and bureaucratic in their economic organization. These studies, again, attempt to explain the meaning of work as related to the people who perform the work.

The Concept of Alienation from Work

The concept of alienation is one of the more elusive and amorphous in the terminology of the social sciences. The concept of alienation from work as originally stated by Karl Marx means that the person experiences work as something alien to himself. The word alienation means in dictionary terms to convey or transfer to another as title, property, right or work. It also implies withdrawal of the alienated party and consequent unfriendliness, strangeness, hostility, indifference or opposition of the object or person to which one "transfers" ownership, etc. The word estrangement is often used synonymously with alienation. It also may mean to infer the consequent state of a person who is alienated from some person or phenomena. For exact and precise definitions we refer the reader to Webster's Third New

International Dictionary.

As a concept in the arsenal of the social sciences which attempts to explain the condition of modern man the term appears to first be used by Hegel. The concept in Hegel's³ work appears as an intrinsic part of Hegel's concept of history. Hegel viewed history as the process of the self-alienation and self-realization of the "absolute spirit." Hegel's "other worldly spirit" becomes external from itself through the process of its world building activities. This absolute or "other worldly spirit" is constantly attempting to transcend its condition. This then is the process of history according to Hegel.

For Hegel, God, the absolute spirit, and the world are one when the absolute spirit realizes itself in history. Man is described as a "finite self-conscious spirit." This finite self-conscious spirit attempts to overcome its finitude, thereby becoming absolute and thus becoming one with God. In essence man should recognize himself as world creator and world builder. Instead, the spirit in its creative world building activity incurs a self-division where the subject--man-- is confronted by the product of the external spirit which is the world it created. This object is then experienced by man as an (a) external, (b) alien, (c) hostile being or thing which stands opposed to its real creator--man. The history of the world for Hegel is the process of overcoming the external, the alien, and the hostile through self-discovery. The spirit must somehow transcend itself to become de-alienated.

Through the urge to self-knowledge the spirit will divest the world and trace the world back to its creator--man himself. Man lives in a state of self-alienation in a self-created but hostile world. In the process of achieving complete self-knowledge to overcome alienation man discovers himself as the world creator. He then becomes at home in the world and unified with God. Reason then prevails.

Feuerbach,⁴ in a sense, turns the Hegelian model "on its head" by positing that Hegel believes that the imaginary, philosophical and spiritual world is more real than the world of men, materials and their worldly activities. In the Hegelian system the latter becomes somewhat of a fantasy, according to Feuerbach. These two worlds stand juxtaposed--the fantasy, philosophical and subjective world versus the earthly or this worldly, world of men. The former simply was thought to be a reflection of man's condition in this world. For Feuerbach, if one substitutes the word "man" for "God" or "spirit" one understands that Hegelian system can be a reflection of the condition of man, and of man's essential nature.

Feuerbach argues that man reveals his essential alienated self--and condition through religion. Man attributes his world building powers to a creature of his own imagination--God. In Feuerbach's thought God is society writ large. The imaginary power that man calls God is a projected image of man as an idealized being. Religion, therefore, produces a supra-human reflection of man as God.

If Feuerbach stood Hegel's argument "on its head" and

"psychologized" it by inserting religion, Marx secularizes and "socializes" the Feuerbach argument. In his early writings⁵ Marx asserted that man's consciousness does not determine his existence as implied in Hegel and Feuerbach. Rather, man's existence determines his consciousness. The young Marx sought the cause of man's condition of alienation in the "substructure" of society--namely, the mode of production, not in man's "nature."

The young Marx discusses the concept of alienation specifically as it pertains to work. In this sense, Marx is the first modern social scientist to deal with this problem. The essence of what Marx terms alienated labor is to be found in the translations of his Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.⁶ The meaning is strikingly similar to Hegel. Marx, however, adds substance to the concept and gives it a sociological perspective. The worker, under the capitalist system of production has his work given to him. He does not do it freely. He exchanges his labor for work to support himself. Work is not an end in itself but a means to an end. The work is not self-actualizing. In that sense, the work is something external, alien and forced upon him. Moreover, the products that the worker creates by his labor are given their form and "life" by his hands, tools and creativity. They do not belong to him. They belong to someone else, as often do his tools. Hence, the product as well as the process of work confront the worker as alien and hostile with a life of their own and as a power independent of him. The objects of work not only have

an independent power--but they control the worker--the performance of work is thus dehumanizing and degrading to the worker. Marx terms this the "objectivization of labor." Ironically, the harder the worker works and the more he produces the more alien, external, hostile and inevitable the world of work appears to him. The worker becomes a slave--not a willing one because he accepts work only to subsist, but nonetheless a slave.

Since work is coerced, not voluntary, it satisfies no creative urge--or in Marxian terms the workers "species being." Hence, work is to be "avoided like the plague." The worker feels at home only during his leisure not at work. Since the work is exhausting and crippling, creating stupidity and cretinism, the worker is reduced to the level of an animal. He enjoys only base human functions. He cannot fulfill his own humanity. He works, which is his life activity, only to subsist and thus experiences himself as a stranger. This occurs to the degree that the worker does not or cannot develop his own humanity. He is not free to experience his work, his self or others. All others remain alien to him because he sees them only as workers or owners. Thus for Marx, alienated labor takes the freedom, spontaneity and conscious choice out of all life and reduces it to the subsistence level. Labor becomes punishment and life becomes torment.

It is basic to the Marxian notion of alienation that alienation occurs in the process of work, the product of work and through oneself and others. It is presented within the context of man being alienated

from, or experiencing his humanity or species being as hostile and alien. Finally, every experience of alienation is an alienation of man from nature. The opposition of institutions to man's inherent creative potentialities permeates Marx's early and later work.

Up to now we have avoided any reference to capitalism. The reason for this is to attempt to show the historical development of the concept of alienation. In the next chapter we will present classical theories of the relationship between capitalistic structures of work and the presumed ensuing alienation. At the present we simply wish to present the concept of alienation as an "ideal type."

A problem in understanding alienation, aside from specifying it, is that the concept has psychological, social psychological, meta-physical, existential as well as political overtones. We have tried to present the core meaning as expressed by Hegel, Feuerbach and Marx. However, it can mean, legitimately, different things to different people. Thus, this term, like psychoanalysis and existentialism, etc., has become a key concept in which people attempt to encapsulate in one term the all pervading malaise of the post World War II era. There is a particular fondness for this term among both some leftist intellectuals and avant-garde laymen. This is perhaps a result of the secularization and apparent simplicity of the term. It was initially adopted by the neo-revisionist school of Marxism but, as often with some forms of high culture, it too becomes kitsch.

Serious contemporary scholars have done work with this

thorny and elusive concept. Lewis Feuer,⁷ one such scholar, presents a detailed history of the "career" of alienation as a sociological concept. Feuer also demonstrates, in the Marxian perspective, the sexual meaning of alienation. This was an important theme in Marx's earlier work.

Two of the neo-Freudians have done serious and outstanding scholarly research with differing definitions of the concept. Karen Horney, reflecting an earlier psychoanalytic tradition defines alienation as "the remoteness of the neurotic from his own feelings, wishes, beliefs and energies. It is the loss of the feeling of being an active, determining force in his own life." Erich Fromm describes alienation and the alienated man as one who "does not experience himself as the center of his world, as the creator of his own acts—but his acts and their consequences have become his masters, whom he obeys, or whom he may even worship. The alienated person is out of touch with himself as he is out of touch with any other person."⁸

Melvin Seeman is a contemporary sociologist who has done much in attempting to give detailed sociological dimension to this concept. Seeman views alienation as a process that has five component parts: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement.⁹

The latter term is also expressed by Marx and it completes a triad with alienation and estrangement. Our working definition of alienation is closely related to the latter term in Seeman's typology. Seeman chooses to explain self-estrangement or alienation from the

self specifically in terms of work. He describes this aspect of it "as¹⁰ the loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work." We choose to use, as our working definition of alienation from work, that unhappy state where man consciously or unconsciously experiences a loss of intrinsic meaning and/or pride in work.¹¹ Admittedly there are gaps in using this definition as there would be in any definition, however, we wish to stress that this is only a heuristic device. We are prepared to find that alienation may or may not exist in the real world. We wish to stress also that our definition of alienation from work does not preclude the other dimensions which Seeman develops. His concept is one of alienation, ours is alienation from work. In the paradigm which we will develop in our next chapter these all occur as different dimensions and sub-processes of alienation from work. We simply place less importance on them than does Seeman. We also wish to stress that when we use the term self-estrangement we mean to infer that the individual is "cut off" from his own feelings. This is perhaps best expressed in Horney's definition. It is alienation from oneself or estrangement from one's own feelings.

We ultimately must make some distinction between alienation, estrangement and self-estrangement. The latter is easier to discriminate from the other two. As we have indicated estrangement and alienation can be used practically as synonyms. However, estrangement may also refer to the result of an alienated condition. Robert¹² Blauner is another contemporary sociologist who has attempted to

clarify these concepts. Blauner distinguishes both alienation of labor and estrangement. The former he describes as an objective condition between employees and the social organization of the work process. The latter is seen as a subjective consequence of the former for the worker.

Thus, when we use the term alienation we are referring to objective conditions of the real world. When we use the term estrangement we refer to the subjective consequences for the worker caused by these conditions. However, we have taken literary license in using the terms alienation and estrangement when referring to the subjective consequences because of their similar use historically and their relative meaning. We trust that the text will be clear in this respect. We will never use the term estrangement to refer to the objective conditions of a social structure. Self-estrangement again refers to the worker being cut off from his own feelings. It is not necessarily or solely caused by the objective conditions of work nor the subjective consequences of it.

We have tried to demonstrate the complexity of this concept of alienation and specify what we mean by alienation from work. In our next chapter we will review the work of the classical theorists on this problem. In the following chapters we will examine previously mentioned levels of bureaucratic work and attempt to discern how alienation from work shows itself. We will also examine non-alienated work as well. In the final chapter we will attempt to bring our findings together with the relative merits of classical theory and contemporary empirical

research in understanding this problem.

We would like to stress again that alienation from work as we have presented it is in an "ideal type" form. We would also like to stress, at the risk of being redundant, that these concepts are elusive, therefore, it may be useful to think of alienation from work more as an on-going process than as a human condition or as "man's fate."

FOOTNOTES

¹ For a discussion of the overall problem of the alienation of modern man see the following: Lewis Feuer, "What is Alienation? The Career of a Concept," Sociology on Trial, ed. by Maurice Stein and Arthur J. Vidich (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), pp. 127-148. Erich Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1961). Fritz Pappenheim, The Alienation of Modern Man (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959). Erich Kahler, The Tower and the Abyss (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1957). Eric and Mary Josephson, Man Alone (New York: Dell, 1962). Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (December, 1959), 783-791. Robert Nisbet, The Sociological Tradition (New York: Basic Books, 1966), chap. 7. As a problem related to work per se, see Robert Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," Labor and Trade Unionism, ed. by Walter Galenson and Seymour M. Lipset (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960), pp. 336-354. Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964). Daniel Bell, "Work and its Discontents," The End of Ideology, ed. by Daniel Bell (New York: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 227-274.

² Only Weber and Mannheim among our theorists emphasized bureaucratic work. Marx in his comments on communal and state communism, in the Orient, discussed bureaucracy but in a way which did not suggest a parallel to modern industrial society. See Karl A. Whittfogel, Oriental Despotism (New Haven: Yale University Press, Inc., 1957), pp. 115-120, 251-253, 264-267, 312-316, 365-369, 374-375. Shlomo Avineri ed., Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization (New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1969), pp. 1-31, 88-96, 313-317.

³ Georg W. F. Hegel, The Phenomenology of Mind, trans. by J. B. Braille (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1931) and Georg W. F. Hegel, The Philosophy of History, trans. by J. Sibree (New York: Dover Publications, 1956). For an excellent explanation of the Hegelian system see, Robert Tucker, Myth and Philosophy in Karl Marx (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 73-150. Also see Sidney Hook, From Hegel to Marx (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950).

⁴ Ludwig Feuerbach, The Essence of Christianity (New York: Harper and Bors., 1957).

⁵ By this we refer primarily to Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, of which there are several excellent translations in whole and in part. We have primarily relied on the translation by Martin Milligan. Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, ed. by Dirk J. Struik and trans. by Martin Milligan (New York: International Publishers, 1964). Also see Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, trans. by Martin Milligan (Moscow, no date). Karl Marx, Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy, trans. by T. B. Bottomore (New York: McGraw Hill, 1964), pp. 167-178. Karl Marx, Early Writings, trans. by T. B. Bottomore (New York: McGraw Hill, 1964), pp. 61-219. Karl Marx, "Alienated Labor," Man Alone, ed. and trans. by Eric and Mary Josephson (New York: Dell, 1962), pp. 93-104. Also see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The German Ideology, ed. by R. Pascal (New York: International Publishers, 1939). Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "On Alienation," Images of Man, ed. and trans. by C. Wright Mills (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1960), pp. 486-507.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Feuer, op. cit.

⁸ Josephson and Josephson, op. cit., p. 16.

⁹ Seeman, op. cit.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 790. In order to simplify our discussion we are deliberately excluding the concept of disassociation, which in many ways overlaps with both the concept of alienation and the concept of self-estrangement. See Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1921), p. 472. Park and Burgess also include two essays of importance on this subject by William James and L. G. Winston, pp. 120-126. The latter first used the term "the divided self."

¹¹ While there is a basic similarity between our definition of work alienation and Seeman on self-estrangement, Seeman's definition is closely related to a Weblenian concept--"the instinct of workmanship" which we will discuss at great length in the next chapter. Our

definition attempts to include with the Veblenian notion of the instinct of workmanship the Marxian opposite in terms of the experiencing of work as alien to the person. Our definition then states what alienation is and implies its opposite. We also have chosen to state that this condition is an unhappy one. Alienation takes many forms and shapes. It is not necessarily an unhappy state--indeed, it may be a happy one for some. We have specifically defined it as an unhappy state because we see alienation from work as a problem for modern man not a state of joy or sublime contentment.

¹² Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society."

CHAPTER II

CLASSICAL THEORIES OF WORK

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the substantive contributions of the classical theorists to the problem of alienation in work. We will explain the individual contributions of each as well as how similar and dissimilar ideas are developed by different theorists. We trust this will be clear in the text. In Chapter III we will develop a paradigm based on our summarization.

Karl Marx

Marx is the first major 19th century social scientist to write specifically on the problem of alienation and work. Although it was subordinate to his analysis of capitalism, Marx's work has been the seedbed of ideas for virtually all other classical sociological theorists who have contributed to our knowledge of this problem.

Marx's earliest and perhaps best known work on alienation is contained in The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. However much about work is contained in Capital, Volume I and scattered throughout his work as it is related to his basic concept of man.

Marx, like Freud, is one of the few 19th century social scientists to put man at the center of his theoretical scheme. For

Marx, man's infinite plasticity in the progressive development of his faculties was central. Man, he felt, need not be limited to developing one aspect of his possible self. However the historical development of societal forces made it necessary to develop one set of talents at the expense of others. In this sense men become monsters¹ because of the overdevelopment of one set of faculties and the atrophy of possible others.

A central theme in Marx's discussion of alienated work is the separation of man from his world building activities. This is compounded by the fractionalization and atomization of work and thus the compartmentalization and fragmentation of his own possible skills.

Marx conceived of man as somehow being able to develop the totality of all of his potentialities and form a "complete" social character.² It would appear that to develop less than one's full potential without developing others, to fragment, to separate and compartmentalize one's propensities was for Marx the essence of alienation for the individual. To magnify and amplify one aspect of the possible total self is to confuse a major social role with one's total self. In essence man is able to treat himself as an object external to oneself as only a human social being is able.³

It is through work, or in Marx's term, labor that man appears to have the greatest opportunity to develop his potentials. Labor is man's "natural" means of externalizing his potential inner self, i. e.,⁴ his creativity, drives, tensions become externalized through

institutionalized activity. By bringing his body, his mind and his unconscious under the direction of his conscious will he effects a change in the world. Whatever the product man develops is because of a culmination of a wish or image created through the mind, the body, and his conscious will. The connections are symmetrical, direct and in a closed progression. There are no external contingencies.⁵

Man through work creates the world--or society. Work defines man's basic relationships with other men and his family. It also defines one's relationship to tools and creates a social division of labor. Engels, Marx's sometime collaborator, implies this in a later work.⁶ Marx himself contrasts the division of labor in society as the "useful" division of labor which is natural and not used for the production of "commodities." The latter form of production is alienating since it uses production as a means by which men become objects to each other, objects of profit, exploitation and manipulation.⁷

Alienation from work occurs when the original "natural" conditions no longer exist, but are replaced by the latter. Marx recognized that certain types of alienation from work historically precede the industrial form.⁸ It would seem to us that the central thrust of Marx's work is to lay the blame for modern man's alienation from work on the massive overriding influence of modern industrial capitalism. This apparent single mindedness and monocausal explanation has been a major source of great intellectual controversy over Marx's work.⁹

The beginnings of alienation for modern man in industrial work start, in Marx's terms when "the less he [man] is attracted by the nature of the work, and the mode in which it is carried on, and the less, therefore, he enjoys it as something which gives play to his bodily and mental powers, the more close his attention is forced to be."¹⁰

The cornerstone around which Marx builds his indictment of modern industrial capitalism are the concepts of the "commodity" and the process of "the fetishism of commodities." A product according to Marx is simply the concrete end product of labor. Most often it is a specific artifact that has a particular use--or use value.¹¹ A product becomes transformed into a commodity when it is no longer produced or used for its use value. When a social meaning--more precisely its value in monetary terms as a means of exchange for money becomes attached to it--it develops an exchange value. The commodity, formerly a product, now is viewed only in terms of its exchange value.¹² The products of man have no connection to their objective qualities stamped by man's labor. Marx characterizes the relationship among men by use of commodities in this fashion:

There is a definite social relation between men, that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things...to find an analogy, we must have recourse to the mist-enveloped regions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation with both one another and the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the product of man's hands.¹³

Although Marx may reify and exaggerate this relationship, it forms the basis of his analysis of capitalism as a human social system.

Commodities are objects made external to man and are therefore alienable from him. For the process to begin, all that is necessary is for men to treat each other as private owners of these objects.¹⁴ Labor, under capitalism is a commodity like all other commodities for both the capitalist and the worker. Human labor is part of the commodity market¹⁵ and thus has a value to both. Thus all human labor has its own use-value¹⁶ and under industrial capitalism and the fetishism of commodities it is transformed into exchange value. The capitalist contracts labor to use it. The worker sells his labor for coin to afford a livelihood. Thus the worker becomes prostituted into a mere commodity to be bought and sold impersonally on the market. In this sense, for Marx, the market under industrial capitalism is a generic factor creating alienation from work.

Marx respected the efficiency of industrial capitalism particularly because it wiped out "rural idiocy." Yet despite its efficiency, which is generic to it, as well as its inherent doom, Marx saw the market under capitalism as inherently irrational,¹⁷ both in itself and in terms of man's work.

Alienation from work reaches its most intensified form under the factory system of production. This analysis of the social form of

the division of labor as dictated by the capitalist system of production is, for us, one of Marx's most valuable contributions to understanding alienated labor. First the worker becomes separated from the tools
 18
 of production. In Marx's terms the capitalist owns everything including the workers labor and the product of his labor. The worker, as
 19
 does his product, becomes transformed into a lifeless commodity.

Not even the guild master or merchant could own labor, laments
 20
 Marx. But the capitalist has complete authority over men, "that are
 21
 but parts of a mechanism that belongs to him."

There will be no attempt here to discuss Marx's description of the exploitative conditions in the factory system which are volumi-
 22
 nous and detailed. They include heat, dust, dirt, noise, foul air, bodily deformation and overall unsanitary conditions. His one caustic remark, that they were a horror surpassing the worst in Dante's
 23
Inferno illuminates this point.

The continual subdivision of labor further intensifies the process of alienation from work by separating intellectual work from
 24
 physical labor. The extreme and minute subdivision of work demands rote skill not intelligent insight. The simplification of the job of the working operative divests him of a sense of responsibility and purpose. The ability to follow orders--blindly, takes precedence. The intra-personal separation of work tasks and intellectual labor mitigates the

direct contact between men's creative propensity and external work and purposely so! Factory technology, when it replaced handicraft production took freedom, initiative and control from the worker. The formerly free worker lacked control over rhythm, pace and movement of his work. It is no accident that intelligence was built into the system of production. That the process of production should have total mastery over man appears as a self-evident necessity for the capitalist

25

according to Marx. In Marx's terms, work loses its "individual character" and "charm." The worker becomes a mere appendage to the

26 27

machine. He no longer uses tools but the tools use him. He is no longer master of the machine but the machine becomes his master. The worker no longer uses his skills in using tools or machinery. He becomes a quasi lifeless mechanism whose limbs unthinkingly perform the necessary operations. The worker becomes a mechanism as is the machinery. The social structure of work is well equipped to atrophy men's skills and render them impotent.

The separation from the total process of work and the eventual product he makes, if he makes a whole product, create an alien and

28

forced suffering for the worker. In essence "the labourer exists for the process of production, and not the process of production for the

29

labourer." To the worker the product of work, in this case the commodity:

...becomes a power on its own confronting him.
It means that the life which he has conferred on the
object confronts him as something hostile and alien. 30

Marx continues:

This fact expresses merely that the object which labor produces...confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer... Labor's realization is its objectification...appears as loss of realization for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and bondage to it; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation. 31

Thus personal loyalty or identification associated with a product, craft or guild is impossible. It is at this point that the abstract, instrumental, monetary meaning of work becomes apparent. The worker is not creating in concrete reality his own desire or will. The objective situations renders this too an impossibility. He therefore is forced to surrender any notion of finding intrinsic meaning or pride in his work. He is simply reduced to maintaining his physical existence. The worker "exists" for production. His "essential being" is 32 prostituted to maintain his existence. Like the prostitute, he must develop his marketable skills so much so that everything he has 33 becomes saleable on the market. This is true for the capitalist and the capitalist's handmaiden of production [clerks, engineers, accountants] as well. Thus they have alienation from themselves or have incurred "self-estrangement" a parallel to what had previously been 34 described as the estrangement of the thing. It would seem that for Marx this was the ultimate personal degradation. The worker is his own willing but helpless prisoner making an instrument of himself. In the process of work the machine makes use of the worker by adopting 35 the worker to the rhythm of the machine.

The capitalist too suffers the same fate but for the reason that
 he appropriates everything and even converts his family, his own wife
 into a means for making profit.

Logically the worker and the capitalist, employees and petty
 bourgeoisie both find themselves alienated from other men, peers,
 subordinates and superiors. The market relationship, the fetishism
 of commodities, the division of industrial labor make for this. For
 Marx each man, worker and capitalist, employee and petty bourgeoisie,
 views the other in terms of the role which he plays in the production
 process. He views the others in terms of his use or exchange value.
 Men become further separated, viewing each other only as objects in
 their segmented roles as workers, employees, or capitalists. This
 reduction or blurring of the total man as his major role denies their mutual
 mutual recognition as total human beings. It denies, to both subject
 and object, their humanity. The bond which unites them is not work but
 their common situation of exchanging labor for coin.

Finally and most vividly Marx describes the type of social
 character created by the factory system in terms of monsterism. The
 worker, employee, capitalist or peasant, etc. by continual subjugation
 to the minutiae of the division of labor becomes a crippled monstrosity.
 This occurs, in the figurative sense, because only a small fraction of
 his potential self becomes developed. In a psychological sense he has
 become executed. In reality he becomes "as stupid and ignorant as it is
 possible for a human creature to become." In this sense the factory

In this sense the factory system of production imprison men's faculties and creates the very antithesis of what Marx believed possible for men. This strongly nightmarish view of man is the logical result of Marx's concept of the nature of man and his possible development in factory work.

In sum then Marx's contribution to our knowledge of alienation from work is the following: (a) He shows industrial capitalism as the source of modern man's alienation from work. The market is reduced to the commodity relations of both objects and men. Man's work is reduced to a commodity to be bought and sold according to the demands of the market. (b) The division of labor as it exists in the factory system of production is the most intensified form of alienated work. It fractionalizes, fragments and separates man from his work, himself and others. It turns men into overspecialized "monsters" who see their work and others as external, alien and hostile objects in the production process.

Max Weber

It has been said that Weber's work represents a dialogue with
 43
 the ghost of Marx. For our purposes we shall concentrate on two major institutional aspects of this dialogue as they relate to the sociology of work. A central theme throughout much of Weber's work was the increasing rationalization of the western world--both the overall societal structures and fundamental institutions.

Weber, as did Marx, emphasized capitalism as a contributing factor in alienating men from their work but not in the same manner nor for the same reasons. However Weber goes beyond Marx in analyzing the internal structure of bureaucracy (capitalistic as well as pre-capitalistic) and its consequences for work. Herein lies his greatest contribution.

For Weber the idea of the market is essential. By the "market situation" he means all of the known opportunities for exchanging products for money, the relevance of these opportunities in establishing prices and attitudes toward competition. The market, in a fully developed money economy, is the quintessence of rationality and impersonal calculation.

Weber was aware of the market and the inherent irrationalities it contained in terms of status groups. He does not relate the market to his analysis of bureaucracy except to emphasize the rationality of capitalism and bureaucracy. Time and again he uses the phrase "without regard for persons." Modern industrial capitalism, among many other types of capitalism, Weber seems to have contended, could arise only in a socio-political system that was rational-legal or bureaucratic as opposed to charismatic-tribal or traditional-feudal. Weber's mode of analysis therefore radically differs from Marx's. While Marx analyzed the structure of the market situation, its irrationality, etc., Weber used the comparative historical analysis of social structures, and attempted to create ideal types! It is on this basis that Weber analyzes

the essence of modern industrial capitalism and its effects on the meaning of work.

Capitalism is based on the organization of formally free labor into rational and methodological disciplined work located in the fixed
48
plant or factory. Men are "free" only to sell their particular services to a relatively small segment of the population at a strictly regulated wage scale.

For Weber the essence of industrial capitalism, in its ideal
49
type sense, is the maximization of rational technical efficiency. Industrial capitalism demands the rational calculation of different market opportunities, e.g., cost and profits rather than the mechanical reliance on traditional means. The ends of industrial capitalism are the possibility of unlimited gain-- a possibility which is sanctioned by
50
the ethos of a society. The advanced technology of the factory system made possible the more efficient production of commodities--more complex than those created by handicraft production. It demanded not only that labor be separate from the means of production and profit but that it be methodically organized, routinized and disciplined into a repetitive, efficient routine. Factory workers became mechanized specialists unable to practice or sell prior craft skills in a market dominated by factory technology.

In this sense Weber could contend that industrial capitalism was rational. It replaced feudalism, traditionalism (and in Marx's terms "rural idiocy") as social systems with a continually calculating,

ever rational and methodically disciplined production structure. It left almost nothing it could avoid to chance, thereby divesting the world of magic and poetry and replacing it with impersonal calculation. Unlike Marx, Weber did not analyze the economics of the market mechanisms, i.e., price determination, credit, utilization of labor, etc., from which the former could conclude that the economic system under industrial

51

capitalism was basically irrational. Thus to Weber no known economic system was more efficient, effective or rationally managed than modern industrial capitalism. Weber's contribution lies in explaining the effect of modern industrial capitalism on the structure and meaning of industrial work. The forced, external and relentless pressure exerted by the structure of industrial capitalism made work a painful disciplined routine. The effect on men was a loss of human freedom as they became

52

cogs in the machine like process. Everyday work mirrored the larger economic and market system. It was cast in an "apparatus" not a focal point of freedom of creative expression through work. The rational, impersonal calculability and efficiency of industrial capitalism makes such freedom appear to be a romantic myth while the reality

53

was irrational. It is irrational because such freedom is denied by the routinization of work and by the quest for escapes from work.

The market situation, and the social structure of work, as it exists under modern industrial capitalism (a) forces men to "fit" themselves to work, rather than adapt the work to themselves; (b) separates men from the means of production and of profit, and (c)

demands a methodical, routinized, disciplined work where the intrinsic nature of work is subordinate to constant, if not compulsive, production-profit making and reinvestment. In short, the structure of work under industrial capitalism is inherently antithetical to the development of intrinsic meaning or pride in work. It accomplishes this by ultimately reducing men's work to impersonal methodical, routinized discipline.

This is the other side of the coin of rationalization of work and is uniquely a Weberian contribution. Marx recognized the excessive division of labor and brutalization but not impersonal, routinized discipline.

If Weber had said nothing else he would have given us a greater insight into those conditions which contribute to alienation from work. But he demonstrated that industrial capitalism alone was not the only contributing factor in creating or intensifying alienation from work. As we have mentioned before Weber saw industrial capitalism as an institution effected by the larger process of rationalization. Indeed he hints that such an economic institution could develop only in a rational-
54
legal order. It is in the bureaucratization of the public and private firms that Weber locates a further loss of men's freedom and the intensification of alienation from work. It perhaps is not unfair to say that Weber may have viewed industrial capitalism and fully developed bureaucracy, both government and private enterprise, as twin institutions ultimately distinct and separate from one another yet each in-
55
fluencing each other. "Without regard for persons" or "the person"

is a phrase that Weber uses repeatedly describing the characteristics of the market, industrial capitalism and bureaucracy and rationality in general.

By bureaucracy Weber referred to a technical form of work organization where the emphasis on administration was central. The bureaucratic form of organization separates the official from the office. The office carries with it a set of legal rules, rights, duties, privileges, etc., that the bureaucrat must enact impersonally without regard to persons or emotions. The offices are arranged in a hierarchical order with a rigid system of clearly graded authority. Each official, has a narrow function to perform and by unremitting repetition he becomes a narrow specialist of incomparable expertise. This is again based on almost complete rationality because it allows for "virtuoso-like mastery" of small but "methodically integrated functions." Enormous and complex tasks become routinely performed by a series of specialists. Rules become the social cement which keeps the entire organization functioning as a precision like machine. Indeed the organization becomes reified and develops a "permanent character" because of this machine like quality.

In industrial societies bureaucracies are government or private organizations where an increasing number of people work. The bureaucrat is paid a fixed salary, with fixed increments, has chances for advancement, may be granted tenure and receives a pension. In sum he develops a career and the prestige of a career.

For Weber there was no other form of organization that was
 57
 more rational or efficient. Among its advantages he lists speed, impersonality, precision, continuity, subordination. We would add, that Weber implies, centralization of authority and predictability although he does not specifically mention them. Although Weber was totally aware of the technical advantages of bureaucracy he was fearful of its consequences, the major one being the bureaucratization of the major societal institutions.

But bureaucracy by its very nature structures work so as to relegate intrinsic satisfaction or pride in work to secondary importance. Intrinsic satisfaction is irrational unless it facilitates work. The
 58
 structure of work separates men from each other in artificial offices, and depersonalizes them as well as their clients. They become small cogs in a great machine and lose their overall perspective. They are relatively powerless and isolated by this, the larger context of the organization. Their work is atomized and segmented while they become further separated because they do not own the means of administration. Ironically as they become more efficient they in fact become part of the means of administration. They become human cogs in the machinery of bureaucracy.

The career can and does, according to Weber, take precedence over all other considerations. Men become completely immersed in the petty details of their work losing sight of other aspects and potentialities in their lives. "It is still more horrible to think that the world

could ~~one~~ day be filled with nothing but these little cogs, little men clinging to little jobs and striving towards bigger ones." Weber termed this the "parceling-out of the soul."⁵⁹ In this sense the bureaucrat exchanges intrinsic meaning for the opportunity of advancement of his career. That the world would know no other men than those Weber claimed could "drive one to despair."⁶⁰

At a more immediate level the ideology generated by bureaucracy is one of rational impersonal efficiency and technical competence. The bureaucrat carries out his job without question, minimizing love or hate or any personal feeling.

Bureaucracy above all demands discipline. It is according to Weber, the most rational offspring of discipline.⁶¹ By discipline Weber meant the "consistently rationalized methodically trained and exact execution of the received order, in which all personal criticism is suspended."⁶² Discipline substitutes habit for routinized skill and creates loyalty to the impersonal organization.⁶³ Loyalty and discipline are ends in themselves for the bureaucrat as balancing mechanisms to compensate for his bureaucratic enslavement.⁶⁴ For the bureaucrat the intrinsic nature of work is merely secondary if it is at all considered. The bureaucrat will process cheese as readily, impersonally and efficiently as he will process people.

Already careerist and having a blind, impersonal sense of impersonal loyalty, efficiency and discipline the bureaucrat becomes a narrow specialist incapable of general thought. In Weber's view the

technical expert is, as he is for Marx, a cripple.⁶⁵ The use of the narrow expert, overspecialized and rationalized and compartmentalized represents a loss of human freedom. In this sense bureaucracy enforces a structure of work which is inherently alienating and produces an impersonal, narrow, calculating, career minded type of social character.

This type of social character, already impersonal and dehumanized has the same effect on others--particularly clients. Adhering to impersonal rules, impersonal loyalty to the particular organization or an impersonal sense of bureaucratic ethics, he treats people as objects or uniform cases. This is done to the degree that no sentiment or hate or personal consideration should enter into the enactment of the official duties. Bureaucrats are dehumanized in the sense that Weber meant in the phrase "without regard for persons." They are rendered fleshless, bloodless and emotionless.⁶⁶

Weber's special nightmare was a society that would be over-run by the incessant march of rationalization and find all of its major institutions bureaucratized.⁶⁷ Thus despair would be wrought by the type of social character that was produced.

In sum then Weber views bureaucracy as alienating because it (1) separates men from the means of administration, (2) creates a social character of narrow compartmentalized, specialized expertise incapable of general thought, (3) turns men into human cogs in the bureaucratic machine by imposing a machine like discipline and loyalty,

(4) creates an ideology of rational impersonal efficiency and bestows a bureaucratic identity in place of the intrinsic meaning of work, (5) loyalty to the organization adherence to impersonal rules and codes, and career advancement become paramount everyday concerns, (6) bureaucracy succeeds in dehumanizing the bureaucrat as well as the client through the above.

Thorstein Veblen

No discussion of alienation and work can be adequate without discussing the work of Thorstein Veblen. His work provides the basis for two important insights. First, he focused upon the intrinsic meaning of work to the workman where Marx and Weber only suggest this concept by emphasizing its opposite. To understand alienated labor, for Veblen, it is necessary to understand non-alienated work. Secondly, Veblen understood and synthesized the "formal" ideas of both the irrationality of the modern market under industrial capitalism and the rationality of industrial bureaucracy. While Marx explained the former in a more detailed fashion than Veblen and Weber analyzed bureaucracy in greater detail than did Veblen, Veblen synthesizes the two perspectives. Neither Marx or Weber made this synthesis. It is the central theme of Veblen's work.

In a very difficult, and from our perspective perhaps his most important book, The Instinct of Workmanship, Veblen set forth his most comprehensive programmatic statement of work. He essentially saw

two major social forces in the creation of western civilization. They were the forces of "workmanship" and the forces of "wastemanship." The former illustrated man's creative "nature" while the latter his destructive propensities. The former include the "instincts" of workmanship, the parental bent and the instinct of idle curiosity. The latter include invidious distinction, pecuniary emulation, conspicuous consumption and conspicuous leisure.

Veblen's image of man is one which shows man as basically
 68
 creative and peaceful but creating destructive and wasteful institutions. At one time, according to Veblen, man did not find work painful drudgery or meaningless exercise for which he acquired cash.

Men, he believed, had a natural "instinct" toward craftsmanship for its own sake. Veblen in effect socializes this "instinct" by claiming it is not a tropismatic reaction nor a culturally acquired proclivity but a conscious, intelligent and rational drive directed
 69
 toward an object outside of oneself. Since the instinct is not an acquired trait it can remain dormant. But being 'aesthetic and resilient'
 70
 it is not totally lost through lack of use. Under tranquil conditions it may re-emerge. For Veblen the instinct of workmanship is a
 71
 central achieving motivation of Western civilized man.

Veblen posited four phases of the "instinct" of workmanship. They are the Savage Era, The Predatory Era, The Handicraft Era and the Machine Age.

The Savage Era, for Veblen, was civilized man's natural

state. Man, he thought, was best fit to live under conditions of "mod-

72

erately advanced savagery," because the instinct as it advances the state of the industrial arts and becomes more efficient does away the need for insight into the process of workmanship. This era is best depicted by an image of man as a creative, Peaceful Savage with strong instincts of workmanship and idle curiosity. The savage took pride in workmanship and craftsmanship for its own sake and his own pride.

This then is the essence of non-alienated labor as Veblen saw it. The work was intrinsically meaningful through the instinct of workmanship

73

and idle curiosity. The savage took pride in his craft work simply for

74

the sake of workmanship! It was no accident that Veblen believed man was best fit to live in a state of moderately advanced savagery. Veblen

however saw societal institutions, created by habits of thought and mind,

75

inherently working against man's propensities. The next three eras, the Predatory, The Handicraft, and The Machine Age dilute, corrupt, prostitute and all but bury the instinct of workmanship. In the

Predatory Era technological advances make it more profitable to own the tools of production and to accumulate wealth. Workmanship was usurped by ownership while one's place in the community became

76

dependent on the latter, plus one's pecuniary obligations. Ownership simply replaced workmanship as a source of social honor. Workmanship was no longer valued for its own sake. With the accumulation of wealth there arises an institutionally sanctioned inducement for aggression, the predatory "instinct." The Barbarian Warlord is Veblen's

symbol of this era. Peaceful and creative habits are replaced by pecuniary values and warlike institutions. A weak but wealthy neighboring group may become the victim of a powerful horde who do not own anything because they find it more profitable to raid and plunder others.

The Handicraft Era saw the growth of handicraft guilds and a system of independent artisans and craftsmen who were also traders in competition with each other. Each trader was also a master craftsman working at the side of journeymen and apprentices. But the development of the market and ensuring competition made the guilds accessories to their own destruction. Market management demanded increasingly complete attention to pecuniary matters. Finally "business" grew separate from industry. "Labor" and workmanship became separate and distinct from business management, initially the merchant guilds. Pecuniary matters took precedence over workmanship and often dictated canons of workmanship. Workmanship became
77
important only as it affected salesmanship and the price system. The instinct of workmanship was further corrupted.

78

The Machine Era or the machine process were the ultimate advance of technology and the industrial arts. Veblen appears fascinated with and can scarcely contain admiration for the machine process.
79
The machine process maintains the smooth operation of intricate industrial production by the requirements of quantitative accuracy and precision in the measurement, timing and rhythm of tools, machines

and other instruments of production. Everything became completely standardized. That which is not standardized demands too much human skill, time, involvement and judgement. In short, that which is not standardized is not economically viable for the production process. Irregularity in the process means delay and in the product means inferior quality. The machine process demands strict scheduling of time around the factory system. Daily life is measured precisely by clocks. It is compartmentalized into blocks of time which revolve around working hours. In this sense modern life is irrevocably stamped by the character of the machine process.

Like Marx and Weber, Veblen understands the human toll of the factory system of production and like Weber, the shifting by bureaucracy. The inanimate object, the machine, sets the work pace and rhythm. The machine is no longer a tool subject to the workman's intelligent supervision. Thinking is reduced to standard units of measurement. The machine process demands a discipline which reduces thought to the quantitative measure of the facts with which the workman is concerned. Independent thought is worse than useless.

The machine process creates an impersonal ideology. Technological efficiency creates no questions of morality, good or evil. The discipline creates habits of thought related only to the sequence of industrial operation. In sum, Veblen sees the machine process as completely rational through the development of (a) mechanical quantitative standardization, and (b) the making of specialists

who develop impersonal and precise quantitative habits of mind as they relate their singular operations of work. And finally, he sees the entire machine process as having a mechanizing effect on the most intimate and personal activities of everyday life.⁸⁴

If Veblen had done only this he would have been in agreement with Weber about the rationality of capitalist production. Implicitly, he would have inferred agreement about the mechanical, disciplinary and impersonal effects of bureaucratization, as conditions of the structure of work which take away men's freedom and creativity in work.⁸⁵

But Veblen goes further than Weber or Marx. His method of analysis juxtaposes institutions and individual and personal motives. Because he has separated pecuniary motives from intrinsic work satisfaction and salesmanship from workmanship he can separate business from industry. His archetypal figures are the Captain of Industry and The Engineer--incarnates of the Warlord and Peaceful Savage respectively.

At the institutional level and the level of personal motivation Veblen may ask, from whence comes profit? The price system, controlled production, and a slightly less than full level of employment are parts of his answer. His is perhaps the most devastating but dispassionately written analysis ever directed at the American businessman. The businessman says Veblen wants a "reasonable profit." For Veblen this meant the businessman's primary motive and chief

concern is with making a profit or getting^a little something for
⁸⁶
 nothing." The businessman, says Veblen, "sabotages" the industry
⁸⁷
 by the "conscientious withdrawal of efficiency" from production.

That is, he does not produce as much, as efficiently as the bureau-
 cratic machinery would allow him. He is less interested in efficiency
⁸⁸
 than in the profit motive. Concern is not with workmanship but rather
 charging what the traffic will bear; not with a quid pro quo exchange,
 but with a set profit. The conscious waste caused by the businessman
 in effect makes him a parasite on the community. But the efficiency
 of bureaucracy allows for a large margin of wasteful expenditure. In
 addition the waste of goods and services does not curtail the community
 from making its living. The ethic engendered by modern business
 causes men to work long hours for too small a pecuniary reward. The
 businessman's wastefulness is compensated for by those engaged in
⁸⁹
 selling their own labor. If the system does survive says Veblen, it
 manages to do so due to no fault of the businessman. It survives
 despite him, for the margin of error under the technical efficiency of
⁹⁰
 industrial bureaucracy is so great.

Veblen goes on to discuss in economic terms the business
 principles which allow the businessman to pursue, single mindedly,
⁹¹
 his interests particularly the use of loan credit. The use of such
 credit allows for large corporations and creditors to extend an exces-
 sive amount of credit allowing larger companies to dominate industry.
 This in turn means that they control the production and the price of

the product in the market.

Veblen, who appears to worship technological efficiency and scientific progress sees the technical expert--the engineers--as the group that could most readily "avoid virtually all unemployment of serviceable equipment and man power on the one hand, and all local or seasonal scarcity on the other hand." In this manner the "Safe and Sane" responsible business leaders would not feel it incumbent upon themselves to deprive the workman a livelihood for fear that "they would presently find themselves discredited and would probably face insolvency." Hardship, wastemanship, deprivation and other shameful social forces caused by business traditions could be removed if the machinery were used most efficiently.

But for this Veblen sees no hope because of the ethos created by the American system of business enterprise. American people view businessmen as safe, sane and responsible men not economic saboteurs, business pirates or industrial incompetents. They believe in the American dream otherwise why would they submit themselves to unremitting, meaningless drudgery. American people view technicians and engineers as "a somewhat fantastic brotherhood of overspecialized cranks, not to be trusted out of sight except under the restraining hand of safe and sane businessmen. Nor are the technicians themselves in the habit of taking a greatly different view..."

The "vested interests" of business enterprise and absentee ownership as well as technicians and working class people have,

according to Veblen, much the same interests. "No class... not even the most abjectly poor, ⁹⁶ forgoes all customary conspicuous consumption." Some sort of pecuniary emulation becomes incumbent on the non-leisure classes, at least in appearance, lest one soil one's reputation. The axis of the two groups is completed through the common pursuit of advancing one's life style through the consumption of material goods and the garnering of prestige. Thus Veblen holds no hope for the triumph of the forces of workmanship through the Engineer over the forces the wastemanship as dictated by the Captains ⁹⁷ of Industry.

Veblen not only sees the contradiction between the efficiency of industrial bureaucracy and the market under the ethics of American businessmen but he extends his nightmare of "imbecile institutions" into the future. The efficiency of industrial bureaucracy allows for ⁹⁸ the creation of parasitic industries like advertising. Because of market competition and standardization of the products the business- ⁹⁹ man must create the illusion of marginal differentiation. With the increasing bureaucratization of major societal institutions including ¹⁰⁰ education and religion, Veblen sees salesmanship as gradually becoming one of the predominant forces of wastemanship. In his own haunting phrase Veblen views society becoming dominated by "the triumph ¹⁰¹ of imbecile institutions."

Implicit in his argument is the notion that men in the 20th Century would continue to seek compensation for the prostitution of

and the lack of need of genuine craft skills by the pursuit of false values. Veblen appears to imply that the seemingly senseless pursuit of material goods and consumption skills is psychological compensation for deprivation in work.

102

In sum Veblen then explains the nature of non-alienated work which neither Marx or Weber do. He sees man's institutions as working against man's creative nature particularly the ownership and consumption of goods replacing workmanship as a source of social honor. Like Marx he sees the irrationality of the market system for men under industrial capitalism as practiced by American businessmen. But while Marx relates it to the generic process of capitalism Veblen relates it to the pecuniary motives of the businessman. In this sense he shows the contradiction between the ideal type rationality of capitalism as seen by Weber and the intrinsic irrationality as stated by Marx. Like both he sees the human toll of standardization wrought by the division of labor and bureaucracy and capitalism. But he laments less, seeing as Marx was unable and Weber only hinted at, consumption as a value replacing production as a value for all American classes. His fascination with bureaucracy is at least ambivalent. He seems somewhat saddened by its routinizing and dehumanizing aspects but does not hold the same profound pessimism as did Weber. His pessimism over the prostituting aspects of work particularly salesmanship is even more profound. Such wastemanship occurs because the efficiency of industrial bureaucracy created by the instinct

of workmanship which literally does away with the need for the latter thereby making dominant the force of salesmanship. The instinct of workmanship when it becomes too efficient denies men the possibility of finding intrinsic work satisfaction in societal institutions. Thus Veblen haunts us with his irony of the completely enclosed system. There is perhaps more in Veblen than we have yet assimilated. It matters little if one agrees or disagrees with Veblen. We are all post-Veblenians and the question is to what degree are we living in the midst of his nightmare?

Karl Mannheim

Karl Mannheim, unlike the preceding theorists, emphasizes only two points concerning the sociology of work. They are largely found in, Man and Society In an Age of Reconstruction.¹⁰³ As Weber's academic disciple, Mannheim emphasized bureaucracy and the progressive rationalization of the world and the dilemma created for the bureaucrat. He focuses on the bureaucrat becoming lost in the web of formal rationality which pervades the bureaucratic structure. The rules, rationality, impersonality, specialization, hierarchy and machine-like quality create an atmosphere Mannheim describes as being one of "formal rationality."

Industrial bureaucracy emphasizes a particular type of rationality--that of functional rationality as opposed to substantial¹⁰⁴ rationality. Functional rationality is that which relates man to an immediate set of work tasks and objects. In that sense it creates a

specialist of unparalleled expertise. However functional rationality does not allow for the understanding of the complex sequence of interrelations between each individual, his specific job, and his place within the total work structure. The intelligent insight into these interrelations is what Mannheim deems "substantial rationality." The authority to make policy-making decisions increases the ability of substantial rationality and the lack of such power decrease this ability. Bureaucracy, by its fractionalizing hierarchical nature, systematically tends to decrease the bureaucrat's chances for substantial rationality.

Mannheim's point is that the bureaucrat loses a sense of total perspective as he becomes integrated into the bureaucracy and becomes more familiar with his narrow job. He develops a trained incapacity for general work or thought.

Mannheim here, analyzes what Weber recognized but did not fully explore. Mannheim recognized the alienation of the creative technician in the bureaucracy. Lost in the technology of his work he becomes a narrow specialist engaged in his immediate task and remains singularly unaware, by design or circumstance, of the larger framework of the organization.

Even more importantly, Mannheim recognized the human aspect of bureaucracy. They are organizations where people work and make careers. Like Weber he recognized, that as cogs in the great machine, the bureaucrat becomes totally absorbed by the details

of his career, i. e., salary increase, tenure, promotion, etc. But Mannheim focused specially on the internal change in self-image and the "habits of mind" (Veblen's term) the bureaucrat develops.

Mannheim called the conscious attempt to remake one's self and one's image over the process of self-rationalization. ¹⁰⁷ Not even the intellectual was exempt as long as he was employed by a bureaucracy. As an employee and cog, one's individual personality becomes a market commodity as are one's skills. One's conscious and systematic control over one's public behavior and impulses directed toward occupational mobility, Mannheim termed "self-rationalization." Systematically the bureaucrat divests himself of the social characteristics not desirable for mobility and attempts to improve upon those deemed valuable. Done in an orderly systematic and total fashion the bureaucrat not only treats the organization as a tool and means to an end, but he treats himself in the same object-like impersonal fashion to achieve his desired ends.

Thus the bureaucrat suffers a double set of conditions alienating himself from his work; (a) He loses a sense of total horizon in the bureaucracy because he is segmented and isolated within it and because of the way bureaucratic formal and functional rationality operate upon him; and (b) he treats himself as a commodity in exactly the way Marx defined a commodity.

Mannheim, in this sense, recognized isolation and segmentation as much as did Marx. Like Weber he recognizes that the intrinsic

nature of bureaucracy creates a certain habit of mind conducive to to alienating one from one's own work. But Mannheim's contribution is that he, unlike Weber or Marx, details and specifies the intentionality created in the everyday work of the bureaucrat which he calls self-rationalization. This process as we shall later see has vast consequences in understanding the process by which alienation from work occurs for certain groups at various bureaucratic levels.

Georg Simmel

108
Simmel's work, mainly his essay on "Metropolis and Mental Life," derives from Marx and emphasizes the importance of the rationalizing effects of the money economy. While Weber emphasized the institutional causes and effects of bureaucratic rationality Simmel examines rationality as an attitude in its own terms by abstracting it from history. Simmel's focus on the individual's "habit of mind" and the formal (not historical) meaning of social action permit him to reduce his analysis to a single level--the abstract mentality.

Simmel largely reduces the social structure and the market to a "given." He does not discuss the rationality or irrationality of the market. He simply analyzes the city as the seat of the money economy. The money economy or cash nexus, for Simmel, provides a form of culture which pervades the social life of the city. In addition, the diver-
109
sity and multitudinous stimuli found in the city increase man's propensity for the use of his intellect and the increasing rationalization of everyday life.

110

For Weber and Simmel the city was originally a center of commerce and developed into the seat of the market economy. The market has a rationalizing effect on the style of life of the city and the minds of its inhabitants. Simmel, as does Durkheim, recognizes the extreme functional specialization of work. Each man being a specialist totally dependent on the work of other specialists becomes an isolated individual. The market, money economy, and heightened intellectualization of life are intimately connected. The market creates a matter of fact attitude reducing relationships to a quantitative formality. All individuality or intimate relations are ignored to a great extent because they cannot be reduced to their exchange value, the logical market unit
111
of measure--how much? The formality and anonymity of unseen producers and consumers pervades other areas of the metropolitan existence. Wide-spread casual social encounters and obligatory social relations, and to some extent more intimate relationships, are diffuse with intellectualization and rationality.

Converging with the rational mentality of the market is what Simmel terms the "intensification of nervous stimulation." It is created by the diversity and amount of sights, sounds, people and the extreme
112
tempo of daily life found in the city. Unable to respond to everything because of the strain on the emotional and nervous system, urban man becomes more discriminating. Self-preservation is attained by a blunting of discrimination and the development of a protective layer for the
113
psyche. This habit of mind Simmel terms, "the blasé attitude." It

increases intellectuality and rationality by creating consciously and unconsciously a more selective sense of awareness.

This self-preservation of individuality and anonymity of the metropolitan man has similar effects for the urbanite's view of the world. As Weber, Simmel sees the world divested of contour, magic, poetry and aesthetic delight. Things and people are as objects floating on a great grey plane, differentiated not by color or quality but quantity
114
and cost. The rationality of the market and the money economy become the common denominator of one's world view. As Veblen, Simmel perceives the infusing of rationality into the machine-like way of life. Order, schedules, punctuality and routine give order to everyday. What would happen, Simmel asks, if all the clocks and watches in a major
115
city were wrong by in different direction but by one hour? The disruption could have international complications in the world market.

Thus the city contains the greatest specialization of the economic division of labor. It creates narrow specialists thereby separating men from one another in a Marxian sense. The market mentality also puts men into competition with one another for jobs and to create new markets. Therefore, men specialize in areas where they cannot readily be displaced by others. There is constant competition to find new sources of income from customers whose needs are yet untapped. Thus there is a constant increasing specialization, differentiation and
116
rationalization among men in the city.

Simmel, cognizant of the market structure, locates these

mental and psychic traits of rationality at the level of the individual. Simmel's reduction to individualization is the cornerstone to his analysis. The swift flow of outer stimuli is counterbalanced by the discerning psyche preventing an over-stimulation of the nervous system. The struggle of men to retain their autonomy and individuality with dignity in the face of external social forces which fractionalize their lives and render them impersonal to self and others is the overall problem with which Simmel is concerned.

The irony is that the freedom which the division of labor and the market offer men create excessive rationality, impersonal competition and over-intellectualized persons. It would appear that Simmel defines and locates the problem of alienation from work in man's struggle to achieve autonomy and retain some individuality despite the individualizing, rationalizing and impersonality of his newly found freedom. This conflict is a main thrust of his previously mentioned essay on the urban mentality.

Simmel then, locates the same Marxian problems of division of labor, the market, fractionalization, specialization in the city rather than in the market per se. He also isolates excessive rationality as does Weber but within the city not bureaucracy. The same characteristics of work described by Marx and Weber are described, to a large degree by Simmel, but in different institutional terms. For Simmel money and the cash nexus both causes and expresses the individualization, rationality, freedom and impersonality of socialization and social relations

in the city.

While specific organizational and detailed cultural analysis is missing Simmel analyzes habits of mind as definite products of the social structure. In this sense he too works within the framework of social structure creating social character. These habits of mind are described in psychological and personal terms as consequences of the abstraction qualities of the urban milieu, money and the market. The problems of men and society and by implication work, are ultimately reduced to habits of mind and not the social structure. Somehow, solutions are arrived at by men achieving some form of inner balance, as represented by the blasé attitude, in spite of total institutional forces. Such an attitude is an essential response to essential social forces.

Simmel's unique contribution to our knowledge of alienation and work hinges on his discussion of the city and the achievement of some form of inner stability of man. He indicates that work in the urban center is particularly alienating because of the excessive rationality and specialization of work. Secondly, he implies that specialization, which is fractionalizing in itself, may be highly competitive in commercial fields among similar specialists, because of the constant pressure to find new and untapped sources of income. Thirdly, Simmel's work by implication has an intriguing possibility. That is, like Marx, men may not feel alienated from their work yet in fact be alienated. Because they have achieved some form of compensation in their personal lives they may be unaware of alienation. This

compensation may be in response to larger sets of institutional problems. Living in the city and work itself may take on the importance of simply being a fractionalized part of their total lives to which they adjust in a similar fashion.

Emile Durkheim

Durkheim's contribution to our knowledge of alienation and bureaucratic work, on the surface, appears almost as confusing as it is contrary to some of the Marxian ideas. In the thorny passages of The Division of Labor he presents the problem as a malfunctioning of social institutions. In his later Rules of Sociological Method Durkheim makes explicit the framework of his thought in which the specific problem is located.

Durkheim locates the problem of work in the "abnormal forms" of the complex division of labor found in industrial societies. The most important of these forms Durkheim calls the anomic division of labor.

The difference between Durkheim's concept of anomie and Marx's concept of alienation should be clearly stated if we are to understand Durkheim's contribution. Essentially an anomic world is one that is normless, implying moral chaos and confusion while an alienated world is one that is outside, removed and alien and faces us massively and unyielding. From its Greek origins, anomie means "broken limits" or, as sociologists prefer, normlessness. In an

anomic world norms either do not exist or become vague or contradictory. In an alienated world men feel and act as if they cannot control their own lives, and are at the mercy of inevitable all-powerful social forces. The confusion of these two concepts is not only important to understand but their consequences as well.

120

Feelings of personal anomie may result from an anomic world, as Durkheim explained. These same feelings may occur, if only temporarily, when one is confronted with an alienated world. When a new employee becomes a member of a massive bureaucratic organization he may incur a temporary state of personal crisis and confusion. Conversely, feelings of estrangement may occur when one is confronted with an alienated world as Marx explained. However, the same feelings may occur when one is confronted with an anomic world. A long time employee may withdraw and feel powerless to control his future in an organization undergoing crisis, confusion or displacement of goals. These two types of worlds are different, the personal feelings and reactions are different, but the same individual reaction, e.g., alienation from work may occur in response to an essentially anomic or alienated world. We make this distinction because we believe the apparent differences between the two theorists on work are more rhetoric than reality.

Durkheim locates the institutional problem in contrasting medieval guilds with 19th Century industrial factory work. He draws mainly from the works of Block, LeVasseuer, Hubert Valleroux,

Cauwès, and Schaeffle, historians and specialists in the 15th and 17th Century evolution of the medieval guild system to the factory system; from handicraft to industrial production.

Durkheim's focus on guilds, particularly the conflict between masters and journeymen can be seen within the larger framework of the positivistic and Comtian traditions in which he worked. Durkheim's discussion of work is related to his theoretical and methodological preference for objective indicators of underlying states. This was part of his concept of making sociology a science of objective social facts without reference to psychology.

A central theme in The Division of Labor is that specialization in industrial society will cause anomie only when the relations among groups are not regulated or are in a state of anomie. Otherwise, the occupational group would bring solidarity. It indeed was the occupational group which Durkheim believed would restore the lost sense of community in the Gesellschaft society.

Durkheim, like Marx, locates what he terms "the anomic division of labor" in the conflict between capital and labor. He traces strikes between worker and master as far back as the 15th Century noting their increasing frequency. Unlike Marx he makes no judgment about the rationality of the market mechanism. Strikes grew with the increasing specialization of labor and the growth of the market which separated masters from workers and divided into entrepreneurs and craftsmen. The formation of guilds and associations further separated

the two groups. Initially, strikes were used to gain higher wages or improved working conditions. As specialization became greater, labor was seen as entirely distinct in the total scheme of production. As strikes and revolts became more frequent there emerged two distinct and separate classes. Durkheim in this sense follows more in the tradition of Veblen than Marx by ignoring any apparent value judgments about capitalism, and focusing on the class division. 123

The similarities between Durkheim and Marx are even more important in several other aspects of their work. The similarities revolve primarily around the increase in atomization of men and their dehumanization in the face of the increasing industrialization of work. 124

The forced division of labor, according to Durkheim, fits the man to the task, by external and direct constraint. For the division of labor to produce "organic solidarity" it is necessary that the task be fitted to the man thereby eliminating complete external constraint, and creating spontaneity. According to Durkheim, men would find harmony between their individual natures and social function. Eventually, only those most apt at their function would remain and the basis for the manner of the division of labor would be only the diversity of individual abilities. 125

Industrialism produced another abnormal form of the division of labor. The industrial division of labor did not allow men to keep sufficiently busy. Useless work or work and idleness did not allow for organic solidarity. Social and economic functions were discontinuous 126

rather than integrated with one another. In addition, the lack of a genuine division of labor creates increasing work. At one level Durkheim appears, to us, to be saying both that time hangs heavy in the workers hands and that its meaning is lost in unremitting, externally imposed painful labor. In organismic analogies Durkheim seems to be advocating a sort of functional rationality. He does not however seem to discuss the intrinsic nature of the work as meaningless or meaningful. He implies that regulation of the workers activities into a functionally rational pattern will bring meaning through group solidarity. He did not imagine Mannheim's thesis that functional rationality does not increase substantial rationality.

Although his basic premise is that the division of labor brings organic solidarity except in a state of anomie, Durkheim realized that increasing specialization brings increasing dispersion, separation and atomization of men. As industry and the market expand, work changes. The relations between employees and employers change. Machines replace men, and industrial manufacturing replaces handwork. The division of labor, Durkheim says, degrades and dehumanizes the individual regimenting and making him into a machine. The machine process automatizes his movements and renders him incapable of understanding the meaning of his work. Each day he repeats the same movement with monotonous regularity, with no intrinsic interest, and can
127
continue to work only by routine. While appearing to be similar to Marx's argument Durkheim continually asserts that the anomic division

of labor occurs only under exceptional and unusual circumstances. Durkheim's concept of anomic work and Marx's alienated work differ more in rhetoric than in substance. While Marx, Weber and Veblen view the division of labor as atomizing and disrupting Durkheim views it as such only under extreme conditions.

Durkheim's insistence that the complex division of labor will bring organic solidarity is rooted in this idea that "guilds" or occupational communities would grow from this division as they did in medieval times where there was the chance to see the significance and unity of values within a larger social framework. Each man would be-
 128
 come an "exchangist" not only in the sense of economic interdependence but in a larger system of social and moral functions as "existed" in the 15th century. A system of rights and duties, in the sense of social obligations would be created and men would recognize their mutual interdependence. A societal morality would necessarily grow out of
 129
 this, creating genuine work communities.

In this sense Durkheim worked in a positivistic and voluntaristic tradition, believing that men could recreate communities in smaller groups. Whether he believed, community, at the societal level, was possible in a newly created industrial society is a moot question.

In contrast, Weber and Marx worked in a more pessimistic or fatalistic tradition believing that societal forces were determinate at all levels and alienation in work was apparently inevitable--community impossible. Marx locates these social forces in the

irrationality of the capitalistic market. Weber does so in the increasing rationalization of the world particularly via bureaucracy and its effects on men's work.

Thus Durkheim covers much the same areas as Marx and to some degree Veblen, using the ideas of atomization, over-specialization and of the machine industrial process and their inferred effects upon the individual. He touches on Mannheim's concept of functional rationality but appears to be unconcerned with the nature of work to the individual and ignores any meaning in work except the social solidarity it might bring.

However, Durkheim chooses to ignore the conflicts between economic interests and power struggles among groups and other divisive consequences of industrialization.

But he leaves us with two intriguing ideas. One is that industrialization and specialization of the division of labor will bring organic solidarity not alienation, as the norm. The second is more involved. Can the industrial division of labor which is essentially anomic bring only an anomic or alienated condition? Can the anomic structure of work create social solidarity or a sense of community? These questions were answered optimistically by Durkheim. All other classical theorists give negative answers. Marx was optimistic in the sense that he felt alienation would end with the abolition of private property. Durkheim differs from all of the classical theorists in so far as he believed that industrialization would not make alienation

from work or the anomic division of labor, mankind's fate in the 20th century.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Modern Library edition (New York: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1908), pp. 396-400.

² Vernon Venable, Human Nature: The Marxian View, Meridian edition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), pp. 147-149, 151-157 is the best source for the explanation of this idea.

³ We have taken the liberty of describing the fragmentation of self in a Meadian sense. Hence the emphasis on social role.

⁴ Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 50 and Karl Marx, Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (New York: The International Library, 1904), pp. 265-273.

⁵ Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 198.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 196-201.

⁷ Frederick Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (New York: International Publishers, 1942), chap. IX.

⁸ Marx, Capital, Vol. I, pp. 49, 386.

⁹ Marx speaks of "craft idiocy" see The Poverty of Philosophy trans. by H. Quelch (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1934), p. 121.

¹⁰ Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 198.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 44-48, 86-87.

¹² Ibid., pp. 48, 54, 65, 83.

¹³ Ibid., p. 83.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 99-100.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 188.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 193.

¹⁷ Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 49-50.

¹⁸ Marx, Capital Vol. I, chap. 13, section 9.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 206, 211.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 394.

²¹ Ibid., p. 391.

²² Ibid., chap. 10.

²³ Ibid., p. 272

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 462-463, and Karl Marx, Critique of Gotha Programme, (Revised translation; New York: International Publishers, 1938), p. 566. This separation has been increasing in kind and degree since antiquity.

²⁵ Marx, Capital Vol. I, pp. 93, 371-374.

²⁶ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "The Communist Manifesto," Essential Works of Marxism, ed. by Arthur P. Mendel (New York: Bantam Books, 1961), p. 19.

²⁷ Ibid., and Marx, Capital Vol. I, pp. 461-462, 470, 472.

²⁸ Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, ed. by Dirk Struik (New York: International Publishers, 1964), pp. 110-111, 149.

- ²⁹ Marx, Capital Vol. I, p. 536.
- ³⁰ Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,
p. 108.
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Ibid., p. 113.
- ³³ Ibid., pp. 111, 151.
- ³⁴ Ibid., p. 111.
- ³⁵ Ibid., p. 149.
- ³⁶ Marx and Engels, "The Communist Manifesto," p. 30.
- ³⁷ Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,
p. 115.
- ³⁸ Ibid., pp. 114-117.
- ³⁹ Marx, Capital Vol. I, pp. 391-394.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 196 and Marx and Engels, "The Communist
Manifesto," pp. 15, 20.
- ⁴¹ Marx, Capital Vol. I, p. 396.
- ⁴² Ibid., pp. 397-398.
- ⁴³ Lewis Coser and Bernard Rosenberg, Sociological Theory
(New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 390.
- ⁴⁴ Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,
trans. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free
Press, 1947), pp. 181-182.

⁴⁵ Max Weber, "Religious Rejections of the World and Their Directions," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 331. Also see Max Weber, The City, trans. by Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwißth (New York: The Free Press, 1958).

⁴⁶ Max Weber, "Class Status and Party," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 180-194.

⁴⁷ Norman Birnbaum, "Conflicting Interpretations of the Rise of Capitalism: Marx and Weber," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 4 (1953), 128. Weber, "Religious Rejections of the World and Their Direction," pp. 333-340, and Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. by Talcott Parsons, (Revised edition; New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1958).

⁴⁸ Gerth and Mills, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

⁴⁹ Birnbaum, op. cit.

⁵⁰ Ibid., and see Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, pp. 47-79.

⁵¹ Gerth and Mills, op. cit., p. 49.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 261-262.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 73.

⁵⁴ See footnote 46 above and also see Max Weber, "The Social Psychology of World Religions," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 294-299.

⁵⁵ Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 215-234. Although Weber does not mention it specifically see also pp. 183-184 and 331 in Gerth and Mills. A similar meaning is to be located in another oft used form which Weber borrowed from Fredrick Schiller, "The Disenchantment of the World."

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 229.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 214.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 197.

⁵⁹Julie P. Mayer, Max Weber and German Politics, (2nd edition; London: Faber and Faber, 1943), pp. 126-128.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Max Weber, "The Meaning of Discipline," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 254.

⁶²Ibid., p. 253.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 254-256.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 199, 228-229, 255.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 73.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 214-215, 228-229.

⁶⁷See Weber's "Essay on Bureaucracy," particularly the sections on Education, pp. 240-244. For the Military, the Governmental and the Church see pp. 221-226.

⁶⁸Thorstein Veblen, The Instinct of Workmanship (New York: The Viking Press, 1914), chap. 1 and 2.

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 4-6, 30-32.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 200.

⁷¹Max Lerner ed., The Portable Veblen (New York: The Viking Press, 1958), p. 41 and Bernard Rosenberg, The Values of

Veblen (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956), chap. 4.

⁷² Veblen, *The Instinct of Workmanship*, p. 320.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 85-89.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 146-161.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 50-52. Repeatedly in his works Veblen uses the phrase, "imbecile institutions."

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 173-182.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 214-257.

⁷⁸ It should be noted that where Veblen uses the term "machine process" we have taken the liberty of using the term bureaucracy. It appears that Veblen implicitly was including the administration and management of machine production by the technicians--the engineers. It is in this context that the machine process is part of the bureaucratic system.

⁷⁹ Thorstein Veblen, *The Engineers and the Price System* (New York: The Viking Press, 1921), p. 11.

⁸⁰ Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of Business Enterprise* (New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1904), pp. 11-13.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 13-15.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 146-147.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 148.

⁸⁴ Ibid., chap. 1 and 9.

⁸⁵ For a more detailed discussion of Veblen's attitude toward bureaucracy per se see *The Higher Learning in America* (New York: The Viking Press, 1918).

⁸⁶ Veblen, The Engineers and the Price System, p. 118.

⁸⁷ Ibid., chap. 1.

⁸⁸ Veblen, The Theory of Business Enterprise, pp. 24-29.
This is also the main thesis of The Engineers and the Price System.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁰ Rosenberg, The Values of Veblen, p. 115, and Veblen, The Engineers and the Price System, p. 119.

⁹¹ Veblen, The Theory of Business Enterprise, chap. 5.

⁹² Veblen, The Engineers and the Price System, p. 144.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 14.

⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 150-151.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 151.

⁹⁶ Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York: Macmillan Co., 1899), p. 70.

⁹⁷ Veblen, The Engineers and the Price System, pp. 87-91, 133-137.

⁹⁸ Veblen, The Theory of Business Enterprise, pp. 28-36.

⁹⁹ Bernard Rosenberg, Thorstein Veblen (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1963), pp. 1-15.

¹⁰⁰ See Veblen, The Higher Learning in America, and Thorstein Veblen, Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times (New York: Viking Press, 1923), chap. 11.

- ¹⁰¹ Veblen, The Instinct of Workmanship, p. 25.
- ¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 169-182, 185-194, 200-217.
- ¹⁰³ Karl Mannheim, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction (New York: Harcourt Brace and World Inc., 1940).
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 51-59.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 51-52.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 59.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 55-57.
- ¹⁰⁸ Georg Simmel, "Metropolis and Mental Life," The Sociology of Georg Simmel, ed. and trans. by Kurt H. Wolff (New York: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 409-424. Also see footnote 10 in chap. I and Albert Solomon, "Money and Alienation," Georg Simmel ed. by Lewis Coser (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1965), pp. 135-137. Solomon presents the basic similarity between Simmel and Marx regarding the concepts of "self-alienation" and "objectivation." Marx and Simmel both locate the same phenomena; the former under capitalism the latter in the money economy of the city.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 410.
- ¹¹⁰ Weber, The City.
- ¹¹¹ Simmel, op. cit., p. 411.
- ¹¹² Ibid., pp. 410 and 414.
- ¹¹³ Ibid., pp. 413-415.
- ¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 414.

115
Ibid., p. 413.

116
Ibid., p. 420.

117 Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, trans. by George Simpson (New York: The Free Press, 1933), and The Rules of Sociological Method, trans. by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller (New York: The Free Press, 1938).

118 Durkheim however recognized the exchange value of a commodity. But unlike Marx he did not see exchange value as inherently alienating or anomic. Only when the price charged for the commodity or the value received for making the commodity were unjust or not in equilibrium, was it considered abnormal or anomic. See pp. 382-383 of The Division of Labor in Society.

119 Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, pp. 353-410 and Emile Durkheim, Suicide, trans. by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson (New York: The Free Press, 1951). However, it should be recognized that anomie primarily meant moral norms to Durkheim. The lack of moral norms meant that there was a lack of values and a unity or hierarchy connecting values to one another.

120 We have taken the liberty of discussing anomie here as an individual subjective state. Durkheim's The Rules of Sociological Method would not have allowed for the discussion of the individual but rather the individual as a social and historical creation. In Durkheim's terms the individual is an individual representation of the larger societal collectivity.

121 See Durkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method, pp. 1-47.

122 Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, pp. 111-174, especially 129-131 and 174-232.

123
Ibid., pp. 354-357.

124
Ibid., pp. 373-376.

125
Ibid., p. 376.

126
Ibid., pp. 389-395.

127
Ibid., p. 371.

128
Ibid., p. 406.

129
Ibid., pp. 406-409.

CHAPTER III

A PARADIGMATIC ANALYSIS OF CLASSICAL THEORY

We will now attempt to abstract from our discussion of the classical theorists those dimensions which appear to be central dimensions in the concept of work alienation. We hope, but do not claim, that our analysis would exhaust all of the major categories discussed by the classical theorists.

In doing so we will take as a starting point the major categories derived from Marxian analysis simply because Marx is the first of the classical sociologists to deal with alienation from work in institutional terms. All of the other classical theorists we have reported upon had access to Marx and all in some sense took some stand explicitly or implicitly toward his work. In some cases, as we have noted, they explicitly disagreed. In other cases they disagreed at a still more difficult level they may have taken aspects of his work for granted. Thus, while we start from Marx, such a starting point does not necessarily mean agreement. Beyond this, where major disagreements occur, we will focus attention upon these disagreements. We also note the extensions and modifications of Marx's work where such extensions and modifications appear to occur.

From this analysis we would postulate that there are three basic western institutions which can describe the basic structure of modern work. They in turn create certain intermediate structures which have been used to describe the immediate conditions of work. These structural effects in turn include imputed social psychological consequences for the individual.

The three major institutions which appear to create and intensify alienation from work as discussed by the classical theorists are industrial capitalism, the industrial division of labor and industrial bureaucracy. We emphasize industrialism in all three concepts because our attempt is to understand the role of alienation in the major work of the institutions modern era. This implies that other forms of alienation have existed prior to modern industrial society. The extent to which some aspects are related or not related to industrialism, to its division of labor, bureaucracy and the market under capitalism or neither may become clear in the analysis.

These three processes in turn become the basis for existing institutional forms of work. Capitalism appears to depend on a market situation where men and machinery are treated as commodities. The division of labor creates fragmented repetitive tasks where no one man creates a whole product. Bureaucracy separates the official from the "office" and creates an impersonal work atmosphere. Some social psychological consequences of the above would appear to be respectively; the viewing of oneself and others instrumentally, narrow

specialization and atomization of work, and dehumanization.

I. Industrial Capitalism

A. Irrationality. -Capitalism, according to most, creates a market structure that is essentially irrational. While it may be rational in monetary terms it is often irrational in that it is out of control of allegedly rational men. The worker can sell his labor on a formally free market, but his monetary value is predetermined by an impersonal market as are the existing types and numbers of jobs. The worker can find himself working long hours for a fixed salary and never advance regardless of skill because skill is often irrelevant: one can find oneself suddenly and inexplicably unemployed regardless of skill. It is the market mechanism in this framework lying outside of the immediate work process which controls man's fate. Men are forced to mold themselves to predetermined jobs and occupations created by uncontrolled market structure, and may become redundant for the same reason.

Marx and Veblen, both, to some degree, make all the points concerning irrationality of the market commodity relations. Weber discusses capitalism but does not focus upon the irrationality of the market. The rational nature of capitalism is discussed with reference to other aspects of capitalism. These include the internal rationalization of industrial organization, of law, of accounting and of its means and relationships.

B. Fetishism of Commodities. -The market situation turns products, human relations and men into commodities. Men relate to each other primarily as commodity producers and instruments rather than as total human beings in the Marxian sense. Men view themselves and others as having specific monetary and instrumental value. In so far as men treat each other as commodities they transform human relationships into commodity relations. This is originally a Marxian idea. Later Veblen implicitly locates it in business enterprise and Simmel views it in terms of the commodity-like nature of social relations in the city.

C. Tools and Products. -The worker does not own his own tools nor the product of his labor. The machinery is located in the factory. He is paid for his labor, the product of which is sold by another person. The production process is performed by "hired" workmen who are in effect as interchangeable as are their tools and productivity. This further reduces and compartmentalizes the human potential in work.

Parallel to the separation of the tools of production from the worker, as stressed by Marx, is the separation of the bureaucrat from the means of administration, the soldier from the means of warfare, and the scholar from the ownership of libraries as indicated by Weber. In fact all of the classical theorists in some senses address themselves to similar separations at different levels for varying occupational groups. Durkheim, for example, discusses the conflict over ownership and products within the context of the guild system.

D. Exploitation and Brutalization. -Aside from the physically brutalizing nature of factory work, as emphasized by Marx, capitalism creates a market structure where the capitalist profits from the labor of other men. The working man, in a sense attempts to exploit the capitalist in terms of amount of work and his wages, etc. Both treat each other in a mutually exploitative manner. Monetary benefits are more important to each than the intrinsic meaning of work. The emphasis on rationality and calculability is implicit or explicit in all of the classical theorists.

E. The Metropolis as Market Center. -The city is the center of the market economy and especially for Simmel the cash nexus. Social relationships, mutual exploitation, the use of others and oneself as instruments are heightened and intensified in the urban work environment. Durkheim implies urbanism with reference to population density.

Simmel emphasizes the effects of urbanism on the creation of monetary markets and a market mentality. This mentality includes habits of mind, of matter-of-factness, objectivity, concentration on the intellect rather than the emotional, a predisposition to rational calculation and impersonality. Social relationships become abstract, measurable and subject to quantitative calculation, especially in terms of price.

Weber argues that, while deriving from a variety of conditions, such psychological predispositions are necessary conditions for the

emergence of a rational capitalism.

II. Social Psychological Results of Industrial Capitalism

A. Monsterism. -According to Marx, the worker as well as the capitalist develops only a small part of his potential human faculties. In becoming over-specialized he "cripples" himself by not being able to develop some of his other propensities. Because of this premature fragmentation and compartmentalization of the total self it is possible to be alienated from himself without realizing it. It is also possible, reflecting Weber, to substitute one form of alienation for another by creating narrow expertise.

The focus on specialization does not necessarily have to create monsterism. Specialization may produce role segmentation, individualism and the capacity for intensified productivity. Thus, not all the classical theorists accept the notion that specialization produces monsterism. This is particularly true for Simmel. Even for Durkheim specialization creates a breakdown of the hierarchy and integration of values in the society at large but alienation and monsterism at the psychological level need not necessarily be the consequence. For the individual the consequence, as expressed in the concept of anomie, may be the incapacity to develop a coherent system of values or norms and the inability to relate to others.

B. Instrumental Meaning. -This refers to any attitude where work itself is not performed as an end in itself but as a means to an external

end. The work itself may inherently be meaningless to the individual or painful drudgery that the person must perform to earn a living. The meaning may be to earn more money because no intrinsic satisfaction appears to be possible. The meaning of work may lie in the prestige, power or security that work provides to the worker or employer. Simmel recognizes the latter in the city. Durkheim is implicitly aware of it in the development of the guild system.

For Marx the loss in intrinsic meaning can be located in the substitution of commodity relationships for product relationships. The abstraction and the fetishism of commodities produce a set of instrumental meanings which replace the primary meanings involved in the social character of production. For Veblen, who fully develops the concept, the loss of intrinsic meaning is expressed in the substitution of invidious comparison through money, ownership and prestige in lieu of the intrinsic satisfaction involved in the instinct of workmanship. For Mannheim, this dichotomy can be found in the concepts of substantial and formal rationality reflecting Weber's dichotomy of substantive and formal rationality.

C. Overcompensation. - The lack of intrinsic meaning in work may be compensated for by instrumental or other meanings. Under the structure of capitalism ownership, monetary compensation becomes highly prestigious. Monetary measures of consumption styles become the measure of prestigious consumption. To develop a particular style

of life outside of work implies an attempt to fulfill oneself when the possibility is denied in work itself. The garnering of prestige through the exhibition of material wealth and conspicuous leisure is one such possibility.

The concept of overcompensation is most clearly emphasized by Veblen. Weber, in his concept of prestige, at times suggests that prestige and illusions of power are substitutes for meaningful work. Simmel emphasizes the quest for prestige and status symbols but does not locate it in deprivation in work but in the anonymity of the city. Marx of course sees "greed" as a generic aspect of capitalism.

III. The Industrial Division of Labor

Paralleling the concept of industrial capitalism is concept of the industrial division of labor. Both concepts are not mutually exclusive but depend on each other. We again stress the industrial nature of the division of labor rather than the division of labor itself.

All the classical theorists emphasize the industrial division of labor as being a major institution in the reconstitution of modern work. This emphasis is one that all could agree upon. Even when it does not appear to be central in his analysis, as in the case of Mannheim, it is because Mannheim by this time treats it as a given.

All classical theorists were, of course, aware that the division of labor proceeds capitalism and modern industrial capitalism. However the latter intensifies the division of labor and its problems. The

way in which labor is subdivided appears to be a cause for work alienation. For Marx, at least, any subdivision of labor was a cause of alienation from work.

Not all theorists attributed alienation to the industrial division of labor. This may in part be due to the apparent inseparability of the industrial division of labor and industrial bureaucracy in the late 19th century in both the factory and state administration.

As indicated not all theorists used the term alienation. The extent to which phenomena analogous to alienation i.e., anomie can be attributed to the industrial division of labor is part of our focus. We previously have indicated the extent to which the analogy can be made.

The following conditions subsumed under the concept of the industrial division of labor would appear to raise basic questions about its effect on the meaning of work.

A. The Separation of Physical and Intellectual Labor. -For Marx this is the culmination of the historical separation of workmanship from ownership. This separation proceeds the industrial division of labor and may be found throughout the historical development of the division of labor. It is especially true in systems based upon slavery. This condition is intensified under the industrial division of labor. The workman is required to do a specific pre-defined task and not to deviate from it. Work is standardized so as to be completely rational and to create no intellectual problems for the machine operator. In accord with Mannheim he cannot use his faculties for problem solving;

a process which also contributes to monsterism. He is a tool with a specific narrow purpose. He cannot plan his work, it is planned for him and given to him by others. Those who are confined to intellectual labor are restricted in the sense that their bodies are of little use in their work. This concept is emphasized especially by Marx and Veblen. It is taken for granted by the other classical theorists and frequently subsumed as an attribute of specialization, as with Durkheim.

B. The Machine Process. -1) Atomizes the entire process of work and the individual's relationship to the whole process of work. Each workman knows only his job which increases functional rationality and decreases substantial rationality.

2) Fragments and segments the entire process of work into minute subdivided tasks. Because of its repetitive simplicity, work becomes dull and monotonous.

3) Compartmentalizes and artificially separates work from other institutional areas of one's life. It also creates artificial and formal relations between men at work based on their formal functions. At higher levels this results in overspecialization in work and thought processes. Marx and Veblen emphasize the machine process per se. Weber and Mannheim, emphasizing the similarities between bureaucratic rationality and the machine process, apply the latter's features to the organization of bureaucratic work whether such work is mechanized or not. It is viewed within the larger context of the increasing

rationalization of the **Occident**. Durkheim recognized all of the aspects of the machine process but as a result of the anomic division of labor.

C. Increasing Specialization of jobs creates a social psychological isolation and separation among men in the immediate work situation, according to both Marx and Durkheim. According to Durkheim it effectively prevents the formulation of occupational communities. For Simmel, specialization increases market competition which in turn begets further specialization and its social psychological results. All classical theorists recognized such specialization.

IV. Social Psychological Consequences of the Industrial Division of Labor

A. Salesmanship Replaces Workmanship. - The idea of salesmanship in work is almost exclusively that of Veblen. Salesmanship flows directly from the separation of the means of production and the separation of intellectual and physical labor. As a result of **capitalism**, Marx posited the development of monsterism. As a result of the separation of labor and ownership, salesmanship, according to Veblen, became valued rather than craftsmanship. The production of goods was expressly for an impersonal market. The "intellectual" labor involved in salesmanship and entrepreneurship became more valued under capitalism. The workman too developed similar values. Although ownership was limited, salesmanship as an occupation was

created by an expanding market and by the division of labor. An emphasis on saleswork may only be inferred from Marx. Only Veblen emphasizes salesmanship as a central institution in modern work. Mannheim, and to some extent Weber, emphasize self-salesmanship but do not stress salesmanship as a central feature of work. Simmel emphasized the use of symbols in establishing personal and social identity in the money economy but does not discuss salesmanship *per se*.

B. Loss of Autonomy and Mastery of the Production Process

1) The machine process, according to Marx, Veblen and Durkheim, reversed the historical relation of man to the tools of production. The machine, not man, "created" the product. Man became for Marx, a living appendage to the machine. He lost control over the machine; he could not set his own pace, nor could he determine the rhythm of his work. This sometimes resulted in an overall feeling of powerlessness.

2) The workman loses the ability to understand the entire process of production because of the fractionalizing of his work and his extreme specialization. In this sense he experiences isolation. He also loses the ability to solve work problems or make rational intelligent decisions concerning them. He develops a "trained incapacity" for general thought, a direct result of functional rationality!

3) According to Marx, the product and process of work stand as

foreign, alien and external objects. The worker views them as having a life of their own independent of him. He views it as inevitable and nothing he can act upon but a force which acts inexorably on him.

Marx and Veblen both agree in attributing these specific consequences to the machine process. The sense of isolation and powerlessness of the bureaucrat in the bureaucratic machine can be analogously inferred from Weber and more directly from Mannheim who makes this a central point of his work. Durkheim in some senses emphasizes the sense of isolation. Simmel locates the cause of isolation in the operation of the city. He also attributes to this process some of the basic causes of the blasé attitude.

C. Consumption and Life Style as Overcompensation. - The increasing specialization of work renders it largely meaningless. According to Simmel increasing specialization creates competition--creating further specialization. The structure of work makes it increasingly painful. Self-realization through work is abandoned and compensation sought in the consumption of material goods and the cultivation of a particular style of life. Stylized consumption is also a form of overcompensation for the lack of intrinsic meaning in work and of an occupational community.

Use of stylized consumption as a form of overcompensation for deprivation in work is a concept that many of the classical theorists recognized. Only Veblen makes it a central aspect of his work. Marx

viewed it in terms of the workers quest for "pleasure" in getting drunk. Weber and Mannheim viewed it in terms of the prestige attached to the bureaucratic career. Veblen fully develops it in terms of a vast variety of forms of conspicuous consumption. It is clearly the opposite side of the coin of salesmanship. Simmel recognizes the overwhelming pervasiveness of the money economy and the use of symbols as a means of establishing social and personal identity but does not discuss salesmanship *per se*.

V. The Structure of Industrial Bureaucracy.

We are treating bureaucracy here in the same sense that we have treated capitalism and the division of labor by emphasizing its role in modern economic and political development. The development of the large scale bureaucratization of major societal institutions has its origin in 18th and especially 19th century western Europe and America. It has been known to exist historically on a large scale but in non-industrial areas.

Weber, the foremost theoritician in this area, treated bureaucratization as intrinsic to large scble industrial capitalism, but locates its origin in the development of state administration in military and religious institutions. He sees the development of bureaucracy as part of the world-wide process of the development of formal rationality. This process is independent of and preceeds the economic rationalization of capitalism. However Weber was one of the first to recognize

that bureaucracy could be applied to the economic institutions of capitalism and socialism. In doing so he made use of concepts developed by Marx i.e., the separation of ownership and control.

Every concept and consequence that Marx thought applicable to lower level industrial work and attributed to capitalism and the machine process, Weber applied to middle and upper level bureaucratic work. Weber in this sense carried Marx's work to a higher level of generalization than did Marx. Marx was aware of the process of bureaucracy but confined it to oriental despotism not western capitalism. Thus the separation of the worker from the means of production becomes the separation of the administrator from the means of administration. The division of labor, extreme specialization, a formal, rational, calculating mentality are institutionalized in bureaucratic offices. In this sense what Marx termed monsterism can be seen as occupational overspecialization and careerism even among middle and higher ranking officials.

In any case, industrial bureaucratization can be conceived of as the third, and not the least important of our three parallel concepts.

A. Offices, Rules, Careers. -According to Weber and Mannheim, bureaucracy, in accord with the division of labor, creates artificial positions or offices. The person who occupies an office, theoretically, is most technically qualified to carry out the duties of the office. The man is molded for the job which he does by following the official

rules impersonally--without regard to his own emotions. In return he receives a fixed salary with regular increments, advancement, fringe benefits, possible tenure, and his retirement salary. In short, the man fits himself to the office and develops a career.

B. Rationality and Specialization. -Bureaucracy creates specialists of unparalleled expertise by the incessant repetition of small tasks. However, this creates functional rationality without substantial rationality. Bureaucrats are cogs in a great machine expert at narrow functions who together manage to perform vast amounts of complex work in this manner. Again Weber, Mannheim and Veblen stress this with respect to bureaucracy but use the concepts Marx applied to factory work.

C. Hierarchy and Impersonality. -All offices are arranged in some form of hierarchical order. Each office holder knows whom he is responsible to, and who is responsible to him. These power relations are made most efficient because each official impersonally adheres to the rules. Rules themselves the social cement which formally guarantees rational impersonal efficiency. These ideas are unique to Weber and Mannheim but with respect to bureaucracy they replace concepts of market impersonality and efficiency.

VI. Social Psychological Consequences of Industrial Bureaucracy

A. Careerism and Self-Rationalization. -According to Weber and Mannheim the structure of bureaucracy simultaneously expands career

opportunities and diminishes the range of actual work. For this reason the development of one's career may become paramount with work becoming an activity instrumental to the development of one's career. This demands, among other things, a conscious and unconscious re-making of one's self and self-image. Thus careerism and self-rationalization are twin processes.

B. Fetishization of Rules--Loss of Perspective. -1) As we have noted with the division of labor functional rationality causes a loss of total perspective or a trained incapacity and effectively reduces one's ability for intelligent insight and decision-making. Bureaucracy, again according to Weber and Mannheim, adds to this by developing a rigid type of social character who acts only with and according to the rules not deviating from them. The idea of a specific type of social character is implicit in Veblen.

2) For Weber, Mannheim and Veblen bureaucrats become an army of small cogs in the giant wheel of bureaucracy. Their blind discipline becomes ordinary habit and thus the structure takes on a machine-like quality with the bureaucrats reduced to human, non-questioning efficient machinery with a trained incapacity for general thought.

3) He experiences relative powerlessness and nameless, faceless, anonymity. The bureaucrat, for Weber and Mannheim, may identify upward with the organization, downward with its clients, or not at all. Ultimately he may ambivalently identify as an efficient bureaucrat.

C. Dehumanization. -Machine-like discipline in obeying orders, impersonal adherence to rules, separation from the office, etc., create a rational calculating atmosphere. Bureaucrats react to their superiors, subordinates and clients by psychologically stripping away these peoples emotions, flesh and blood. In short, they dehumanize them by treating people as abstract "cases" divested of their human qualities. This concept embodies Weber's pessimism about bureaucracy tinged with a concealed respect for its efficiency.

We can anticipate that some of the empirical research may not focus on all of these dimensions of classical theory. The modern empirical researchers are not obliged to pursue one or any of these dimensions. Some dimensions may be the explicit focus of their research. In other work, where the research does not focus on a classical dimension, it may be possible to infer the relevance of that dimension from the research in question. In some cases where a major institutional process, as defined above, is focused upon not all of the social psychological processes may be focused upon or noticed. This may be due either to the theoretical focus of the empirical researcher or to their not raising the necessary questions. It may however be due to the lack of application or the relevance of the classical dimensions. Our task will be to sort out of the welter of probabilities explanations which enable us to ascertain whether differences in findings, if and when they occur, are due to differences in the way problems are posed and research is conducted or whether in fact the social

realities are different than those anticipated by the classical theorists. At a substantive level we are interested in, to the extent that empirical research is able to provide us with answers, whether alienation from work does or does not occur. To the extent that it does occur we are interested in the specific occupational groups to whom it occurs. We are also interested in the specific occupational features and processes which cause these forms of alienation. Finally as a result of this analysis we may be able to assess whether the classical theorists provided subsequent researchers with guidance that enabled them to understand the meaning of contemporary work.

The following charts codify our discussion so that it may be more readily grasped. The categories checked indicates a major emphasis. The absence of a check may indicate that, among other things, the theorist in question assumed the phenomena and having done so not stressed it. The categories indicated in our paradigm are necessarily condensed and abstract. They are therefore only minimal indicators of the concepts used by each theorist and the use of the paradigm is thus no substitute for the specific discussion of the concept as used by the theorist in question.

TABLE I

IMMEDIATE CONDITIONS AND STRUCTURES OF WORK CREATED BY INDUSTRIAL CAPITALISM,
THE INDUSTRIAL DIVISION OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL BUREAUCRACY

	Marx	Weber	Veblen	Durkheim	Mannheim	Simmel
Industrial Capitalism	x	* x	x		**	++ x
Irrationality of Market	x		x			
Fetishism of Commodities	x		x			++ x
Ownership of Tools and Products	x		x	+ x		
Exploitation-Brutalization	x		x			
Metropolis as Market	x	x				x
Industrial Division of Labor	x	x	x	x	x	x
Separation of Intellectual and Physical	x	x	x		x	
Machine Process	x	x	x	x		
Narrow Specialization	x	x	x	x	x	x

TABLE I (continued)

	Marx	Weber	Veblen	Durkheim	Mannheim	Simmel
Industrial Bureaucracy		x	x		x	
Office/Rules/ Careers		x			x	
Rationality and Specialization		x	x		x	
Hierarchy and Impersonality		x			x	

* Weber locates many of the features of industrial capitalism in industrial bureaucracy.

** Mannheim located it all in the industrial division of labor and bureaucracy.

+ Durkheim emphasizes this point with respect to the guild system and to mercantile capitalism rather than industrial capitalism.

++ Simmel states these phenomena in terms of social relationships as commodity relationships in the urban marketplace under a money economy.

TABLE II
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF WORK STRUCTURES

	Marx	Weber	Veblen	Durkheim	Mannheim	Simmel
Industrial Capitalism	x	*	x		***	x ⁺⁺
Monsterism	x		x ^{**}	x ⁺		
Instrumental Meaning	x		x			
Overcompensation through Ownership and Money	x		x			x ⁺⁺
Industrial Division of Labor	x	*	x	x	x	x
Salesmanship	x		x		x	x
Loss of Autonomy and Mastery of Production	x		x	x	x	
Consumption and Life Style as Overcompensation			x			

TABLE II (continued)

	Marx	Weber	Veblen	Durkheim	Mannheim	Simmel
Industrial Bureaucracy		x	x		x	
Careerism and Self-Rationalization		x			x	
Fetishization of Rules and Loss of Perspective		x	x		x	
Dehumanization		x				

*Weber locates all of these phenomena as a result of industrial bureaucracy not industrial capitalism or the industrial division of labor.

**Veblen sees this in terms of industrial habits of mind and business habits of mind in respective classes. This is especially true, of course, in the concentration of conspicuous consumption, leisure and waste.

***As before, Mannheim locates this in the industrial division of labor and industrial bureaucracy.

⁺Durkheim locates this as a result of the increasing division of labor as well as the development of the guild system and mercantile capitalism.

⁺⁺Simmel locates this in the use of money, ownership and symbols of prestige in the urban marketplace not in industrial capitalism per se.

VII. Conclusion

After having viewed our paradigm and related the basic ideas of the major classical theorists so that paradigm a number of relationships seem to emerge. First, Weber and Marx appear to have almost identical diagnoses of the specific social and psychological consequences of modern work. Marx however treats the origin of these consequences in industrial capitalism and in the irrationality of the market but separately from the industrial division of labor and exclusive of industrial bureaucracy. Weber, while pointing to the same social and psychological consequences locates them primarily in bureaucratic work and treats the generic cause as being that of bureaucratization. He is less sensitive than Marx to the irrationality of the market. On the other hand Weber appears to suggest that the forms of rationality that govern bureaucracy are the generic institutional processes of contemporary western society and that the market rationality (and irrationality) along with the division of labor are only particular forms. One can speculate that Weber, entering the scene at a later date, accepts the diagnosis of the central work characteristics of western society implicit in Marx, but, from a later vantage point, sees that these are not due to capitalism as market relationships but are due to the industrial mode of production.

Veblen, strangely enough, does make the dichotomy between capitalistic market relationships and the industrial mode of production but recognizes there is mutual opposition. But he is aware of both

sets of factors whereas both Marx and Weber select one set of factors and make that set appear to be predominant. In this sense, Veblen seems to have a surer grasp of the process of industrial and economic development in western society than either Weber or Marx.

Mannheim, leans partway between Marx and Weber though, as our paradigm illustrates, more toward the Weberian end of the spectrum than the Marxian. At the same time one must recognize that working within a framework of Marx and Weber, Mannheim develops his own perspective. This is especially true with respect to the concept of self-rationalization and therefore men making themselves over to fit a market whether bureaucratic or capitalistic. Secondly, Mannheim in the distinction between functional and substantial rationality emphasizes the loss of meaning in work due to the contradiction between the inherent rationality of the mode of production and the irrationality of the market. Within bureaucratic structures, in this sense, he combines Marx and Weber.

Simmel represents a totally separate case. He appears to concentrate on urbanism as the major institutional phenomenon. At the same time he recognizes that the market based on the money economy and the division of labor (but not necessarily the industrial division of labor) are central features of urbanism. Simmel appears to derive these aspects of his work from Marx. The fetishism of the commodity becomes the cash nexus and creates a form of monetary rationality, manipulation, and impersonal exploitation intensifying alienation and

estrangement and isolation. It also creates a division of labor expressed by consumption terms in residential classes. Simmel, in general, tends to analyze the social psychological thought based on an urban monetary society and does not concentrate on the qualities of work itself. Nor does he concentrate on the institutions that organize work apart from exchange in the market. At the same time he appears to have generalized a great many of the social psychological processes described in more narrow terms by Marx and Tonnies, thus making them available to others who might have rejected these concepts if they were stated in purely Marxian terms.

Simmel suggests that urbanism both impoverishes and enriches mental life. It provides a wide variety of stimuli for the person to become more individualized. Individualization is also promoted by the emphasis on the intellect and the large amount of freedom offered by the city. However, at the same time, the excessive stimuli create overintellectualization and the shrinking of the primary emotional life of the individual. These aspects of urban life are parallel to alienation but are not necessarily negative.

Durkheim's work appears to be derived from entirely different sources and entirely a different tradition than any of the other classical theorists we have discussed. For him the basic processes are derived from the increase in population density and the development of a complex division of labor. These results in the multiplication of normative systems and the failure of any one normative system to

embrace a total culture of normative action. Individuals are thus left with a plurality of unrelated ad hoc norms which Durkheim called anomie. Anomie is a function of the integration of society not of individuals. It is therefore not alienation. When modern Durkheimians treat anomie as traits of individuals they ignore his major methodological premise.

At the same time individuals are separated from social groups and collectivities which sustain them in any one direction egoistically and individualistically. Men are separated from not only a culture but from society. They are isolated. They develop forms of rationality which however cannot sustain them in their normal social relations. Thus, pathology, suicide, and other forms of anomie emerge. Durkheim's methodological principles did not allow him to examine in detail the individual process of anomic breakdown. As a result, at this level he appears to be weaker than any of the classical theorists of the Germanic tradition. His concentration on normative order, on collective representations (symbolic systems) leads him to neglect, with some exceptions, the specific institutional and organizational features of modern industrial and bureaucratic society. At the same time he does present an image of the normative disorder in western society and the problems entailed in normative disorder. He emphasizes the problems of social isolation, social integration and the failure of our capitalistic, industrial society to provide overall and intervening structures which relate an individual to the society as a

whole. At this level he intersects with Mannheim, Weber and Simmel.

In our subsequent discussion we will keep in mind differences between anomie as a societal attribute and alienation as a process involving individuals and raise the question when necessary as to the extent that one is related to another.

CHAPTER IV

THE POLICY MAKING EXECUTIVE

The Protestant Ethic

By the Protestant Ethic we refer to the doctrines of Lutheranism, Calvinism and later Puritanism with their emphasis on "calling" and "inner worldly asceticism." The idea of a "calling" to any lawful secular vocation or work is attributed to Luther's rejection of the medieval meaning of the term which limited it to the monastery. Luther's attribution of religious dignity to secular work made secular labor as acceptable a way of serving the greater glory of God as going into the monastery.

Calvinism as did Lutheranism posited man as an innately powerless and often wicked creature, who is unable to achieve salvation except by a predetermined grace of God. Luther's God was merciful and kind as well as omnipotent. All one needed to do was to accept and serve him. Psychologically speaking Calvin's God was arbitrary and unknown. Without justification or reason he condemned a significant portion of the population to eternal damnation. At birth, for some unknown prior sin, one might be doomed or among the chosen few. How was one to know if one was saved under this doctrine of

predestination? There was never any concrete proof that one was among the chosen. However if one were to serve the greater glory of God through methodical, unremitting secular labor, with no surcease it was possibly a sign of salvation. Success through increasing God's work, the accumulation of capital was never to be enjoyed for itself, but to increase God's creation, the world itself. There was a strict renunciation of any pleasures of the spirit or flesh. Self-adornment, sensual, emotional or psychic pleasures were not to be enjoyed. Enjoyment was a sign of eternal damnation.

Since personal pleasure was renounced, and the idle hoarding of past profits was a sign of doom, only reinvestment of surplus and profits was permitted. Thus the Protestant Ethic resulted in that emphasis on capital accumulation that made modern industrial capitalism possible.

Among the Puritans in America, especially the middle class and the farmers there developed a total commitment to work the whole day, six days a week. The ethic of Puritanism with its emphasis on "inner worldly asceticism," described above, demanded this methodical and rational way of life in the secular world. For both entrepreneur and worker success or failure served as a means of forecasting one's predetermined fate.

It is this "ethic" of Christian asceticism which Weber maintains is necessary but not sufficient in explaining the development of the "spirit" of modern capitalism in America. The spirit of modern

capitalism is dominated by rational and systematic conduct for the acquisition of capital. It is marked by the sober, not greedy, continual process of reinvestment of acquired capital in a form of enterprise that is calculated to yield capital gain. This in its barest outlines is the classical Weberian proposition concerning the role of Protestant asceticism and the rise of the rational and systematic pursuit of capital based on calling.¹

The Institutionalization of the Protestant Ethic

On his trip to the United States in 1904, Weber noted that in the Yankee states, those who succeeded in business belong to a Baptist, Methodist or other voluntary Protestant sects. Admission to such a sect was bestowed only after an examination of moral worth, balloting and a subsequent probationary period after adult baptism. Admission to a sect guaranteed the moral qualities of the person, especially those related to business scruples. That the sects would only accept someone whose moral conduct was beyond doubt was apparently recognized equally by sect and non-sect members as well. It literally guaranteed the small businessman a local market, free from competition, in his area.

In the Methodist sect for example it was forbidden to argue over prices--fixed prices existed. Trading was not allowed before tariffs had been paid. Rates of interest were charged that were no higher than the law permitted. No borrowing was permitted unless one

was able to pay back. Accumulation of personal wealth was forbidden.²

Membership in a sect was literally a credit line to the sect member. If a sect brother were travelling and met with a financial emergency his membership in the sect guaranteed him the right to claim and receive financial aid from sect brother of means. If a sect member were to get into financial straits through no fault of his own, his affairs were arranged for him and his creditors reassured. Everyday business opportunities could be concluded on the basis of sect membership. Ultimately it guaranteed him burial, but mostly access to credit.

Thus the motivation of the Protestant Ethic became institutionalized in Protestant sects and in small business. It was accomplished because the sects imposed a moral and economic discipline far more rigorous than any "church."

Weber noted that these sect-like associations which once prevailed³ were decaying. Historically Weber viewed them as one of the more important bases of modern American individualism. Essentially confined to the middle classes and farmers these associations acted as vehicles of social mobility into the entrepreneurial middle classes. Another function they served was to maintain and diffuse the capitalist⁴ business ethos among the broad middle class strata.

The typical Yankee businessman was socialized from boyhood on through admittance to a series of exclusive association--from school clubs, genteel college fraternities to businessmen's clubs.

Admission was tantamount to a ticket of success. Failure to gain admission to a club was to be a sort of pariah. Membership was essential no matter what kind. He who did not succeed took the hard road in business life.

Weber maintains that "without the universal diffusion of these qualities and principles of a methodical way of life, qualities which were maintained through these religious communities, capitalism today, even in America would not be what it is." The early capitalist entrepreneurs, specifically Weber mentions, Pierpont Morgan, Jay Gould and John D. Rockefeller formally belonged to these sects especially the Baptists. But Weber shrewdly notes, wielding a double edged sword, they joined to legitimate themselves in their social and personal lives not in their business lives. But these capitalist figures bearing the same motivation as the sect members were present in most eras. They were to become the bearers of the modern spirit of entrepreneurship.

The problem that we seek to examine here is what influence has been left by the founders, at the executive and managerial levels. Has secularization through bureaucratization rendered impotent the Protestant Ethic? If so, to what degree and specifically how has this come about? Is the objective structure of the work of policy making executives an alienating one? Or was the spirit of the founding fathers deeply embedded in the corporate structure? Does the policy making executive feel a sense of "estrangement from his work"? From

himself? If so, what forms of alienation are exhibited? Are they accounted for by the classical theorists or do the contemporary researchers add something to our knowledge of this problem?

We will attempt to examine the structure of work in current studies as did the classical theorists in terms of industrial capitalism, the division of labor and bureaucracy particularly as this is most clearly associated with the secularization of the Protestant Ethic through bureaucratization. We will examine closely the intermediate processes associated with these larger institutional processes. We will be looking for signs and indicators that show an unhappy sense of estrangement, or the person experiencing a loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in his work, and the immediate job situation which structures it. It is the social psychological consequences which ultimately will indicate the extent of alienation from work.

A brief note on the studies selected in the first two sections. The studies chosen are primarily qualitative studies dealing with the American business corporation. They were done in the 1950's through the early 1960's when the issue of "conformity" as defined by Whyte and Riesman had reached its peak in American sociology. Several were done by gifted amateurs who were attempting to describe an entire issue in contemporary American society. If they focused on alienation it grew only out of the larger focus of their work.

The work of Mills, Whyte and Riesman although contemporary is in many senses seminal work in dealing with the problem of alienation

in bureaucratic work. Underwood, Henry, Presthus, Dalton and Bensman provide first-hand work in describing the social-psychological meaning of the executives role. We have tried not to limit ourselves to the data of sociology but have gone wherever there is empirical evidence provided by social scientists dealing with this specific problem. C. Wright Mills once claimed to be "objective but not detached." We may say the same and hope that the picture provided by our data will help us gain a greater understanding of the problem.

The Policy Making Executive as Organization Man

The Organization Man is our starting point in studies of bureaucratic work. Whyte explores two different types of management men at different levels of The Organization--the executive and the non-executive. By "executive" Whyte refers to corporation men who are presidents, vice presidents and middle level managers who have out-
8
stripped their colleagues and are on the way up.

In portraying these men Whyte does not ask whether or not they are alienated. Instead he explores the hypothesis that the executive is a well-rounded man, motivated by cooperation and works less hard than in the rough and tumble days of corporate enterprise. Whyte's conclusion is that the executive is a well-rounded man, intensely driven, exhibiting a large amount of asceticism. He not only accepts but thrives on tension, conflict and competition. In Veblenian terms he exhibits a "trained incapacity" for general thought and life.

In Weberian terms he is an overly specialized "cog." Dewey referred to it as "occupational psychosis" and Merton, who we will deal with in a later chapter, develops this theme at other bureaucratic levels. The irony is that the drives that produce executive neurosis are the same that make him productive. Whyte's portrait of these men is gleaned from interviews with (1) fifty-two company presidents (average age: fifty-five); (2) twenty-three vice presidents (average age: fifty-three); (3) fifty-three middle management men who are "comers" (average age: thirty-seven).

What is their work week like? They work an average of fifty to sixty hours per week. They are in "The Office" about nine and a half hours a day. They work four nights a week: one night for business entertainment; another for conferences; the other two nights they move to their branch office--their homes. There are dictaphones, calculators and much reading of business periodicals and trade reports which if read on office time would be considered loafing. Some do serious phone work calling others at home. Weekend work is also a norm either at home or dropping by the office on Saturday to "tidy up a bit." The five day a week is fiction, and the man who does not "take his problems home with him" is not likely to be promoted.

The Process of Executive Work

This is how executives describe their work.

I'm working harder than I ever have in my life...
The incentive isn't monetary gain. There is much

more than that... I feel I'm part of a crusade making the world a better place in which to live. My usual work week is seventy to eighty hours... I get to the office at 8:30 A.M. and am usually at my desk until 6:00 P.M. There's usually a luncheon conference daily and three nights a week I take home a brief case with reading material and reports. I spend about two hours those nights on the reports. Two nights a week is the average attending local meetings... Every Saturday and Sunday there is a membership conference, an executives conference, a convention, or a union picnic. ¹⁰

Work is dominant in the executive's life. Management appears to be the most vital function in the United States to them. Everything else in their lives appears to be subordinate to work. Nor can they compartmentalize their lives. Leisure, friends, home, play are measured in terms of how well they mesh with work.

I go home thinking about decisions I have to make. I just don't like to sit and think, so I pick up a detective story—something light—and sit there wondering what I'll tell Mike Quill when he says such-and-such or what I'll say at the next fare increasing hearing. In the middle of a rate or a wage fight, I lie awake nights wondering what the hell I'll say next. Sometimes I get up from one wage bargaining session, go home, lie awake thinking until it gets light, and then go back to the bargaining table with only an hour's sleep. ¹¹

There appears to be a psychological mechanism which keeps them occupied with work after hours.

Instead of relaxing at night with a mystery story... I keep at it until eleven o'clock and finally I say to myself, The devil with it, I'm going to have a high-ball or two and go to bed. But I sit there stewing until 12:30 or 1:00. As a result, I am very uncompanionable at breakfast. My wife says I just sit there and dream and maybe she's right. But I do get a kick out of being well informed in business. ¹²

Although it is something of a compulsion with him, this man gets his "kicks" out of work. Another man, a company president, "swore off" work at home much like a heavy drinker goes on the wagon.

I can't read the shortest report...without my mind going into action to plan what to do next. I found this stimulated me so much I just couldn't get to sleep at a reasonable hour. ¹³

But why do they work so hard? They offer two reasons. One is the ego demands it.

People are like springs...The energy you have within you had to come out one way or another. I would really be in bad shape if I didn't work. ¹⁴

A second reason is love.

I dearly love this work. You love only one time and you might as well do something you like. ¹⁵

This man was not referring to his wife. He may have been referring to a deep social psychological need within himself in addition to this work.

In summing up Whyte's executive, thus far, we may say that he cannot distinguish between work and the rest of his life and appears not to be troubled by it. He appears to be the 20th century incarnate of Weber's ascetic capitalist and Veblen's peaceful savage. He is far more ascetic perhaps than the businessman of a half century ago, but less noble than Veblen's peaceful savage. Thus far we have seen no conflict in the executive's work. Does it exist? If so, how?

The Executive's Inner Conflicts

Whyte tells us:

...the aspects of luxury that he talks about most frequently concern things that are organic to his work—good steak dinners, comfortable hotels, good planes and the like. His house will never be a monument, an end in itself. It is purely functional, a place to salve the wounds and store up energy for what's ahead. And that, he knows full well is battle. ¹⁶

The total absorption in and commitment to work as Whyte tells us portrays the American corporate executive as unable to participate in the wider life and enjoy the therapeutic fruits of leisure. The executive "curses the demon" within him "and feels guilty in doing so." If his work is a form of tyranny it is self-imposed tyranny. The inability to enjoy leisure is a minor conflict for the executive. He feels it is something that he should worry about--but has no time. His work is his leisure.

For them real conflict stems from work. The executive is characterized by a fierce desire to control his environment. He does not surrender to domination by the almighty corporate father. He wants to dominate not be dominated. He never becomes a true believer in the organization, but remains suspicious of it. In this sense the executive is an anomaly. Gone are the rough and tumble pioneer days of the corporation. Gone are the buccaneers, the captains of industry and of men who "worked" 18 or 20 hours a day in the old sense of the word. In their place are the committee men of the conference table.

The corporations now want administrators who have mastered the human relations techniques of eliciting group participating, group problem solving and togetherness. They do not "work" but skillfully elicit, moderate and adjust, the work of those who produce. Primarily, the executive is the "balance wheel" on which the corporation becomes a smooth running machine. As Whyte says, 'If the criteria set up by many personnel men were to be applied across the board the majority of corporation executives would be out of a job tomorrow.'¹⁷

Dalton, another present day researcher tells us:

He deals with ambiguity. Though he has defined goals and understood ways of reaching them, he functions only as he fashions new routes that are always out-of-date. Yesterday's guide often fails him in today's contradictions. His indispensable ability is not to act out cut-and-dried precepts, but carry on where there are no precepts. If he is to escape "ulcer gulch," survive as a leader, and protect himself without permanently alienating associates, he must precipitate but channelize crisis, and aptly compromise to preserve the uncompromisable.¹⁸

In short, he lives on the fringes of anomie because he himself does not control the actual work. Avoiding anomie is part of his job and as we will see, he thrives on it, because he is always striving to control his environment. In doing so he is in control of his job situation which is the management and control of the work of others.

The concept of running a corporation is based on the past for Whyte's men. They are "get things done guys." They relish the competitive struggle. Total cooperation via the committee route is not

their style--but it is not foreign to their work. They will cooperate as long as it is seen as a "contributing thing," when it is not, they complain. "Not only must we work hard but we must be well-adjusted sociable fellows as well," they say. The extra-curricular sociability is a major source of tension to them. While the executive may applaud human relations and decentralized authority it is sometimes a cumbersome burden. It degenerates into meaningless ritual which prevents him from "doing the job."

There's too much of this group stuff, but you don't want to be left out... This sort of thing has a sort of velocity. ¹⁹

The executive must act according to the role. He adopts the mask and develops the proper dramaturgy.

The calm eye that never strays from the other's gaze, the easy, controlled laughter, the whole demeanor that tells on lookers, that here certainly is a man without neurosis and inner rumblings. Yet again the drive, the fierce desire to control one's own destiny, cannot help but produce the inner conflicts that the demeanor would deny. ²⁰

So the executive listens as if he is interested. He suggests rather than gives orders. He becomes good at team playing and playing at gregariousness--if he sees it is useful to getting the job done. If he must "sell" his ideas to top people who are uninformed in order to do his job he will. He must portray "an authentic, and icy, bohémie" and "disagree with colleagues professionally without having to dislike ²¹ them personally." Although a drain on his time and an anxiety creator,

the executive sees this as part of his job that must be done. But even if he sees no utility in good fellowship, sociability, etc., he must participate. This is what he detests because it is what produces tension.

One Vice-President said:

It is when you get where I am that you see the difference between the "contributory" and the "noncontributory" aspects of the job. You've got to endure a tremendous amount of noncontributory labor--this talking back and forth, and meetings and so on. The emptiness and the frustration of it can be appalling. But you've got to put up with it, there's no mistake about that, and you just hope that you can keep your eye on the contributory phases which put you on the glory road.²²

This is as realistic and tough minded a statement that exists in the literature on executive work. Another executive sums up the pain of compulsive sociability:

If you count all the time required for cocktails, dinners, conferences, and conventions, there is no end to work. I think any responsible executive these days works practically all the hours he is awake. That's the part that kills you off. You can stand the office hours, but you can't stand the rest.²³

Are these men unhappily alienated from their work selfestranged? Have they lost intrinsic meaning and pride in their work? If they have, it is not evident in the data. Tensions and conflicts that result from compulsive sociability do not appear to dull their appetites for staggering amounts of work. It is something they view as necessary to put up with though it may figuratively or literally kill them.

These intensely driven men appear not to have suffered a loss in the zeal for their work.

Women and Children First?

Whyte tells us that the executive:

...sometimes 30, sometimes as late as 45... feels he has made the irrevocable self-commitment. At this point he is going to feel a loneliness he never felt before. If he has had the toughness of mind to get this far he knows very well that there are going to be constant clashes between himself and his environment, and he knows that he must often face these clashes alone. His home life will be shorter and his wife less and less interested in the struggle. In the midst of the crowd at the office he will be isolated—no longer intimate with the people he has passed but not yet accepted by those he has joined.²⁴

Whyte explains how the executive manages not to compartmentalize work. By doing so, seemingly they avoid unhappy self-estrangement. This is part of the process of organizational socialization. The executive appears not only to have left his parental home but the conjugal bed as well to take the vows of organization life. The executive we quoted before as referring to "the one time he would love" was not referring to his wife but his work. It was no mere slip of the tongue. Executives appear always to be planning and putting off some long term project with their children. Somehow they are too busy to start it. They recognize their failure and care not a little about it. They complain they just don't have the time to build a boat, etc., with their sons. In fact they look forward to the days when the kids will be grown-

up and married--so they can stop feeling guilty about neglecting them.

The executive then appears to have something less than a total ego involvement with his wife and children. What of those he works with who are his subordinates? How does he see and treat them?

Of Subordinates and Superiors

One executive who worked nights at his branch office said:

I do a lot of spot-checking by phone from home...
I have more time then, and besides most people
have their guard down when you phone them at home.

26

The after hours telephone call from a fellow colleague is an executive technique. Just a pleasant chat on something he "just happened to be thinking about." If that won't generate anxiety-producing tensions another personnel executive's office hours technique might.

I sit down with a man with a record of the tests and his vital data in front of me. I am very friendly with him. It is a tense situation, and by increasing the stress I can get him to reveal much more of himself. For example, I will be running down the list and I will read aloud "married seventeen years." Then I will read "children: none." I will let my eyebrows go up just a little and then pause thoughtfully. He is probably very sensitive on this point and in a few minutes he will begin to blurt out something about his wife or himself being sterile, and how maybe they have seen doctors about it. Just at this point I ask him how his sexual relations with his wife are now.

27

Does the personnel executive above see his subordinates as would a warm humanitarian intellectual? He makes possible a potential crisis which could expose the man's worst fears and anxieties and

perhaps lead him to a serious emotional upheaval. At the very least, it is a cruel reminder of a social and personal stigma. This executive did not seem at all concerned about this apparent callousness. He rather appeared to take pride in his technique.

There are few examples of attitudes toward subordinates in Whyte. From these two comments alone we cannot make any conclusive statements. It would appear however there is something less than genuine concern and empathy for subordinates on the part of Whyte's executive.

As we have stated the social psychological effects of this bureaucratically specialized work have been noted by Veblen and Weber in terms of the habits of mind and capacity for general thought. However, Whyte's data also show us that the policy making executive undergoes some conscious remaking of the self--or what Mannheim termed self-rationalization. That these men cannot distinguish work from the rest of their life activities is in part due to the structure of the job and the development of the career. (Other important aspects will be developed later.) Thus Whyte shows us how bureaucratic overspecialization occurs and is an important link to Weber, Veblen and Mannheim, who all discuss this in bureaucratic terms. While Marx never recognized this at the bureaucratic level he recognized monsterism at the level of capitalism. In this sense Weber, Veblen and Mannheim through Whyte show the similarity and relevance of monsterism, which Marx related only to capitalism, to the bureaucratic personality.

The Corporate President-A Profile

The executive is a unique type according to Whyte:

He knows that he can never fully "belong."
The continuity that he seeks in his life is work
that satisfies his drives.²⁸

No better statement can describe the corporate president.

29

Kenneth Underwood's study of top level executives discussed a similar type to Whyte's. He continues in the same mode of organization analysis as Whyte. Underwood develops a model of the executive which is a synthesis of responses from six executives of the president and vice presidents of large corporations. Underwood was able to invite top level business people to a seminar at Wesleyan University to speak to faculty and business students on the "human and moral problems of the executive." From personal interviews and from the public seminars and discussions Underwood combines data discussion and questions which he tells us is representative of executives at this level. He develops a profile analysis of a corporation president, Richard Bishop--which is a pseudonym for the incorporated interviews of six executives in comparable positions. It should be kept in mind that one limitation of this study is that it appears to present the public ideology and self-definition of the executive. However, its major value lies in the hazy area between the public role presentation and the private inner self of the executive.

Richard Bishop is the president of National General Life Insurance Company. The company had brought Bishop to the

presidency because it was steadily losing position and prestige. It was thought that Bishop could discern developments between the life insurance industry and society and could implement constructive action within the corporation to get it moving again.

Bishop's initial statements on religion concern "a lifetime of activity in the Baptist church," whose values and principles are "engrained in one." Bishop is not talking about applying Christian principles to business problems or a moral justification of involvement in business. He is talking about an ascetic methodical way of
30
life.

His work is not a job but a total "way of life." He is dedicated to an "eighty hour week" where leisure and work are not separated. Work includes Saturday executive training sessions and study sessions, and "out-of-town engagements." To be an executive means to give his whole life, full resources and belong to the work and the corporation. Family and others are secondary. The corporate executive is concerned with the policy making and direction of the entire company. The heart of the executive's work is the ability for decision, the act of decision based on reflection. This brings tensions but tension accompanied by "mental richness and psychic drive." If one wishes to avoid these tensions Bishop's advice is:

...then plan your career for a lower level of work characterized not only by high technical specialization but also by simplification and impoverishment... The narrow specialist has settled for, or is only capable of, a kind of gray mediocrity;

he does not face the greatest challenges and toughest problems in society.³¹

Not even Whyte's executive would think of an eighty hour week. There is practically an incapacity for anything but total commitment to work and success.

Underwood tells us that work at the lowest levels of the organization is designed by the policy making executive as "routine and specialized" in character. The jobs at the lower levels are defined and routinized so that the factory worker "feeds" a machine, an office worker "digests" the input and output of a machine. For Bishop this produces a distinction between "free time" and "work." For the policy making executive (as opposed to the middle level manager who supervises the production or sale of goods, under policies made by the executive) the job demands the total person, the total ego, the total imagination. "Work time" is not limited to "desk time" or "the office." His chief characteristic, like Whyte's man is a lack of distinguishing work in the perspective of his entire life. The major sustenance of his life is dedication to the company.

Because there is no total involvement on the lower levels Bishop concludes "that some alienation from work is always present
32
in factory and office." At those levels work is an "obligation" not a way of life. This is as close a statement as there is for specifically testing the effect of planning and control of the work of others and alienation.

The President and His Subordinates

Let us examine Bishop's attitudes towards subordinates.

Thus far there is no reason to believe he is a man alienated from the organization, his work, or himself. He appears to accept "some alienation" as inevitable at the lower organizational levels. But is he alienated from his subordinates? Does he see them as things or objects rather than people? How does he handle their human frailties?

Sometimes the hardest thing that you have to do for a man, but the most responsible thing, is to tell him to seek something else in the way of work...

... When you try to know a man, you don't employ one factor in evaluating him, but you try to see him whole. You desire to see men develop their full potentialities, to get ahead, and you try to recognize people as having problems, the same as you do. Now, so to relate oneself to another person, you can call simply good business, and it is, or you can call it love or the milk of human kindness.³³

This apparently revealing statement indicates a certain humanism behind the carefully developed dramaturgy, the modulated voice, the cultivated sense of humor, the automatic smile, the easy controlled laughter and the subdued dress. There is not only careful calculation and rationality but there appears to be a genuine compassion for others. This may or may not be a public statement expressing a favorable corporate image. Yet as we will see, concern for the man does not interfere with company policy.

There is no mention of a corporate family but Bishop does talk about the stockholders.

We are dealing with the savings of millions of

people. I am impressed by the fact that in so many cases we are dealing with their major savings. So I have a feeling of real responsibility where so much is at stake in our policyholders' families. I must think in terms of our assets, which are over three billion dollars. ³⁴

Bishop again indicates an attitude of responsibility to people--not cases. Unlike Whyte's two Machiavellian executives who check up on "subordinates" at home or apparently delight in torturing prospective employees. Bishop in contrast appears to be a kind man when dealing with his subordinates. After all, he says, "it is good business." Perhaps he has a deep understanding of the human condition, perhaps it is good company policy.

Thus far Whyte and Underwood have given support to the notion expressed in Marx, Weber, Veblen and Mannheim that direct control of work and control of others work helps prevent alienation. We have been unable to show any conclusive proof that executives are unhappy or estranged from their work, the corporation, or themselves. If anything, there appears to be considerable evidence to the contrary. Underwood, like Whyte shows the development of the bureaucratic personality a la Weber, Veblen and Mannheim. He also demonstrates bureaucratic overspecialization or "monsterism" as Marx termed it, in relation to bureaucracy. But we seem to have discovered in our survey of the literature thus far something neither Mannheim, Veblen or Weber foresaw discussing bureaucratic work. The executive seems to enjoy a peculiar inner egoistic delight in doing a staggering amount

of work.

The Psychodynamics of the Executive Role

William Henry's study "The Business Executive: The Psycho-
 35
 dynamics of a Social Role" is a discussion of the personality dynamics
 of high level functionaries in large business corporations. It adds a
 psychological dimension to Whyte and Underwood's analysis of the
 policy maker. The study involved over one hundred business execu-
 tives in various types of corporations. The techniques used were a
 "Thematic Apperception test, a short undirected interview, and a pro-
 jective analysis of a number of traditional personality tests. The
 validity of our analysis, which were done blind, rested upon the coin-
 cidence of identical conclusions from separately analyzed instruments,
 upon surveys of past job performance, and upon the anecdotal summary
 of present job behavior by the executive's superiors and associates." 36

This study is one of the few that attempts to analyze the
 psychodynamics of an occupational role. Henry's executives, like
 Whyte's, are intensely ambitious men. They are characterized by an
 intense desire for achievement. They must "get things done" in order
 to be content. But their need and satisfaction is in doing something--
 the immediate accomplishment of the moment as opposed to completed
 work or prestige derived from the finished work. They are fixed with-
 in the structure and process of work and are continually stimulated
 37
 by the immediate achievement of the moment.

The dynamic, active and striving executive has successfully channelized any hostility and aggressiveness into his work. But his constant movement is compulsive. He is unable to take vacations or enjoy leisure when there are problems to be worked out. Behind the pride in getting things done there is a great anxiety of not really succeeding. In that sense they compulsively try to solve created problems because of fear of failure. The feelings of inferiority appear to be long internalized and given rise to under their present jobs. Their compulsivity appears almost as a dialogue with their inner selves to whom they must continually prove their adequacy and worthiness.

They have a constant mobility drive for continually moving onward and upward. Executives enjoy the nature of their work, and view it as a challenge. From each completed task, if successful, they derive a strong feeling of satisfaction and the competence to continue their upward course.

The executives that Henry studied had a strong sense of self-identity. That is, they know who they are, what they want and where they are going. They have mastered the basic techniques of achieving their goals. Decisiveness, also mentioned by Underwood and Whyte, is another cardinal trait. It is not necessarily the ability of an executive to make clear-cut and competent decisions instantaneously. It is rather the ability to see the interrelations of a problem and organize it in manageable terms. They exercise substantial rationality in working out a decision. It is this ability to be decisive after some

reflection that is absolutely necessary for advancement. As we have seen before, the ability to organize unstructured situations with a degree of certainty is the main work of the executive.

Somewhat grim and humorless, the executive sees himself as a serious, responsible person with little or no time for the aesthetic or for personal introspection. Thus far, Henry's executive appears quite similar to Whyte's and Underwood's man in terms of drive and dedication to work. All appear intensely ambitious and apparently not to be alienated from their work. If anything, they appear to relish it with a certain zeal.

The Corporation as Father Surrogate

Let us see how he sees his supervisors. Whyte and Underwood do not discuss this point. Henry's executive posits authority and his supervisors as "controlling but helpful." In general "he looks to his superiors as persons of more advanced training and experience, whom he can consult on special problems and who issue him guiding directives. He does not see the authorities in his environment as destructive or prohibiting forces." Not coincidentally those who view authority as prohibiting have difficulty relating to their superiors and are unable to work smoothly. The executive is a man who can never go home. He has broken the emotional hold of his parents without resentment and is left psychologically free to make his own decisions. The tie to his mother is clearly broken. The tie to his father "remains

positive in the sense that he sees his father as a helpful but not re-
 40
 straining figure." This is functional in the organizational framework
 where group cooperation and company loyalty are emphasized. The
 slight dependency on a father image and the need to operate within an
 established framework means the executive can operate well within
 the overall framework of the organization with his superiors acting as
 41
 friendly father models.

Robert Presthus characterizes the upwardly mobile, who is
 or is well on the way to being a policy making executive in the follow-
 ing manner:

His most functional value is a deep respect for
 authority. Not only are his interpersonal relations
 characterized by considerable sensitivity to authority...
 but his superiors are viewed as non-threatening models
 for his own conduct. Meanwhile his subordinates are
 regarded with considerable detachment which permits
 "universalistic" decisions that meet organizational as
 opposed to individual needs. 42

Similar to Henry's executives, Presthus tells us that they tend
 to identify with, and develop personal attachment to their superiors,
 who become symbols of present and future achievement.

Subordinates: Doers of Work and Proteges

How does he see his subordinates? While Whyte and
 Underwood give us contrasting views, Henry's executives are mixed
 in their responses. To his superiors he is very responsive as we
 have seen. Concerning his subordinates Henry tells us that the

executive sees them:

...in a detached and impersonal way, seeing them as "doers of work," rather than as people. He treats them impersonally, with no real feeling of being akin to them or having deep interest in them as persons. It is as though he viewed his subordinates as representatives of things he has left behind, both factually and emotionally. Still uncertain of his next forward step, he cannot afford to become personally identified or emotionally involved with the past. The only direction of his emotional energy that is real to him is upward and toward the symbols of that upward interest, his superiors.⁴³

But the rub is that the executive identifies with some of his subordinates and may treat them in a quasi paternalistic manner.

This does not mean that he is cold and that he treats all subordinates casually. In fact he tends to be generally sympathetic with many of them. This element of sympathy...is most apparent when the subordinate shows personality traits that are most like those of the superior. Thus the superior is able to take pride in certain successful young persons without...feeling an equal interest in all subordinates.⁴⁴

In sum, the executive is impersonal although not cold; views his subordinates as "things" and "doers" of work though sympathetic and prideful of those who resemble him.

Following the classical theorists analysis we ask if Henry's executives are unhappily estranged from their work, the organization or themselves. This is a delicate question. They appear to respond favorably to their work, have immense loyalty to the organization and don't seem self-estranged. But one wonders whether it is the intrinsic meaning of their work. These men seem to enjoy their own inner response to their work. Their satisfaction appears to be in their own

preoccupation to work rather than the work itself. This is a new dimension in part explained by Henry. Thus Henry and Presthus add a social psychological dimension to the work of Underwood and Whyte. In doing so they explain the social psychological mechanism underlying social character, i.e., compulsion, total ego involvement, the corporation as family surrogate and intense driving ambition. These were not recognized by the classical theorists, nor dealt with except by Mannheim. At this point we must turn to several other empirical studies of the same tradition but which are more analytical than Whyte, Underwood and Henry on this problem; one of which is of critical importance in understanding the policy making executive.

The Narcissistic Attitude

Bensman helps to clarify this issue in his own study of the
 45
 advertising man. He joins together the classical and contemporary theoretical traditions as well as the social psychological traditions in his analysis. In that sense he adds a dimension that neither group fully developed. Bensman's study is based on participant observation in a large advertising agency over a ten year period while he was a director of consumer research. While his focus is on no one executive he gives us a composite picture of the advertising man. Bensman claims there is a unique personality which is either attracted to advertising, or if not, is created by the total structure of the advertising agency, if one remains long enough in the field.

The account executive's job in particular is characterized by anxiety, pressure, and the senselessness of work. Thousands of dollars and man hours become invested in the best way to market beer, spaghetti, toilet paper, etc. Men spend their lives becoming experts in marketing breakfast cereals and find themselves out of work when the client withdraws the account. Unemployment is potentially around the corner if a jingle or ad does not sell. Men's lives and careers are built on the success of selling marginally differentiated products. These careers are frequently ended by coronaries, ulcers, and nervous breakdowns. Bensman's haunting question seems to be, for what?

The chief characteristic of the executive, says Bensman, is that despite the anxiety, the pressure, the senselessness of work, the executive not only gets the job done but thrives on it as well!

For the difficulties, the pressure, the politics and manipulation, the irrationality, the powerlessness, and the isolation all constitute a challenge to one's manhood. The challenge is "to be crushed or survive." The answer the advertising man gives is: "Throw everything you can at me—work, pressure, senselessness—and somehow I will lick you and force you to throw even more work at me. Each victory will make me more able to survive new challenges, since my nerve and toughness will be greater and my skills will have been tested in more encounters." The response is a Promethean challenge to the gods and the fates.⁴⁶

It is the response to his inner attitude which excites the advertising executive (especially the account executive). In literary terms, says Bensman, this attitude is called Faustian; in psychological terms, narcissism. It literally means that one is more concerned

with one's response to one's self in work than the work itself.

The narcissistic individual, even in the midst of the most difficult work and pressure, keeps an area of his own consciousness detached from his work. He becomes his own observer, checking on himself and commenting on his performance, as he manipulates himself and others. He works in a frenzy, and praises or condemns himself as he does so. In the sense that the detached observer in him robs him of the capacity to feel anything spontaneously, none of his feelings are "genuine." Even if he acts or speaks spontaneously, the narcissistic observer makes an ironic or detached analytical commentary on the action, saying, "Nicely done, boy," or "You'll have to do better the next time." The driving ambition of the narcissist, then, is to win the plaudits of his own inner cheering stand.⁴⁷

We are able to say that the executives described in other studies appear to be narcissists. The decision making and policy improvising nature of the work cause them to resemble in some ways the free wheeling captains of industry who forged their own frontiers prior to full scale bureaucratization. They did not operate within the organizational frameworks other than the one's they created. For these men the ultimate idea of authority was located within themselves. Authority was not delegated while teamwork and cooperation were foreign ideas. Highly narcissistic people find it difficult to work with
48
a framework established by others. The executives we have studied are all characterized by both an ability to cooperate with others in order to promote the overall policy of a company and a high degree of independent thought. The only time they "chafe at the bit" is when they see overcooperation and oversocializing as not contributing to

getting the job done.

However, we do believe, as Bensman says that narcissism can be linked with any kind of work. He tells us it is likely to be found in the creative and performing arts and politics where there is some sort of public performance. "It is also likely to be found to be found to a high degree in other industries where occupational strains and stresses are similar to those of advertising. These include public relations, the mass media, management consulting, and the upper levels of all large-scale organizations."

49

"You Promote the Guy Who Takes His Problem Home With Him"

In his now classic article, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Robert K. Merton describes the effects of the social structure and of the bureaucratic form of organization on those operatives at the lower levels. Briefly, though we will deal with the clerk in another chapter, Merton emphasizes the rigidity, conformity, and a fetishism of the means, rules, and regulations. But he raises theoretical questions which concern the substantive level we are dealing with here.

To what extent are particular personality types selected and modified by the various bureaucracies (private enterprise, public service, the quasi-legal political machine, religious orders)? Inasmuch as ascendancy and submission are held to be traits of personality...do bureaucracies select personalities of particularly submissive or ascendant tendencies...does participation in bureaucratic office tend to increase ascendant tendencies?...Do various systems of recruitment...select different personality types?

Does promotion...lessen competitive anxieties and enhance administrative efficiency?...Is there a tendency for differential association to be especially marked among bureaucrats? 50

We would suggest that the work of Bensman, Whyte, Underwood and Henry appears to substantiate some theoretical questions raised by Merton. Specifically, that the upper levels of large scale organization attract and/or create a specific type of social character.

Robert Presthus goes as far as to suggest a model by which the corporation systematically promotes to its upper echelons, those who are loyal to and identify with the corporation.

...This ability to identify strongly with the system is highly productive in personal terms since it qualifies the upwardly mobile for the organization's major rewards... The organization qua organization has meaning for him, evoking loyalty, affirmation and a constant point of reference. Having accepted its legitimacy and rationality, he can act on the basis of its value premise. The capacity for identification has great strategic value...because social power is rather evenly divided among competing groups. This condition sharpens the organization's conflicts with competitors and puts a premium on loyalty and certainty among its members. The organization tends to resemble a church, which needs champions to endorse its values and to increase its survival power. No dissenters need apply. The demand is for conformity. 51

C. Wright Mills briefly discusses the social character of top level executives: The men at the top of the managerial cadre are formally responsible to the stockholders.

...they are men who have things done for them... they are always in line with the aims of the employer or other higher ups; the ends of the organization become their private ends. For they are selected by and

act for the owners...as safe and sound men... carefully held within the feasible and calculable lines of the laid-out career. That is why they are at the top and that is the point to be made about them; they are cautiously selected to represent the formal interest of the enterprise and its organizational integrity: they serve that organization and, in doing so, they serve their own personal interests. 52

After Presthus' analysis, Mills appears to almost be calling them high priced hacks.

Mills would agree with Presthus, Bensman, and Henry that a particular type of man is drawn to the top management positions. But Mills' analysis is less inhibited than Presthus'. It is Bensman who affords us the most penetrating insight into this level of work in his unique analysis of the narcissistic personality. In this sense he is the most important link in joining the classical theoretical tradition with its limitations to the tradition of the contemporary sociological and social psychological researchers with its limitations. Bensman combines both. Any understanding of this level of bureaucratic work is incomplete without reference to his work.

The pioneer work of Whyte, Underwood, Henry, Bensman, Dalton, Presthus, Merton and Mills tells us that the men at the top of American business corporations have a capacity for staggering amounts of work. They appear to be intensely driven men who cannot separate their total lives from their work. Their attitude might be called narcissistic but regardless they appear to represent a unique social character. There is some evidence that the American corporate

structure systematically promotes this social type to its upper echelons.

We have examined this form of bureaucratic work, as the data would permit us, in terms of how the executive views the process of his work, his subordinates and superiors and his own reaction to his work. We have some evidence that when work consists of the detailed planning of work for others and when one is psychologically in control of his job situation that a sense of alienation and estrangement from work, the organization and one's self does not occur.

If these men are estranged from their work it is not in the data. We have not proven conclusively that these men find intrinsic meaning and pride in their work. We have apparently discovered that they respond more to themselves than to the intrinsic meaning of their work. Since narcissism can be attached to any form of work it may be ~~impossible~~ to make a meaningful distinction between the two. These men are apparently not at all alienated from their work but not necessarily because they find intrinsic meaning and pride in it. Rather they appear to be narcissists drawn to this work, in part, because of their narcissism or become narcissistic because they remained at their jobs over a period of time. It is in this sense that we go beyond the question about alienation and work as posited by the classical theorists. They did not and probably could not have foreseen the development of the executive as a particular social character. The policy making executive is a true child of bureaucratic growth in 20th

century corporate America. Just as the classical theorists did not foresee this it appears that it will no longer be possible for those outside the corridors of the organization to naively assume that those at the top view themselves as alienated from their work.

Classical Theories of Executive Work

Quite obviously something has happened to change the Protestant Ethic. Whether there has been a decline or a change due to the bureaucratization of work cannot be specified with any degree of accuracy from our data. Moreover, the policy making executive appears, while he continues to work, as hard as the Puritan. He is not reacting to either the Protestant Ethic or its decline. He may be reacting to other factors which we will now discuss.

Analyzing these studies in terms of questions raised by the classical theorists several considerations become apparent. Of the major factors determining the immediate structures and conditions for work, the research studies do not focus upon industrial capitalism, especially the market mechanism, in any immediate or specific way. If anything, industrial capitalism and the market mechanism are assumed by the authors, but are not broken down into specific factors which can be discussed. Instead the authors focus implicitly upon bureaucracy and the bureaucratic and industrial division of labor.

The industrial division of labor and industrial bureaucracy strongly effect this type of work. The immediate conditions of work

created by the division of labor for the policy making executive are (1) narrow specialization, and (2) the almost total emphasis on intellectual labor. The immediate conditions of work created by bureaucracy primarily center around (1) the office and the career as a total way of life, and (2) the extreme organizational rationality and specialization inherent in the career and job which center around the decision making process. Weber's analysis of bureaucracy as an ideal type emphasized the rationality, the specialization and the concept of the bureaucratic career. While he mentioned little of the industrial division of labor he located the same phenomena in bureaucracy. Veblen focused primarily on rationality and specialization and mentioned little of the career except in terms of the predatory motives of the businessman and the technical competence of the engineer. Mannheim's work strongly emphasizes the forms of bureaucratic rationality and specialization. He emphasizes career mobility achieved through self-rationalization even more strongly than did Weber. Weber emphasized the "self-rationalization" of the Protestant in his image of Benjamin Franklin and of the Cromwellian "Men of Honor." Marx, Durkheim and Simmel all recognized the narrow specialization of the industrial division of labor. Marx recognized the separation of intellectual and physical labor. But none placed it in the bureaucratic context.

Only three psychological consequences as postulated in our paradigm, seem to have occurred for the policy making executive and these are discussed by Veblen, Mannheim and Weber, and peculiarly

by Marx. They are the results of (1) overspecialization, (2) careerism, and (3) the meanings found in work.

The emphasis on rationality and specialization seems to have created to some extent a "trained incapacity" for general thought and life.

As leaders of organizations they transcend the narrow specialization of the division of labor within organizations but in doing so they become creatures of the organization, and the organizational mentality frames their entire thought and life. These men cannot distinguish work from other areas of their life. But they don't seem to suffer the effects of such "rationality." Because they are at the top or near the top their very jobs demand a large degree of substantial rationality. What Marx termed "monsterism" Weber and Veblen and Mannheim recognize at the bureaucratic level--and monsterism was not a product of capitalism. Ironically in the case of policy makers "monsterism" does not appear to create alienation from work.

As members of the organizational elite they mediate between the organization, the society, and especially, financial markets. They relate to other bureaucracies and deal with the effects of general business conditions on the products they have to sell. They, specifically as leaders of the organization, are subject to the vagaries of the market, and whatever anxieties may or may not be produced by this exposure. The fact that this aspect is not discussed by our empirical researchers may be less a criticism of Marx than it is the insensitivity

of the researchers to the issue. As leaders of large scale corporations business executives may be protected from the market, but we doubt it. Market planning appears to be a major function of the executive. At times of relative prosperity the market mechanism may not appear to be a cause of problems. Yet if we assume that a market mechanism is always operative, we should ask how the market effects the policy making executives everyday work, his life chances and any anxiety it may produce. We cannot assess the importance of these questions independently of the studies and by implication cannot see to what degree this area of response would validate or invalidate Marx's emphasis on the market. We would assume that they are of primary importance, but were overlooked by the empirical researchers.

The research studies focused on the more specific internal problems related to the bureaucratization of business whether in fact the researchers were explicitly aware of the relevance of Weber, Mannheim and Veblen to their work.

Mannheim more clearly than the others is applicable in specifying the change the executive undergoes both consciously and unconsciously in the course of his career. The making over of the social character during a period of time to suit the organization is described as self-rationalization. Yet our data indicate that many of the social psychological traits were present or latent in the character make-up of the executive prior to achievement of their ultimate positions and were nurtured by the organization. None of the postulated social

psychological results of the division of labor, i.e., salesmanship, loss of autonomy, isolation, powerlessness and life style as a form of compensation are reported upon and there is no evidence that these executives are alienated from their work. Not even overcompensation or instrumental meaning as discussed by Marx appear to be evidenced in these social psychological characteristics. The policy making executives revel in their own work and their inner response to it. They "love" their work and get "kicks" from it. Yet this seems to be due to the very nature of their work and perhaps more to their inner response to it.

The type of social character which the contemporary theorists and researchers, Bensman, Merton, Presthus and Mills describe help to more fully explain what the classical theorists cannot totally explain nor can Whyte, Underwood and Henry. What these researchers have added to our knowledge of bureaucratic work is the following. A particular type of social character may systematically be recruited to certain levels of bureaucracy. If the person stays in the job long enough the social character will develop, or the executive will not rise to a position that requires the new social character.

Weberian analysis and by implication its extension in Mannheim's work with respect to societal institutions creating the types of social character needed, particularly in bureaucracy, would appear to be more applicable, specifically to this type of work, than Marxian analysis. These executives are not monsters in the Marxian

sense. They are created by bureaucracy and a bureaucratized society, not the factory system under industrial capitalism.

The classical theorists, in part, are able to account for the development of a particular type of social character in a bureaucratic career. Yet they cannot account for nor did they foresee that a particular type of social character with these latent characteristics might be systematically recruited to these bureaucratic positions. Perhaps the questions the classical theorists didn't ask are: Would a fully bureaucratized society create a social character necessary to bureaucratic dominance? Would that social character be effective in creating new elites at the upper echelons of the society? Given the fact that there are variations in character types produced in a bureaucratic society, what mechanism within a bureaucratic structure operate so that different character types reach different levels in the structure? These are questions that were raised by Merton. The work we have cited has advanced a great deal over the classical theorists in isolating bureaucratic personality types and specifically mechanisms by which such types are in part created and disturbed in work organization. But none of the works thus far have been able to explain why certain types rise to certain positions in invariant ways. These are some of the questions that should be answered if we are to understand the meaning of work at the highest levels of organizations in a fully bureaucratized society.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.

² Weber, "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 302-323. There is a large amount of work on the Puritan influence in America as it is related to Protestant secularization. One excellent source is Milton Yinger, Religion in the Struggle for Power (Durham, N. C.; Duke University Press, 1946)

³ Weber, "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism," pp. 313-319.

⁴ Ibid., p. 308

⁵ Ibid., pp. 310-311.

⁶ Ibid., p. 309.

⁷ Ibid., p. 308.

⁸ William H. Whyte, The Organization Man (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1957), p. 57.

⁹ Ibid., p. 158.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 160.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 161.

¹² Ibid., p. 163.

¹³
Ibid.

¹⁴
Ibid., p. 160.

¹⁵
Ibid., p. 162.

¹⁶
Ibid., p. 165.

¹⁷
Ibid., p. 155.

¹⁸
Melville Dalton, Men Who Manage (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959), p. 164.

¹⁹
Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 170.

²⁰
Ibid., p. 172.

²¹
Ibid., p. 169, see footnote specifically.

²²
Ibid.

²³
Ibid., p. 170.

²⁴
Ibid., p. 174.

²⁵
Ibid., pp. 162, 421-434.

²⁶
Ibid., p. 158.

²⁷
Ibid., pp. 206-207.

²⁸
Ibid., p. 182.

²⁹
Kenneth Underwood, "On the Pinnacles of Power - The Business Executive," The Human Shape of Work ed. by Peter L. Berger (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 181-210.

³⁰
Ibid., p. 186.

³¹
Ibid., p. 191. Underwood tells us that Bishop refers to his work as a game. However he provides no direct questions. We do not wish to explore this issue because it is a Pandora's Box that would take at least a chapter. We only wish to point out that it exists and a full perspective does not yet exist in the literature. Also see Dalton, op. cit., pp. 164-167.

³²
Ibid., p. 192.

³³
Ibid., pp. 196-197.

³⁴
Ibid., p. 203.

³⁵
William E. Henry, "The Business Executive: The Psychodynamics of a Social Role," Personality and Social Life, ed. by Robert Endleman (New York: Random House, 1967), pp. 354-361.

³⁶
Ibid., p. 355.

³⁷
Ibid., p. 356.

³⁸
Split vacations are a sensitizing index to amounts of tension and pressure see Whyte, The Organization Man, pp. 177-178 and Dalton, op. cit., pp. 235-236.

³⁹
Henry, op. cit., p. 356.

⁴⁰
Ibid., p. 360.

⁴¹
Ibid., p. 361.

⁴²
Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), pp. 203-204.

⁴³
Henry, op. cit., p. 360.

44
Ibid.

45
Joseph Bensman, Dollars and Sense (New York: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 41-51.

46
Ibid., p. 47.

47
Ibid., p. 48.

48
Henry, op. cit., pp. 357-361.

49
Bensman, op. cit., p. 50.

50
Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 205-206. Harold Lasswell develops this point in the political arena see Power and Personality (New York: Viking Press, 1948).

51
Presthus, op. cit., p. 168.

52
C. Wright Mills, White Collar (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 92-93.

53
See Philip Slater "On Social Regression," American Sociological Review, Vol. 23 (June, 1963), 339-364. Slater makes this point but not in relation to occupations. It is apparent that Bensman and Slater derive it from the Freudian concept of secondary narcissism. The original concept is expressed by Dilthey in the idea of the Faustian Man.

CHAPTER V

MANAGERS - NON POLICY MAKING EXECUTIVES

The Harvard economist, Joseph Schumpeter in an economic analysis of capitalism, socialism and democracy wrote that there was no economic reason why capitalism could not endure. He predicted the system could last fifty to a hundred more years. But addressing himself to the question of whether capitalism would survive, Schumpeter flatly stated he thought not. Briefly summarized his position is as follows:¹

Schumpeter compared capitalism to a knights jousting tournament. Such a tournament had flair and excitement. Business under advanced capitalism did not. It was dull, routinized and drab! For capitalism to survive, Schumpeter thought, entrepreneurs would have to behave like knights or pioneers. The old capitalists were bold, daring adventurous men who were willing to risk fortunes on expansion and on creating new empires, etc. But these strong old "lions" were disappearing with the increase in industrial bureaucratization. Increasingly they were surrounded by and replaced by rational, personal bureaucratic managers. Far from being bold and daring these men were complacent with their relatively large salaries and more concerned

with status, consumption and security than amassing fortunes. Like policy making executives their jobs are also a direct result of bureaucratic development.

In addition the depression had exposed the sacrosanct "business of America is business" ideology to the merciless glare of rationality. The once sacred bastions of "business" were assailed not only by the intellectuals, but by the doubts of the working class. The "idols of consumption" had already started to replace the "idols of production."² Capitalism, thought Schumpeter, would merely fade away like those old "lions," not with a roar, but with barely a whimper.

Schumpeter in a sense, is the American translator of Weber. His vision of the evaporation of the spirit of capitalism in American business as influenced by the Protestant sects is Weberian. The haunting spectre of an increasingly rationalized, bureaucratized world, where men would become "cogs" or "specialists without spirit,"³ "sensualists without heart," Schumpeter says has arrived. It has marched in with the career bureaucrats--the Organization Men.

A decade after Schumpeter's thesis, David Riesman and William H. Whyte whose work we have partially examined, were to send a shock of recognition through the general public with their highly recognizable "other-directed" and "organization men." Riesman, in a sense is the heir of Weber as he traces the change in American social character from "inner" to "other-directed." Whyte, more the heir of Schumpeter, shows us that at the middle levels of American

corporations the manager, a new type of social character, has taken over.

In this section we will present the work of David Riesman, William H. Whyte and C. Wright Mills. Each has done important work in describing the occupational position of middle level managers. These are the men who implement the policy made by the executives above them. They must coordinate the work of others below them, i. e., sales, production, clerical, etc. The modern managers are different than their predecessors. They do not growl, bully, threaten or fire their subordinates. Instead they adopt "personnel methods" and attempt to manipulate those they supervise. In short they are in a structural position where they have to use others instrumentally by making themselves into instruments. Here we see the relevance of Mannheim and Weber. Personality becomes their stock in trade. It is this aspect upon which we will focus. Our assumption might be that when work consists largely of the manipulation of others, using one's personality as an instrument, one will suffer a loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work. This point as we have indicated derives from Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization, and is stressed by Mills in White Collar.

The Lonely Crowd at Work

Riesman's "data" are derived primarily from interviews. That is all he says, there are no references to depth, focus, etc. He

also makes use of movies, popular magazines, popular novels, radio programs (TV was not yet widespread), cookbooks and children's games. While he uses the concept of mass culture, Riesman weaves this into an overall framework based upon classical sociology. His classical sources appear to be Veblen, Marx, Durkheim, Tocqueville, Simmel, Freud and Fromm.

Riesman, as researcher, develops the following thesis⁴ about the changing American social character. We have moved from a social type that is described as "inner-directed" to one described as "other-directed." The inner-directed person has internalized, from childhood, a strong set of values and goals. He knows who he is, what he wants and is kept on course by an internal "gyroscope" inculcated by his parents and other parental surrogates. A sense of guilt is the predominant control of his behavior.

If the inner-directed person listens to the internalized voices of his parents the other-directed person uses a radar-like sensitivity to pick up subtle cues and hints from his peers. The other-directed has no strongly internalized goals, values or ideals. In a moral sense he is personally anomic but manages to keep on course by use of his sensitivity. His chief emotional responses are anxiety and shame--not guilt. Shame is based upon the fear of ridicule, guilt on deeply internalized values. The other-directed type, says Riesman, is rapidly becoming the dominant type of the new middle classes in larger American cities, i.e., New York, Los Angeles, Cincinnati, etc.

In terms of work the new middle classes are the bureaucrats, the salaried professionals, managers and other white collar employees. In contrast the old middle classes were bankers, small merchants and the technical engineers. The crucial aspect which concerns us is that work has changed from an emphasis on production to one of consumption.⁵ There is also less of an emphasis, according to Riesman, on what a group produces than on its morale.⁶

Two Meanings of Work

The inner-directed man who may have been imbued with the asceticism of Weber's "Protestant Ethic," according to Riesman,⁷ saw his work in terms of things not people. Viewing Riesman's study from the standpoint of his conception of work (though work is not the manifest focus of his study) under the Protestant Ethic was experienced in terms of certain technological and objective processes and not particularly group cooperation. The other-directed person views work in terms of personnel. People are more than the sum of their workmanlike skills and qualities. They have emotions, irrational in terms of their work which prevent them from working effectively. The inner-directed person saw no need for human relations skills. It was all taken care of somehow by Adam Smith's wonderful "invisible hand." One needed inner discipline, and a bent toward worldly asceticism. Riesman tells us that more attention was focused on products and business decisions than people. Moreover there was concern with the

product itself not the problems of marketing. The fetishism of commodities had not yet begun.⁸

The other directed administrator is not expected to be grim, stoic and humorless about work. Rather he is expected to enjoy the sociability and the amenities that accompany management status. These amenities and forms of sociability appear to be intrinsic parts of his work. Business and pleasure are combined in extended lunch hours, conventions, etc. Much office time is spent in varying forms of sociability. Gossiping becomes a conference, kibbitzing secretaries becomes "morale building" and so on. Riesman symbolizes this change by the phrase "from the bank account to the expense account."⁹

The other-directed think in terms of a career where they will find the respect and affection of an amorphous group of contemporaries. Not seeking fame or riches they seek a middle level plateau Riesman calls "The Milky Way." As we will see Whyte expresses a similar idea but calls it "The Plateau." The uncertainty of the world and their own anxiety does not make for a commitment to long range goals. What they want is a middle level, secure position among not quite distinguishable colleagues. Hopefully it will offer relatively high status and pecuniary reward. Here they will compete for marginal differentiation on the Milky Way. They need no long range goals. They are built into the organization, and the other directed man seeks security in its shadow.¹⁰

Not all find the Milky Way. Some escape to the upper executive levels. As Riesman says:

...depleting the expense account can serve as an almost limitless occupational therapy for men who, out of a tradition of hard work, a dislike of their wives, a lingering asceticism, and an anxiety about their antagonistic co-operators, still feel that they must put in a good day's work at the office.

11

Fear not, Riesman tells us, these men are few in number, the majority are bland fellows with no great ambitions.

Captains of Consumption - Personalized Glad Handlers

The inner-directed Captains of Industry who found challenge by living on the interstices of established economic frontiers appear to have all but been replaced by the Captains of Consumption. These terms are Veblenian in style and spirit though they are Riesman's. Riesman has, of course, written an extended essay on Veblen. The forcefulness, if not ruthlessness, of the early Rockefeller's, Morgan's, and Gould's, has been replaced by managerial statesmanship based upon personnel techniques or upon public relations. Increasingly, managers are less concerned with what a group produces than its morale.

12

Riesman entertains no romanticism about the old inner directed Puritans finding meaning in their ascetic work. The chief obstacle to autonomy in work, as Riesman sees it, is what he terms false personalization. The sociability demanded in work, Riesman

claims, is neither free nor sociable.¹³ Riesman focuses on false personalization as the main problem in work because it sums up the character of the other directed individual. While he does not discuss the meaning of false personalization in depth, its meaning is not left ambiguous.¹⁴

Riesman's new men of power are the White Collar managers not policy making executives. They are production supervisors or "people pushers," a term coined by Robert Lynd. The old inner directed manager never "saw" his secretary. Perhaps a benevolent form of paternalism bridged the social distance between the two. The other directed manager "is compelled to personalize his relations with the office force whether he wants to or not because he is part of a system that has sold the white collar class as a whole on the superior values of personalization."¹⁵ Personalization even when not deliberately exploitative is false because it becomes compulsory. "It is a mandate to manipulation and self-manipulation for those in the white collar ranks and above."¹⁶

While Riesman is not explicit in what he means by false personalization, he does tell us that increasingly the product of work appears to be a pleasing but marginally differentiated personality. As with soap or toilet paper the difference lies primarily in the illusion created by the packaging not in the requisite qualities or skills. Erich Fromm's "marketing orientation"¹⁷ appears to have been a prime source

for Riesman in developing this concept. Karl Mannheim, however, using the term self-rationalization was the first sociologist to use the concept.

The Marketable Personality

The marketing orientation refers to the "personality market." Personality "packages" are offered for sale as commodities complete with brand name and label. Similar to the commodity, exchange value not use value is emphasized. Success depends on how nice a "package" the personality presents. Is he "cheerful," "stable," "well rounded," "ambitious," "reliable," "hostile," "broad-gaged," "aggressive," etc. Modern man experiences himself as both seller and commodity to be sold. His self-esteem depends on how successful he is in marketing the product. Self-evaluation and self-esteem are based on successful selling or lack of it. Helplessness, anxiety, and insecurity are the results of any marketing setback. This feeling of the self is explained in Fromm's terms as:

I am what I do...man encounters his own powers as commodities alienated from him. He is not one with them but they are masked from him because what matters is not his self-realization...but his success in the process of selling them. Both his powers and what they create become estranged, something different from himself, something for others to judge and to use; thus his feeling of identity becomes as shaky as his self-esteem; it is constituted by the sum total of roles one can play: "I am as you desire me."...

...The way one experiences others is not different from the way one experiences oneself.

Others are experienced as commodities like oneself; they too do not present themselves but their salable part. 18

This is a distinctly modern phenomenon. For those who aspire upward, the corporation is the vehicle of mobility. To fit in, one's ability to play the expected role becomes decisive. This concept derives directly from Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization.

The "marketing orientation" consists of a form of self-inventory. An inventory is made; assets and liabilities are assessed. New habits replace old ones. The proper dramaturgy is learned; smile, modulated voice, controlled laughter, warmth, spontaneity and interest are simulated. Residence and spouse are chosen with care as are magazines, books, clothing, line of conversation, political ideology and automobile. Nothing less than a "social lobotomy" occurs in this process of self-reorganization. This is exactly what Mannheim termed "self-rationalization."

Self-Rationalization in Work

By self-rationalization Mannheim specifically refers to the systemic control over one's "impulses" in accordance with a life plan or life goal. This far reaching control is found in work and outside of work as men attempt to "fit" themselves to bureaucratic job markets.

Modern society attains perhaps its highest stage of functional rationalization in its administrative staff, in which the individuals who take part not only

have their specific actions prescribed...but in addition have their life plan to a large extent imposed in the form of a "career" in which the individual stages are specified in advance. Concern with a career requires a maximum of self-mastery since it involves not only the actual processes of work but also the prescriptive regulation both of ideas and feelings that one is permitted to have and of one's leisure time. 19

In short men remake themselves, both consciously and unconsciously, in all socially visible areas of their lives. The career of a bureaucrat means more than a commitment to work. It means a style of life. One wears the proper clothing to the office; adapts the "right" line of conversation; reads the "right" journals; marries the "right" woman; lives in the "right" neighborhood; and learns impecably how to simulate warmth, spontaniety and sincerity. As practiced by bureaucrats this is what constitutes much of adult socialization.

For Riesman then false personalization becomes a problem for the manager because of almost limitless demands made on him for compulsive sociability, warm interest and emotional involvement with his peers and subordinates. Women in white collar jobs, for reasons which we will deal with in a later chapter, often weave their unmet emotional needs into the superstructure of the office. 20 The far reaching effect of false personalization, in the office or factory, on these women, is described by Riesman.

For many white collar workers...false personalization is the only personalizing that they meet... Work, when it has these overtones for people, still remains real, important, and magnetic. This was

one lure that during the last war drew many women of the middle and lower middle classes into the factories...despite poor working conditions, inadequate transportation, and pressure from spouses. Escaping from domestic lives of extreme privatization, they were willing, even eager, to accept the most monotonous seeming jobs.²¹

What of the personalizing manager. Is he alienated from his work? Is he self-estranged? Part of his job of personalizing is to demonstrate sincerity. It is one of the qualities by which a retail store manager may gain a following. Success is not defined only in terms of money but also by a personal following. Said one man, "You got to be able to talk to the customers...when a customer comes in you can turn her one way or the other...the customers can tell if you're sincere."²²

The managers try to become morale boosters. He may try to develop feelings of harmony between management, workers, and work processes because management ideology cannot conceive of high production without high morale. It is also a device, says Riesman, to keep him busy. If he were to think he might realize how dispensable he really is. He clings to the cherished myths of scarcity and indispensability because to be considered surplus is too frightening. He has a vested interest in believing that he is the guiding hand that keeps the department going. The very nature of false personalization is to conceal that the manager may not be as important as he might appear.²³

For Riesman a high degree of false personalization is a

problem in work. Overpersonalization causes a drain on emotions
 24
 and an increase in anxiety. Too much emotional energy is invested in
 false personalization making "nervousness" the predominant character-
 istic of the manager. This overpersonalization of the manager does
 not allow him to invest energy in creative work. He creates a social
 ritual out of work. Another psychic hazard of false personalization
 rests in the character mask it forces upon the user of its techniques.

He ends up being what he plays, and his mask
 becomes perhaps the inescapable reality of his
 style of life...

Some inner directed people can do this: they
 simply do not see the others as people, or as
 highly differentiated and complicated people.
 But the other directed managers, professionals,
 and white collar workers cannot so easily sepa-
 rate coercive friendliness on the job from a
 spontaneous expression of genuine friendliness
 off the job. 25

Autonomy Versus Alienation

For Riesman, the problem is not alienation from work but
 rather a lack of autonomy in work. By lack of autonomy in work he
 means the draining of energy into false personalization. Energy that
 might otherwise be used for productivity. He concludes:

...people's real "work"—the field into which,
 on the basis of their character and their gifts,
 they would like to throw their emotional and
 creative energies—cannot now conceivably coin-
 cide, perhaps in the majority of cases, with what
 they get paid for doing. 26

Only one manager in an interview gave any evidence of

inner turmoil concerning his job. After he described how he was becoming more tolerant and appreciative of labor leaders he blurted out "I need a psychoanalyst."²⁷ We may only speculate, many others might be or are led to a similar conclusion upon similar introspection.

Riesman's distinction between autonomy and alienation opens new areas and questions. All of the structured conditions are present which would indicate these men should be unhappily alienated or estranged from their work and themselves. Yet in their own terms they do not lack intrinsic meaning or pride in their work. If we accept what work means to the manager in his own terms we can only say that there appears to be no conclusive evidence that they are alienated from their jobs, despite the prevalence of false personalization. And it would certainly seem that false personalization infers self-estrangement. Whether they are alienated or estranged in their work remains a moot question.

The Organization Man at Work

Whyte's organization men are "management men" as distinguished from "executives." They are the "middle management" trainees and junior executives who are not policy makers--but "people pushers."²⁸ Only a brief description of the manager is given by Whyte.

In the old sense of work, he does not work; he encourages others to work. He does not create; he moderates and adjusts those ~~who do create~~. "Primarily he is the balance wheel on the tendency of the professional-type individual to wander into new, unexplored and perhaps dangerous territory."²⁹

As a group they are younger and more optimistic than the executive. They believe in the organization and have taken the vows of corporate life--in a word they are the "true believers" in the organization.

Whyte uses interview data as his prime source. His source of data are young executive trainees and junior executives. He does not state who they are, how many, or by what companies they are employed. He also wrote to 150 personnel directors and an equal number of corporate presidents asking them to state what type of men they wanted in their organization. He described an administrative type schooled in human relations and a pioneering type unafraid to test new procedures, or make unorthodox decisions. This is combined with Whyte's general knowledge derived from his career as an editor of Fortune magazine. One limit appears to be that Whyte knows less about their actual jobs than the philosophy of what a corporate manager should do.

These organization men are ambitious but not overly so. They want to be successful--but not too successful. They cannot convince themselves that work is the most important thing in their lives. They want to be more relaxed, spend more time with the family, maybe later on become interested in the "cultural" things like music, reading, etc. They collectively want a reasonably high position--but not out on a limb. This level, or Plateau, as they call it, is "in the middle levels--well not exactly middle, a little higher than that--and the

work furthermore can be just as fulfilling." They want "success without tears"--or ulcers.³⁰

It is not that they lack ambition, Whyte tells us, it is that they are ambitious in a different way. Their goals are no longer concrete but fluid. They no longer speak of "earning a million" or becoming president of a corporation. Ambition is relative to the group. Their goals are to be similar to other bright young men on the way up--not to surpass them.³¹

The ambition of the young managers is based less on fatalism than optimism. They believe that the organization wants to make use of their best qualities, just as they do. They therefore do not see the system as something to be bucked. Cooperate with it, be loyal, do a good job and the organization will be good to you. It's just plain, good business. There is no need for goals, since the organization, amorphous, large and secure provides them.³²

If the older "executives" have fallen to skepticism or cynicism Whyte tells us the young men on the way up have none. The organization, good and big, is their future--they are sure of this. And why should they think otherwise says Whyte.

Corporations have been expanding at a great rate, and the effect has been a large-scale deferral of dead ends and pigeonholes for thousands of organization men. With so many new departments, divisions, and plants being opened up, many a young man of average ability has been propelled upward so early--and so pleasantly--that he can hardly be blamed if he thinks the momentum is a constant.³³

And it is they think--all one must do is get off at the Plateau.

Management Not Work

If Whyte's executive retains some of the asceticism of the Protestant Ethic, the manager lives by the Social Ethic. The Social Ethic in effect legitimizes the pressures of the organization against the individual. It suggests the group is the source of creativity; man's ultimate need is to "belong"; through the application of science, belongingness may be achieved. In effect Whyte argues the Social Ethic does for the organization what the asceticism stressed by the Protestant Ethic once did for the captains of 19th century American industry. ³⁴

Here in Whyte's paraphrase is the "job" of the Organization Man:

The rough and tumble days are over. Since the job is to keep things going...the leader must be the professional manager, "the man who knows how to elicit participative consultation, how to motivate groups and individuals, how to enhance job satisfactions...how to conduct problem-solving meetings." He will be a generalist who will not think in terms of specific work but in the science of making other people work. ³⁵

Personnel managers not only omit words like "drive," "vigor," "dynamic," "aggressive" and "imaginative" in letters describing the type of recruits they want, they warn against them. They want men who have the "leadership" qualities to elicit orthodox decisions. One president said:

We used to look primarily for brilliance...
 Now...we don't care if you're a Phi Beta Kappa
 or a Tau Beta Phi. We want a well-rounded
 person who can handle other well-rounded people.³⁶

Basically ideas and decisions come from the group, the well-rounded man mediates the ideas of others and does not allow his judgment to interfere. He is supposed to allow the group to arrive at a democratic group decision. He can do this because he has been trained to deal with the techniques of problem solving and how change should occur. Let the "captive screwballs" he hires find solutions to the problems of the corporation. He, the non-partisan mediator, will do the rest, including "keeping in check" the screwballs. No dissenters or geniuses need apply for administrative positions. A Steinmetz³⁷ would be hopelessly antisocial, they say. What they want is a good team player.

What do they really think about their work privately? Are they unhappily self-estranged, do they have pride, or find intrinsic meaning in their work?

Their "work" is committee work.

For a young man on the make there is no better vehicle than the conference way... via the conference he can expose himself to all sorts of superiors across the line of command. Given minimum committeeman-ship skills, by an adroit question here and a modest suggestion there, he can call attention to himself and still play the game.³⁸

They also recognize some of the wastemanship of the committee way, but they defend it.

But this sort of thing, they say, is the heart of the organization man's job, not merely the disadvantages of it. "Any man who feels frustrated by these things," one young trainee with face unlined said... "can never be an executive." ³⁹

This is seen as contributing--to advancing one's career advancement. After hours entertaining afforded by the expense account is also seen as contributing to the same end. One young manager said of it:

You take this business of entertaining... You have to go through all that stuff for ten years or so, but then you can chuck it. It's like running for the President of the United States; during the campaign you have to do a lot of things you might not like, but when you get to be President that's all over with. ⁴⁰

This junior executive just quoted may be an exception to the rule. Most junior executives, says Whyte, find the high life afforded ⁴¹ by the expense account very welcome.

They are well aware of "the rat race," "ulcer gulch," and "crack-up city," as the way of life for the older executives. That is why they seek the Plateau. They know that the organization demands a certain amount of conformity and "as a matter of fact, half their ⁴² energies are devoted to finding out the right pattern to conform to." It is a necessary fact of life until they get off at the Plateau and are able to do what they please.

So they play the game. The more broad-gage and "well-rounded" they appear the quicker and easier they will reach the Plateau.

"As soon as you know your way around a new department you start telephoning," one trainee explains, tapping the intercommunication telephone directory. "Believe me, this little green book here is a man's best friend..." "I or anybody else," another trainee says, "can walk into a manager's office just as easily as we can each other's. By ten o'clock of the day I hit the New York office I was calling everybody by his first name."⁴³

Manipulation? No--the company encourages it, says

Whyte.

Are these men alienated from their work, the organization or themselves? There certainly seems no substantial evidence for it, if alienation is defined as being aware of one's condition and unhappy about it. Is there a lack of intrinsic meaning or pride? Whyte tells us of the 'game-like' quality of their work. They want their superiors to pat them on the head and promote them along with their peers. Alienated from others? They hardly seem so. Alienated from subordinates? Except for the "captive screwballs" there are no subordinates in Whyte's description of the organizational world. There are only superiors--executives on top and junior executives on the way up, and happy peers. No one else seems present. Are they self-estranged? Perhaps they systematically control their own needs and desires and hide their "real" inner selves. That might be true if there were any evidence these men have inner lives, or even impulses. There appears to be none. They appear more to be merry psychopaths instead of unhappy, alienated, estranged creatures.

But what of their ambition to reach the Plateau? It would seem that their careers are subordinate to that alone. Not so, says Whyte. They accept the benign corporate way of life, they expect to work hard and "want to work hard...the good, equable life is paramount and they see no conflict between enjoying it and getting ahead."⁴⁴ What they are and what they want appears to be what the organization wants and demands. But here is the rub says Whyte, "he'll never get promoted unless he is something of a rate buster, and rate busters can't park on the Plateau. The antagonistic cooperation, to use David Riesman's phrase, must continue."⁴⁵ Whyte goes further than Mannheim in describing the habits of mind and the specific type of social character embedded in the latter's¹ concept of self-rationalization. In effect he locates an entire social stratum of self-rationalization bureaucrats. If anything he establishes an institutional base for men whose work is most conducive to self-rationalization. Whyte in effect locates the "need" for rationalization in The Organization and thus appears to validate Schumpeter's thesis.

The Managerial Demiurge

Viewing Mills' conception of work though it is not the primary focus of White Collar his description falls heavily on the side of the Marxian interpretation. In a bitter and savage attack on bureaucratic work Mills portrays the various levels of white collar work in the organization. Mills distinguishes between two major levels of

bureaucratic work. At the bottom are the salespeople and the clerks who work in the vast "salesrooms" of corporate enterprise. Behind them stand the enormous office file and calculating machines. At the top Mills finds the "new entrepreneurs," the "bureaucratic fixers,"⁴⁶ and the managers. One of Mills' primary points is that the white collar people are the new middle classes. This as we shall see is important and in the historical development of self-rationalization.

Mills, not generally known as a methodologist, employs personnel manuals, interviews, novels, labor statistics and fragmentary studies. In one section of White Collar he appears to have used as a prime source the Labor Economics staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. (White Collar Workers: The Problems of Definition, unpublished.) Mills also used 128 "intensive interviews" with white collar workers. He draws upon his own field work experience, particularly a survey of United Automobile Workers, C.I.O. in Detroit (1947). He also draws upon many of his own previous publications. White Collar, perhaps Mills' most splendid achievement, is the culmination of many years work, thought and knowledge little of which was "systematic" as that term is now understood.

Mills essentially is a social critic not a scientist. He finds evidence wherever his own personal bent takes him. But this should not detract from Mills' achievement. It should rather show that methodology is primarily a process of thought, and not a ritualistic formula.

In the suggestive phrase "the managerial demiurge" Mills

describes the transformation of private American business from ownership to management. Mills' theme is that bureaucracies are self-creating and self-perpetuating systems of organized irresponsibility. As administrative tasks become larger the number of managers and their importance in relation to ownership increases proportionately.

Mills is somewhat sketchy in delineating a hierarchy of managers. He is more precise in expanding on the nature of management and the ideology of managers. He sees those at the "top" and those at the middle levels. He dismisses top level executives briefly as the carefully chosen servants of the stockholders.

Standing between the workers and top managers and owners are the middle managers who in Mills' words:

... can plan only limited spheres of work; they transmit orders from above, executing some with their staffs and passing others to those below for execution... their skills have become less and less material techniques and more and more the management of people... While engineers take over the maintenance of the plant's new machinery, the middle managers and foremen take on more "personnel" controls over the workers, looking more often to the personnel office than the engineering headquarters.⁴⁷

What exactly does a middle level manager do? What techniques does he employ? Mills tells us of the vanishing foreman who used to be a work guide and craftsman. Now he is more of a personnel manager.

The foreman must use his personality as a means of evoking discipline and loyalty. Again we see the notion of self-rationalization. Here are some of the qualifications needed for the job:

...a loyal leader embodying managerially approved opinions...the foreman is chosen for his skillfulness in handling personnel - rather than...mastery of the particular operation in his charge...Getting along with people is 80 percent of the modern foreman's job...The prime requisite is a rounded, well-adjusted personality.

48

And here is some helpful advice on how to do the job perhaps from a personnel manual:

...foreman must "always be the same" in their relations with people...The essential quality of friendliness is sincerity...They should memorize, from the personnel records, the following about all the members of their department: first name; if married, whether husband or wife works in the plant; approximate ages and school grades of children...etc." From local newspapers "he will learn such valuable items as: accidents; births; deaths; children's activities; participation in the Red Cross; Y. M. C. A....wedding anniversaries; parties; recitals..." The manner of speech of the foreman during even a minor conversation is perhaps more important than what he says...Good listening habits are a must...He should fine himself 10 cents for every fall from grace...He needs a pleasant, clear voice[*(test recordings are recommended)*]...The words "definitely" and "absolutely" are taboo.

49

By not "bossing them" but "manipulating their experience," management relaxes its authoritative manner and appears more democratic. There is an image of solidarity between top management and middle management given off by the use of similar techniques. The

object is to create loyalty, enthusiasm and morale among the "cheerful robots." To do this these new Machiavellians, as Mills calls them, sell their smiles, gestures, and kindness. It becomes an impersonal means of earning one's livelihood.⁵⁰

Nowhere is the ideology of impersonal manipulation more flagrantly exposed than by Mills. The bold statements that "people are personnel"--even robots to be manipulated into being cheerful and smiling certainly indicates these managers are alienated from their subordinates.

Mills, like Whyte, shows the predominance of self-rationalization in managerial work. Yet Mills' work has more frightening implications than Whyte's because managers are increasingly becoming the new middle classes. Riesman assumes that the middle classes are becoming increasingly other directed. Mills then gives even more support to Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization and Schumpeter's new class of managers by combining elements that are separate in the arguments of Riesman and Whyte. But how does it feel to be one of these middle managers? Mills simulates the following inner dialogue:

Servants of Decision Makers

You carry authority, but you are not its source... you are on view from above,... you are seen from below, perhaps as a tool. You are the cog and the beltline of the bureaucratic machinery itself; you are a link in the chains of commands, persuasions, notices, bills, which bind together the men who make decisions and the men who make things;... But your authority is confined strictly within a prescribed orbit of occupational actions, and such

power: as you wield is a borrowed thing. Yours is the subordinate's mark, yours the canned talk. The money you handle is somebody else's money; the papers you sort and shuffle already bear somebody else's marks. You are the servant of decision, the assistant of authority, the minion of management.

51

Ambivalent recognition of power appears to be central to the manager's feeling. He is a central and key figure. He controls those below but his job situation is not under his direct control for he is controlled from above. Nowhere is there evidence of guilt, remorse, self-hatred or a desire to do anything but simulate warmth and interest. Nowhere in Mills' entire discussion of the managers is there any evidence or discussion that these people are estranged from their work because they find no pride or meaning in it. At worst they are aware of feelings of relative powerlessness in terms of their policy making superiors. However they see themselves in almost total control of those below them. This may be some form of compensation in their avoiding alienation. They are apparently in sufficient control of their jobs and find enough intrinsic meaning in planning and coordinating the work of subordinates. If these men are unhappily alienated, estranged or self-estranged from their work it is not clearly evident in the data Mills supplies.

We may conclude from Mills, Whyte and Riesman that work at the managerial level is different than at the executive level. The manager's job consists more of implementing policy than making it. Work largely consists of organizing the work of others rather than

actual production. To accomplish this end the manager must make an instrument of himself through false personalization and a market orientation in order to manipulate his subordinates. Rather than complain about this managers appear to accept it as a necessary part of their job. They see others, particularly subordinates, as things and objects to be manipulated.

Whyte and Riesman picture the manager as seeking a satisfactory plateau in the organization where work alone will not monopolize their lives. They do not appear to mind that final decisions are not theirs alone. Only Mills hints that this is frustrating for some. Yet it appears that their work still allows them some control over their job situation. They believe that they run the job not vice versa. Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization is in part validated by Mills' use of it. This seminal idea is documented in detail by Whyte, Riesman and Mills. As a result we know how this process works in more subtle ways, institutionalized processes and mechanisms than the classical theorists could have known. It is Mannheim who makes it possible for contemporary theorists to use classical theory.

It is obviously his concept of self-rationalization that is the outstanding characteristic of managers as reported in our empirical studies. But he also intensifies the Weberian emphasis on the development of the career of the bureaucrat and emphasizes the social psychological dimension more than did Weber. His work also indicates that Weber and Veblen's emphasis on the bureaucratization of work

and its implications for the development of specific types of social character and habits of mind are excellent guides to understanding managerial work. No other classical theorist emphasized the motivation of men to make themselves over to correspond to the demands of "the system." It is in this sense that Mannheim through Weber adds an indispensable guide to the understanding of modern bureaucratic work.

It would appear that when work consists of the detailed planning of the work of others, a loss of intrinsic meaning or pride is not likely to occur. We are not saying that the absence of substantial evidence proves these men are not alienated from their work. If they are, it just is not evident in the data presented by the researchers. If we are to accept this we must explain why in the face of some contrary evidence, these men react the way they do yet appear not to be alienated from their work.

Executives in these studies do not appear to be unhappily alienated, estranged or self-estranged from their work. The top level executives appear to be narcissistic but this is not the case for the middle level managers. What then? Are they moral psychopaths without conscience, or are they blind? The answer appears to be neither. Such an answer appears to lie in the very nature of bureaucratic work.

"The essence of bureaucratic work," says Presthus, "is the replacement of individual control by the control of the work process."⁵² Just as responsibility for work becomes diffuse so does control of work.

By changing the conditions of work, bureaucratic structure has tended to change the character of work... There is... less inducement for individual work... Reward is found not in the intrinsic value of work, but in hierarchial roles of coordination which become valued as organizations become larger... those in such roles often control valued by-products of work such as income, recognition, and so on... 53

Mills, Henry and Whyte have already shown us that policy making executives are intensely ambitious men who are afraid of failure. 54 They struggle hard to succeed and control the bureaucratic jungle that is their environment. In some senses the key to understanding the policy making executive and the manager is their belief in control over the job despite the structural tendency of the organization to minimize it.

The manager lives within the boundaries of institutionalized schizophrenia. He must be able to show marked enmity and friendship 55 toward the same people and not be unaware of the contradiction. The quasi "schizophrenic" relations can be seen in these requirements:

To sit through endless meetings; to consider gravely the opinions and suggestions of subordinates who neither know nor can be told that... discussion is really beside the point; to endure the often pointless discussions into which committees often degenerate; to give way gracefully on small things; to suppress dislike and irritation; to treat unequals equally; to seriously propose... programs, most of which are sure to be still-born; to waste ruthlessly the time of others in an effort to legitimate one's role of coordination; to discuss every issue at the level of principle, meanwhile keeping an eye on its implications for

one's power and perquisites; to weigh proposals both in terms of their substantive rationality and in terms of the influence of those who propose them; to see progress and hope where neither exist... 56

To this job the manager brings his peculiar capacity for action despite ambiguity and contradiction. Such a mind will tolerate ambiguity--but only long enough to make sense out of it. To live with ambiguity is one thing if it is controllable. But to have uncontrollable ambiguity appears to be intolerable. Perhaps they control the ambiguity by an ability to think of problems abstractly, separate them into components, view their possible effects and remain impersonal while deeply involved in the very problem.

The structural position of their job demands that they manage and coordinate people who have the technical knowledge they do not possess but who do the actual work. In this sense they live on the very fringes of anomie.

This is a point inferred by Melville Dalton, another empirical researcher. Dalton's work is essentially a study of management practices in several large scale industrial firms. Specifically it is concerned with the gap between official and unofficial ways of everyday bureaucratic management. His study is heavily focused on the unofficial or subrosa practices of managers and how the official and unofficial are integral aspects of bureaucracy. It is Dalton's premise that the impersonal mechanistic framework of bureaucracy is at odds with personalizing emotional human beings. The unofficial world of

bureaucracy consists of an intricate, often experimental maze of informal deals--relations between officials that are ever shifting and changing with new personal goals or losses or gains in power and prestige. In short, the executive must accept and attempt to deal with functional and ethical ambiguities in his everyday work. Anomie as experienced by the manager means:

He deals with ambiguity. Though he has defined goals and understood ways of reaching them, he functions only as he fashions new routes that are always out-of-date. Yesterday's guide often fails him in today's contradictions. His indispensable ability is not to act out cut-and-dried precepts, but to carry on where there are no precepts. If he is to escape "ulcer gulch," survive as a leader, and protect himself without permanently alienating associates, he must precipitate but channelize crisis, and aptly compromise to preserve the uncompromisable. 57

In short, anomie as they experience it is a challenge. They thrive on it and perhaps love it or they perish. The policy maker, as we have shown experiences anomie in a different manner--and thrives less on it.

This is what Dalton calls "the paradox of coerced freedom." He defines it as "the freedom to choose, alternative courses of action, to create new means, official or not, for winning ends, and to devise ways of appearing to conform when practice forbids it." 58 He even suggests the type of social character driven to such work.

This is precisely what Whyte's executive meant when he stated "The ideal is to be an individualist privately and a conformist

publicly"⁵⁹--if one can get away with it.

Freedom, as Fromm noted, is frightening. Those in whom it inspires fear appear to become "rule bound" and fixated on procedures.⁶⁰ Dalton speaks of one such manager who refused to actively participate in the formal meetings that act as a stage or front for apparently aimless and hidden battles.

I just set and listen. You know a damn sight better than to say anything. You're licked before you go in a meeting. If you speak up and make a complaint, you'll have to prove it and you'll make a dozen guys sore. If you make a suggestion there'll be a dozen guys against it because it'll bother them some way or show up their dodges. I'd rather just keep my mouth shut and draw my pay.⁶¹

Seeing little hope in controlling the situation this manager surrenders. The problem, claims Dalton, "is less one of the individual being himself than it is of his being free to show himself as he is."⁶²

Visible conformity does not mean total conformity. Middle level management appears to offer coerced freedom which is conducive to the talents and abilities of the tacticians, the foxes, the wheeler dealers and the Machiavellians. They accept the ambiguity and refuse to surrender. It is no wonder they appear not to be unhappily self-estranged from their work--they somehow manage to control their jobs and manipulating the work of others.

It is the paradox and tyranny of bureaucratic work that one group escapes alienation and finds freedom in work by controlling the

work of others. We would call this overcompensation. By blinding oneself to the tyranny of the group, the executive manages to avoid confronting those aspects of his behavior which would appear to indicate alienation. This has frightening implications in a bureaucratic society where the historical trend indicates this type of social character has become increasingly predominant.

Classical Theories of Managerial Work

In examining the structure and meaning of the managers work according to the classical theorists it is apparent that all three major western institutions in our paradigm are applicable in varying degrees in explaining the paradoxical behavior of the non-policy making executive. Industrial capitalism is important insofar as the managers job was created by the growth of industrial capitalism creating the need for technical people to manage the work of others while policy making and monetary decision were carried out by different people. It is in this sense that Schumpeter is important. Thus, the immediate condition of everyday work created for the manager by industrial capitalism is that he becomes an intermediary between policy makers, technicians and operators.

The policy making executive isolates the manager (except sales, marketing and advertising managers) from the operation of the market. The managers described in our studies appear to have little awareness of the market. Their job is the skillful management or

exploitation of those beneath them within the corporate hierarchy. Of the classical theorists only Marx and Veblen stressed this aspect of capitalism. Weber's ideal typical view of capitalism did not permit him to see it. However, he did see it quite clearly at the level of bureaucracy.

The industrial division of labor in this case creates two immediate conditions: (1) the separation of intellectual labor from the physical, and (2) narrow specialization. Again the former is recognized by Marx and Veblen. Durkheim appears aware of it to a small degree. The narrow specialization is recognized by all of the theorists. The structure of industrial or bureaucratic employment is based on narrow specialization.

Generally we define specialization in terms of technology and almost all of the classical theorists did so. The manager is a different kind of specialist than usually understood by the term. They are not technical specialists in terms of technical skills, rather they are bureaucratic and political specialists. In one sense they are generalists with regard to their ignorance of technical work but they are specialists in terms of bureaucratic procedure and manipulation of others.

The nature of industrial bureaucracy makes all of the objective characteristics of bureaucratic work personal issues in one's career. One's place in the hierarchy is paramount; rationality and impersonality are central to the office. The office is marginal, but

loyalty to the bureaucracy is paramount to one's mobility.

The social psychological consequences for the manager follow directly from his immediate structural conditions of work. However, only two or possibly three in our paradigm appear to be of major importance. As stated earlier, capitalism, the division of labor and bureaucracy, create monsterism. Marx, Veblen and Durkheim attribute this condition to capitalism. Marx, Weber, Veblen and Mannheim attribute monsterism to the division of labor caused by bureaucracy. Overspecialization appears to be a requirement for work in advanced industrial societies.

One social psychological consequence of the division of labor stands out in empirical studies. It is the lack of autonomy. The manager is marginally located between policy makers and operatives. He is hand maiden to those above and an apparent master of those below. He is powerless in reference to his bosses and exercises immediate power over his subordinates. Marx, Veblen, Durkheim and Mannheim recognized the phenomena of powerlessness. However, they seem not to have recognized that it could exist simultaneously with possession of power at other levels.

Marx, in his discussion of alienation of the capitalist from himself and others, implies an alienation "at the top." Veblen in emphasizing the pecuniary mode of life and habits of thought of the businessman implied an alienation from the habits of thought of the industrial craftsman, of the engineer, the technological manager and

"industrial institutions."

Weber recognized this implicitly at the bureaucratic level. It seems to be part of the general process of dehumanization throughout bureaucratic hierarchy. It occurs, in addition, in the notion of advancement of one's career implicitly at the expense of others. Careerism and self-rationalization go side by side. The latter particularly is important to the manager. He must make an instrument of himself in order to use others successfully and manipulate them.

Thus the classical theorists can explain the manager's position as an intermediate managerial specialist who suffers some powerlessness and makes a tool of himself in order to manipulate others. However, this does not explain and is contradictory to our theoretical assumption that where these conditions exist alienation from work should be present. It appears that they should be alienated and estranged from their work. There is, as we have pointed out, no evidence for this in the "empirical" studies. There is a good bit of evidence that they are at least ambivalent about finding intrinsic interests in their work. Interest may be only in the coordination of hierarchical roles. There is strong evidence from Whyte and Riesman that they are self-estranged--but they appear not to be aware of it. If anything, they appear to enjoy their state.

Again, as with the policy making executive, we find a confusing situation. Here we can offer only two suggestions as to why they do not appear to be alienated despite their objective situations.

The first, as pointed out by Dalton, is that they appear to live on the fringes of a quasi anomic work world. By this we mean there is a lack of clarity or an absence of norms in everyday work situations in their jobs. This may perhaps be a characteristic of the level of bureaucratic work. Whyte, Riesman and Mills' work strongly indicate this. It may be this freedom which offers the challenge to them and perhaps where their intrinsic interest lies. The office may create the ability to live with this type of anomie or it may systematically attract that type of social character. Any strong evidence of the latter is lacking. Here we see the importance of Durkheim's concept of anomie, but in a way that Durkheim did not intend. Instead of producing phenomena similar to alienation these mild forms of institutionalized anomie help to mitigate alienation and integrate the person with the job.

Second, the manager appears to compensate for his lack of power by almost total control over his subordinates. This is compensation of a sort which is not explicitly discussed by the classical theorists. The powerlessness also may be compensated by the belief in the corporation and the life style and identity which it offers in this case. In any case their lack of powerlessness is offset by other compensations.

The classical theorists may or may not have envisioned this aspect of compensation. Weber and Mannheim offered slight clues but the contemporary researchers fully illuminated it. It is

their direct contribution to our knowledge in this area. There is one question explicitly raised by Mannheim and in a sense by Schumpeter but not dealt with by the contemporary researchers. The question raised is: to what degree are the managers acting self-consciously and deliberately in manipulating themselves and their organizational system? The opposite question can also be raised: to what degree are these men the passive (but not unwilling) victims of the development of large scale bureaucracy and total societal bureaucratization? In other words, to what extent is a habit of mind a by-product of a particular social structure, to what extent does it imply "intentionality" and self-consciousness?

Riesman and Whyte implicitly treat managers as "victims" while Mills implies self-conscious awareness and intention. It is even possible to raise the same questions about policy making executives although the idea has not been developed in the literature.

Regardless, Riesman, Whyte and Mills do not focus upon these questions nor do they answer them, but this should not detract from the overall quality of their work. In all cases the questions they raised, were not directly concerned with alienation from work. Their methods of research, involving the interview, their preconceptions and interests may not have allowed them to find alienation even if they were looking for it. Their achievement might never have been possible were they looking for only direct evidence of alienation from work. Historically we may never be able to answer this question with any degree of

accuracy about these "hard-eyed men of the fifties."⁶⁴ However, that a new generation of bureaucrats will develop is a certainty. These questions may be more applicable for them particularly what effects, if any, have the prior generations of bureaucrats had on current ones. Do they accept the organization and become its willing self-conscious tool, or do they reject it--moreover, can they reject it? If they do reject it, an interesting question is, how did they manage to rise in the organizational structure? However, it should be realized these questions are merely speculative as there are no new researchers in this tradition at present. We may therefore be content with what we know--which is the validation of the frightening predictions made by Weber and Schumpeter at the beginning of this century. Much of industrial society, as we know it, has come to be populated by bureaucrats.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Joseph Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (New York: Harper & Row, 1950).

² Leo Lowenthal, "Historical Perspectives of Popular Culture," Mass Culture, ed. by Bernard Rosenberg and David M. White (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 46-59.

³ Weber prefigures this in his discussion of the Protestant sects in America.

⁴ David Riesman, Nathan Glaser and Reuel Denney, The Lonely Crowd (Abridged edition; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1953).

⁵ Ibid., pp. 30-36.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 83-85.

⁷ Ibid., pp. 33, 135, 137.

⁸ Ibid., p. 136.

⁹ Ibid., p. 161.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 165-166.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 162.

¹² Ibid., p. 289.

¹³ Ibid., p. 162.

¹⁴ The origins of this term by Riesman are primarily derived from Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization--also through Marx and Simmel in terms of the commercialization of market relationships. Veblen contributes the idea of salesmanship and Merton's concept of pseudo Gemeinschaft and Mills' concept of the same in mass society are also similar.

¹⁵ Riesman, Glaser and Denney, op. cit., p. 303.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Eric Fromm, Man for Himself, (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1966), pp. 75-89.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 80-81.

¹⁹ Mannheim, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, pp. 55-56.

²⁰ Riesman, Glaser and Denney, op. cit., p. 304.

²¹ Ibid., p. 310.

²² Ibid., p. 224.

²³ Ibid., pp. 306-308.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 312.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 259, 305.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 314.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 154.

²⁸ A term first used by the Lynd's then adapted by Bensman.

²⁹ Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 149.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 145.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 144, 176-177. Also William H. Whyte, "The Wives of Management," Man, Work and Society ed. by Sigmund Nosow and William Form (New York: Basic Books, 1962), pp. 551-552.

³² Whyte, The Organization Man, pp. 143-145.

³³ Ibid., p. 144.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 149.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 150.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 152.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 168.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 145-146.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 171.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 170.

⁴² Ibid., p. 171.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 137-138.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 146.

- ⁴⁵ Whyte, "The Wives of Management," p. 552.
- ⁴⁶ Mills, White Collar (see Introduction and chap. IV to IX).
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 86.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 90.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 90-91.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. xvii, 224-238.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., p. 80.
- ⁵² Presthus, The Organizational Society, p. 238.
- ⁵³ Ibid., p. 195.
- ⁵⁴ For a further discussion of the ambitions and drives of managers in general see Presthus, op. cit., pp. 175-179 and Dalton, Men Who Manage, p. 166.
- ⁵⁵ See Tom Burns, "Friends, Enemies and Polite Fiction," American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (December, 1953), 659-660 and Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 169.
- ⁵⁶ Presthus, op. cit., pp. 190-191, also see Dalton, op. cit., p. 227.
- ⁵⁷ Dalton, op. cit., p. 164. See pp. 164-167 for Dalton's theory of the habits of mind of the specific type of social character successful at the work.
- ⁵⁸ Dalton, op. cit., p. 243.
- ⁵⁹ Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 172, also see Dalton, op. cit., p. 244.

⁶⁰ Dalton, op. cit., pp. 227-228, 244.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 228. See footnote.

⁶² Ibid., p. 272.

⁶³ In a still developing economic and socio-political form of analysis John K. Galbraith, The New Industrial State (New York: The New American Library, 1968), Noam Chomsky, American Power and the New Mandarins, (New York: Vintage, 1969), and Milovan Djilas, The New Class (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957), deal with a new strata of technical bureaucrats termed respectively "technocrats," "mandarins" and the "new class." All three, Djilas in particular, are in the Veblenian tradition in that they posit the technician or technical bureaucrat vs. the political managers instead of business men. None imply conflict between the two, again these specific questions are not raised, because of the difficult problem originally posed by the researchers. Also see Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1959). He discusses the work of Djilas as well as James Burnham. In addition he also discusses the work of three European sociologists: Theodor Geiger, Fritz Croner and Karl Renner who applied terms to this new generation of bureaucrats. Geiger--the "new middle class," "experts" or simply "bureaucrats." Croner similarly labels them the "new middle class." Renner terms them the "service class." See also David Granick, The Red Executive (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1961) for an analysis of the Soviet manager. Also see Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills "A Marx for Managers," Reader in Bureaucracy ed. by Robert K. Merton et. al. (New York: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 165-178 for one of the earliest and most poignant discussions of this topic.

⁶⁴ This is a term occasionally used by Peter Hamill in his daily column in The New York Post.

CHAPTER VI

ADVERTISING AND MASS MEDIA OCCUPATIONS

The advertising and mass media industry in America employs thousands of creative professional people in various organizational capacities. There are three studies in this field which supply not only continuity but a structural analysis of the industry and a social psychological description of what work means to those employed in this field as well as an indication of the type of social character in advertising. Two of these studies are based on at least ten years of participant observation. The third is in part a study of commercial artists.

The first of these studies focuses on the creative types called¹ "exurbanites" who work in the Madison Avenue communications industry. They are the commuters who live beyond suburbia, in exurbia. This land lies in a sixty-mile radius from New York City spanning Fairfield, Bucks, Rockland, Westchester and the North Shore of Long Island. The author, A. C. Spector, claims an exurbanite status. Among his other non-sociological credentials, Spector is currently an editor of Playboy. He has been literary editor of the Chicago Sun and on the editorial staff of the New Yorker. However, in the Exurbanites, he is a knowing guide in an area we know little about.

By "creative," Sectorsky means radio, TV, movie writers, comic strip artists, copy writers, commercial artists, photographers, the editorial staff of radio and TV shows and directors, among others. "For simplicities sake," says Sectorsky, "the creative exurbanite will be hereafter referred to as a writer, but there is no reason to believe the same statements could not be, with equal accuracy, applied to the directors, the musicians, the artists."²

The creative exurbanite "rents his brain" so to speak to the advertising agency, or the mass media. He is an idea man--a symbol manipulator. He writes, edits, or publishes magazines and newspapers. He conceives the advertisements, jingles and commercials which support magazines, newspapers and television. He is a commercial dream merchant who sets life styles for middle class America.³ Yet their attitudes toward their apparently exciting and glamorous work are laden with anxiety, cynicism, contempt, and irony.

Competition and Insecurity

There is nothing more permanent than change in advertising. Sectorsky calls it a game of musical chairs. The higher one ascends, the fewer the chairs. Sudden unemployment is a fact of life one must learn to accept in order to successfully participate in this game. There are several structural reasons for this. First, there is the

very intangible nature of creative work. The criteria for judgment of such work is often the subjective judgment of "qualified experts" or non-specialists. Second, there is no way for the complexities and the irrationalities of the market to be scientifically controlled. A jingle commercial or lay-out, may be spectacularly successful or a miserable failure. In either case, the causes tend to form an involved chain. The clients who are seen as overdemanding ingrates may, for petty reasons, withdraw their accounts from that agency. Thus, those who worked on the account--writers, illustrators, etc.--may be seeking employment from phone booths the next day. A \$30,000-a-year television writer may receive a call on a Sunday night that his script is no good, and he'd better have something by noon the next day or else. The deadlines serve to keep work going in a "pressure cooker" atmosphere of perpetual crises.

C. Wright Mills noted in White Collar that bureaucracy, particularly the communications industry, set the conditions of intellectual life and controlled the market for its products in America. Employed in this industry he claimed were a new middle class of college educated people with only their education and skills in communications to sell. At one time they might have been intellectuals. They are, instead, salaried employees practicing some professionalized skill. As idea men in advertising, their careers hinge on selling commercials to the public and writing jingles telling others what to buy. They do not write scholarly books or articles. They are no longer alienated

intellectuals. They have become members of the new middle class. They have become technicians selling skills and techniques as commodities that they may or may not believe in. The ascendancy of the technician over the intellectual as a trend in contemporary American society is particularly noticeable in advertising. However, the fusion of the bureaucratic technician and the intellectual is not purely an American phenomenon but one related to industrial and bureaucratic society in general. In addition to Whyte, Mills and Riesman researchers like Galbraith have all noted the rise of the technocrat in industrial society as a new stratum. Although this chapter only deals with the advertising industry in America it is possible to view the ascendancy of the technocrat as a symptom of industrial bureaucratization.

There is no comparable historical or theoretical tradition to managers or policy making executives. There is a smaller but notable framework. Thorstein Veblen, as we have already stated, called the advertising industry basically parasitic created by the monopoly of industry among giant corporations. Their basic use was to create the illusion of "marginal differentiation" among products that were essentially similar. It is this basic structural condition, which appears to create the inherent structural conditions of work in the advertising industry. To what degree this will account for the structural strains in advertising and the type of social character found in advertising is one theme which will run throughout this chapter.

Insecurity is evident even at the lower levels in the book

publishing business, where there are no weekly or monthly deadlines or thousands of dollars are involved. Men who might have been college English instructors, according to Sectorsky, read and work in relative quiet. But rising costs and prices force publishers to occasionally fire people. They always have to rehire others. "Those in the business can reel off in minutes the names of a dozen or so men and women who have worked for more than three publishers in the past few years."⁵

Structural insecurity grows in other levels and creates a vast competition among specialists. Laymen, says Sectorsky, think there is competition in advertising, but they have little idea of the intensity of it unless they have worked in the industry. Sectorsky simulates the following dialogue between an editor-in-chief and managing editor:

Oh, by the way, Bob, said this editor, a few of us were sitting around the office last night, talking about the front of the book. You know, some of the young guys around here have a lot of good ideas about how to fix it up.

"Why didn't you call me in"?

We looked for you, but you'd gone. Don't worry about it, Bob, I can give you all that was said in a memo. That'll cover it.

Gosh, Joe, if you're thinking of having any more of these editorial meetings, I'd like to know about them. I can always plan to stay late you know...

Sure, sure, forget it. This was just one of those impromptu bull sessions. Valuable, when they, you know, get the spark some of these youngsters seem to have. I'll send you a memo.⁶

This man now is lucky to catch the 7:08 when he used to leave no later

than 6:00. When he leaves, he is certain that his editor is no longer in the "shop."

This is not merely competition between specialists to do a better job. It is ruthless, cut-throat competition either to get ahead or maintain one's status quo. It is, Sectorsky says, "a bastard by Fear out of Insecurity."⁷

Fear implanted by innuendo and suggestion operates at all levels. When a new "administration" comes in, there is talk of replacing "fat" with vigorous new blood. Copywriters and others are made to tremble. An account executive may call together his creative staff and suggest that in the next few days decisions will be made between himself and the client affecting their careers, incomes, and future lives. Then the worry begins--who's telling who what? What's going to happen?

Throat cutting does not always exist at the overt level. Everyone acts as if he knows more secrets and inside information than the next person. Even two layout men working over a drawing board engage in this game. The purpose is to appear more important and, in effect, break the morale and working efficiency of the next man. Interoffice politics is a way of life and it helps to destroy men's souls.⁸

The Memo

Creative work, even in business, requires such intensive

concentrations of energy that one cannot work intensively through the six to eight working hours of a working day. Thus, to fill in time and alleviate tension, jokes, self-mockery and elaborate satirical memoranda are indulged in by ad men.⁹

When an impasse occurs in developing an idea, the "developers" might "shelve it" and talk it over on the train to Greenwich. To the poor unfortunate who lives in town the response is: "Well, don't worry, Fred and I will discuss it and we'll memo you in the morning."¹⁰

The use of the memo is attested to in a widely circulated, but anonymous, memo titled "The shortstop in the Scotch" christened after Salinger's Catcher in the Rye. It discusses "those big slobs who all commute with brown satchels." The memo says:

They earn their money, though. They write memos. Billions of goddam memos and all. I think they get paid by the memo. I really do. They put fancy names on them, headlines like:

Re: The use of a Semicolon in the
Buckwheat Campaign, Small
Space Ads...¹¹

Jokes are another structurally determined reaction to creative work in advertising. The practical joke tends to be complex and expensive. The Art Department of the agency adjacent to an IBM building is reported to have spent an entire afternoon creating a beautifully lettered sign which was then placed in full view of IBM's windows. The sign read: "The Hell With Thinking."¹²

Self-ribbing jokes are another form of release. They are to

some extent familiar with psychiatric jargon and bend the terminology to their own use. The terms are hilarious perhaps because of the group norm to convert one's trouble to humor.

...the exurbanite is victimized by traumatic ruralism, or urban Abklingen (the fading out of the memory of the city)...abulia (inability to make up their minds), and alloeroticism (erotic tendencies directed toward others), and perhaps especially contrectation (the impulse to touch members of the opposite sex indiscriminately); just as is evident that more than a few suffer from aphanisis (fear of loss of power of experiencing sexual pleasure).¹³

While jokes are aimed at their plight--contempt is aimed at themselves. There are varying reasons for the contemptuous attitude toward their work. As inside hipsters, they may see all advertising as fraudulent.¹⁴ Occasionally they wonder whether a mature and gifted person ought to make one's major life work selling cereal crackle or soap suds.¹⁵ A T.V. or radio writer, says Spector sky, may tell you that he is not only a very good writer, but perhaps one of the best. Then he may add, "I'm the best goddamn eclectic writer in America" or "I'm the best second-rate writer in America."¹⁶

Not all are this self-conscious. Some few must believe in the worth of what they are publishing.¹⁷ The writer still believes in his talent. He was once going to write "The Great American Novel," but he was seduced by Madison Avenue. "I may be a whore; but goddam it, I'm a \$100 a night call girl not just some Eighth Avenue hooker!"¹⁸ His secret dream is to return to simple artistic discipline by taking the

unfinished novel out of the drawer and finishing it. He really believes he could do it if he could get away from the pressure long enough.

Some of the ad man's favorite fantasies are filled with images of himself pounding away at his typewriter trying to control a vast flood of creative energy; reading galley proofs on his terrace; or at a book author luncheon. According to Sectorsky he wants to be a serious writer but does not really want to write. He is not a serious writer nor is he likely ever to become one. A serious writer will finish something just to stop the thought of undone work from nagging him. The exurbanite only talks about writing. The limited dream is designed to be just that--simply a dream. He many never return to true art because of the commuting time and money demanded to live his self-imposed life style.

Some creative few are able to return to careers in art with help from psychoanalysis. But Sectorsky tells us they are indeed few in number. It seems that for many who try it it's already too late. Commercialism has corrupted their once promising talent.

Some escape facing their self-betrayal by excessive outdoor activity, others through increased drinking, sexual promiscuity or increased bitter self-humor. Others face their work and wallow in their cynical corruption.

What's the matter? What do you want of a guy?
Haven't I got what I want? I've got a home, haven't I? It's a good home, isn't it? Home! It's a fornicating manor! Are you making my kind of dough? Get wise, doll baby! I do what I do, and I like

what I do, and if you had any sense, you'd try and do the same. Listen to me a minute. Don't get the idea I'm unhappy, or frustrated. I know what I want, I've got it, and I'm going to keep on getting it. It's got nothing to do with truth, or beauty, or any of that crap. It's entertainment, by God, and nothing I touch has a rating of less than thirty. Three-oh. Beat that, Jack.

23

Spectorsky tells us that there are many happy creators in the communications world and even the miserable have their happy moments. The special hell the exurbanite calls the "Rat Race" is built into the structure of advertising in the form of competition, insecurity and harassment. But the act of creation is their "thing." "In no other industry," Spectorsky tells us, "are work and play so fetchingly intertwined." Their product is "fun" to turn out, he adds. They would like, however, to escape the competition and insecurity but only to become serious writers. These creative people do not or cannot escape to other professions. Their contempt for their meaningless work may be a reflection of their own self-contempt over corrupting youthful talents and aspiration. While they hate their jobs, and perhaps themselves, their work is the only thing they can still do or want to do. The exurbanite represents a ~~stream~~ in advertising that no one appears to have foreseen. We must examine others in the field for a fuller understanding.

The Advertising Man

There are two distinct types of "meaning" that Bensman discusses in advertising work. One is the instrumental meaning which is

not derived from the work itself but from the money, glamour life
 style and self-importance of advertising. The intrinsic meaning at-
 26
 tached to the work is what concerns us here. This type of meaning ap-
 pears to be most applicable to creative people and technicians, i.e.,
 writers, artists, designers, musical composers and trained research-
 27
 ers.

A primary focus of Bensman's study is his description and
 analysis of the meaning of work to the creative person as he gradually
 is socialized into the structure of advertising work. For this Bensman
 is well qualified having spent a decade as a consumer research direc-
 tor in this field. During this time he was able to conduct interviews
 informally with officials in his and other agencies who were not aware
 they were being interviewed, and to observe advertising as an active
 participant and as a bystander. As an insider he was able to establish
 "unofficial" relationships with employees, thereby observing both their
 public and private behavior.

Typically, the recruit who comes into advertising hoping to
 practice his skills on "real live problems" is quickly doomed to dis-
 illusion. He works on such problems as determining from the inter-
 views of suburban housewives the color, packaging, and lettering
 which will help to give an old soap a new image. At each stage of the
 work, he is told by countless others how to create "glitter" and "daz-
 zle." When the design is completed, his superiors may reject it be-
 cause it involves new meanings or complications not thought of before.

He is told politely to redesign his work from the point of view that the boss has just discovered after seeing the design, but which he now thinks was his own original point of view.

According to our researchers, the new recruit begins to realize that his work is a tool and he, a commodity for helping someone sell soap more efficiently than it is presently being sold. Any attempt at autonomous creative work is nullified by the preconceived or "optimal" ideas of his superior:

Thus the exposure to agency work tends to turn internal meanings into external meanings. Work tends to lose its meaning-for-itself and to develop instrumental meanings.²⁸

By "instrumental" meanings Bensman means that the satisfaction derived from work is not from the work itself but from the by-products of the work, its external effects, whether these be money, prestige, power, glamour or other effects.

Individuals with creative talent or with scientific aspirations who are intrinsically interested in their work are driven out of the industry if they insist that the work be internally meaningful. If they remain... it is because their work has become instrumental to them. To say that the work is instrumental is to say that the work becomes at the same time an object and a means for the individual.²⁹

The ad man's similarity to the policy making executive is evident in this case even though the structure of work is essentially quite different. Interestingly, it is the only case thus far where different work structures appear to create a similar personality structure.

But even for the creative technician who remains, there is a limit to the instrumental meanings (and narcissism). They still maintain their "instinct of workmanship" that is the pride in doing a professional job simply for its own sake.

It is the last quality to disappear. Thus most creative and scientific personnel will continue to strive for technical excellence in their work regardless of whether they think the work they are asked to do is badly conceived, is inartistic or unscientific, or essentially is not their own... This is because technical virtuosity is the last remnant of a man's pride in his creative ability. To the layman or to a specialist in another field, it is a source of considerable amusement, and at times ennui, to see two creative specialists or technicians fighting tooth and nail (but politely) over minor points of technique that do not appear to affect the strategy, overall design, or imputed results of an advertisement. However, such concern for detail usually results in technically accomplished advertising. 30

Pride, for the creative person in advertising, may involve the attitude that anyone can write a slogan which will sell a good product. The real test is if a man is to write something that will help sell
31
a product with little merit. This changes the definition of pride a bit-- but it is still pride.

Bensman, in many senses, takes us beyond our original question of alienation from work. We are already familiar with his hypothesis from the chapter on executive work, that advertising creates narcissism in those who remain even if they were not narcissistic at the outset. It would appear then that narcissism is a quality of the creative specialist as well as the policy making executive.

Those creative people who remain in advertising are those

who do not demand intrinsic meaning in their work. Instead, work becomes instrumental for other areas of their lives. Although they have marketed their talent, their pride in their creative ability is not lost. It continually reasserts itself in the perfection of detail and technique in their work.

Riesman, as we have noted, sees lack of autonomy as the main problem of work. Bensman sees the main problem as the demands made by work bring out less than the best a person may bring to his work in terms of creativity. All work, especially advertising demands a deep self-involvement. For the creative person, it involves the sources of his creative energies.

The quality of one's work shapes, channels, and gives expression to one's creative energy. If the job demands the ability to exploit and manipulate others, both in personal and in impersonal relationships, the very self that provides the basic energy for these actions must of necessity be corroded by these actions. If one attempts to build walls against one's own exploitation and against attempted exploitation by others, a great deal of one's psychic energy is invested merely in self-protection. It is no wonder that the field is populated by would-be artists, novelists, scholars, and poets who rarely manage to fulfill the promise that gave meaning to their youth.³³

The creative man in advertising is caught in a web of external and internal conflicts over the meaning of his work, as Spector and Bensman have shown us. Any attempt to ascertain whether or not they are unhappily alienated or self-estranged from their work must wait until we have examined in detail one particular group in advertising-- the commercial artist.

The Commercial Artist

Art work is a very basic part of an advertising campaign.

Agency staffs usually include trained personnel for this purpose.

Mason Griffs' study is concerned with those people who have studied fine art throughout their formal education, and work in the commercial world. The effect that this may have on the meaning of work for the commercial artist is the problem we will deal with here.

The commercial artist goes into the field when confronted
34
with the necessity of earning a living. The effect of this on his identity as an artist is described by Griff in the formation of three distinct types of commercial artists. One group still symbolically accepts the role of artist; another rejects it in favor of the role of commercial artist and a third group attempts to identify with both roles.

The fine artist works as a commercial artist, but maintains the identity of a fine artist. Initially he says that it is only a temporary thing until he can accumulate enough money to support himself while painting. He justifies his work as a commercial artist on the basis that he cannot live from the sale of his paintings. The market for painting is tenuous and large enough only to support a small number of artists. Art is viewed in American society as nonutilitarian and is not one of the central values of a culture that stresses utilitarian and
35
pragmatic values.

Another reason that causes him to leave serious painting is the lack of a stable frame of reference to measure one's progress by:

"I sell a little but I don't know whether or not my level of painting is
³⁶
 improving." Not only is confirmation by others lacking, but also
 lacking are the more usual progress marks i.e., promotions, raises,
 or awards.

Bensman notes in his study of advertising that the creative
 person who accepts the world of advertising experiences some guilt
³⁷
 for betraying his talents. Griff, referring to the commercial artist,
 confirms this by adding, "this is the group which suffers the most and
 has the deepest guilt feelings about working in the commercial art
³⁸
 field."

The commercial artist must not only legitimize his new role
 to his peers and family who he believes see him as a sellout and prod-
³⁹
 igital son, but to himself as well. The discouraging and painful attempts
 to support himself as a fine artist legitimize the change to commercial
 work. "I was tired of being a bastard from society."
⁴⁰

The conflict between the two roles is further heightened be-
 cause he now has less time to paint. The ability to paint is looked
 upon as a God-given talent. It becomes almost obligatory not to waste
 this talent. The fine artist feels he must develop it for the glory of
 God and Man. To use time and energy to help sell material goods is
⁴¹
 not only a sin but a perversion of his innate endowment.

The traditional artist must also feel that his work in the com-
 mercial field will not erode his talents. He points out that the spec-
 ialized work he does is related to fine art. The layout man claims he

is the "thinker" in the studio and only assigns work to others. The illustrator says he does the finished art work and is as close to painting as it is possible to become. The letteror claims his work is not even art; therefore, how can it effect his work in fine art. Together they
 42
 all deny their betrayal in producing commercial art.

At one extreme "the commercial artist" has found functional significance in his role. As an artist, he finds both commercial and fine art utilitarian. The commercial artist sees himself as the instrument by which the clients verbal demands are transformed into pictorial images. He does the clients bidding and refrains from altering or changing the verbal demands of the client. After all, he says, the clients pay him for it. He has little conflict because he is ideologically committed to commercial art. The job is done when the illustrations
 43
 and layout are completed as quickly and cheaply as possible.

The commercial artist works under the pressure of deadlines as do all ad men. If the client is in the fashion industry ads and catalogs for clothing must appear in advance of the season. These technicians have, like all ad men, gastrointestinal disorders, nervous breakdowns and ulcers since they know that they may move from
 44
 \$50,000 a year to unemployment overnight.

Their attitude toward the traditional artist is that he is some sort of 19th century archaic figure. The commercial artists are not in advertising temporarily--it is a career. If the fine artist fails, his ego is damaged. When the commercial artist fails, he's likely to be

looking for a new job. He does not deny that he is forced to work within bureaucratic restrictions on color, subject matter and budget. He develops the discipline to use his talent within these restrictions. He claims that discipline to work within such restrictions will help his work progress and enable him to produce paintings that sell. Because⁴⁵ of this, he feels more creative than the "serious" arts artist.

Although they take an almost objective, disinterested and professional attitude toward their work, the commercial artist still feels the constraint of his client. "You can almost feel the client guiding your hand as you draw," some complain. One artist told of a client who liked an illustration the artist had done but asked, "couldn't he just widen, a little more, the ass of the girl sitting on the fence"?⁴⁷

Another problem is being typed into a specialty:

I had a friend who could do beer bottles well. Perspiration on beer bottles was his specialty. You know, of course, how broken down it is? One person does the head, another the arms, another the furniture, etc. Well, his specialty was beer bottles. He tried to get out of it. He would go to a new client and ask for work and they would ask him what kind of work he had done. He would tell them "perspiration on beer bottles." They would say, "We have work for you on that." He couldn't get out of it.⁴⁸

The third type of artist identifies with both the fine artist and the commercial artist believing that his position lies in commercial art. They believe that legitimate work may be done in both fields. The problem of carry-over does not exist for them. They believe that

promoting growth in one field promotes growth in the other.

Like the commercial artist he believes that meeting problems which must be solved within a short time will gain him speed and precision and give him more time for painting. Unlike the commercial artist, he is not interested in selling his paintings. He would rather use them as a way of advertising himself to prospective clients. It is important to him to have clients who will allow him the right to determine his own art product. When he finds a client who will accept such innovations, he will produce work that is not much different from his non-commercial work.⁴⁹

At another level the compromise artist is involved in a mission to raise the level of public taste in art. He is involved in a crusade of sorts to put "art" into advertising.⁵⁰

Of the three types, the compromise artist appears on the surface to have fewer role conflicts. Unlike the traditional artist he does not feel the need to use complicated mechanisms of compromise and withdrawal because he does not believe the artist should be independent or autonomous. He apparently does not complain about restrictions as do other types, but restrictions are still a problem to him.

The fact they all complain about this is a clue to why all three types continue to paint in the fine arts tradition whenever they can find spare time.

All of the artists interviewed, regardless of their

role identifications, stated that they felt an intrinsic need to paint and that they experienced a satisfaction from painting, because this was their only opportunity to paint without a restriction imposed by a client.⁵¹

The traditional artist views his extracurricular work as a medium by which he can perfect his ability to paint. He learns by correcting past mistakes, by developing new styles and new forms of expression. The predominant theme is self-improvement.

He refers frequently to the fact that he feels an intrinsic need to paint (which resembles catharsis), and that this is a need which he feels must be fulfilled even at the expense of reducing his income.⁵²

The commercial artist is motivated primarily by the desire to supplement his income. A second motive centers on the need to keep up with style changes in the field. He must develop an original style and keep pace with changing art fashions in order not to be "typed."

The compromise artist paints in order to advertise himself and thereby attract desirable clients. He also desires to improve his style. The third reason is that he feels a certain "need disposition" to paint.⁵³

Both the traditional and compromise artists state explicitly that they paint for intrinsic meaning. The commercial artist does not. The former two identify with the role of the fine artist; the latter does not. It is no accident that they look for intrinsic meaning in their work off the job. The traditional artist is literally in exile, an alien, in a

commercial setting. He expects to gain nothing from his work, but the money to become free of it. He hopes, in the process, his "God-given" talent won't be corrupted beyond hope. The compromise artist tells us specifically he paints for the intrinsic meaning in his work. His identification with both roles means that commercial art has not destroyed the "instinct of workmanship." He has a strong outlet in his identification with serious art. Even the "sell out" commercial artist has not totally lost his "instinct." He may feel the restriction even more than the others but paints to express himself.

It is not a question of whether these commercial artists are unhappily alienated or estranged from their bureaucratic work because of a lack of intrinsic meaning or pride. The traditional artist is clearly alienated in this sense. The compromise artist appears to have escaped self-estrangement in work due to his dual identity. He does so by becoming an occupational "schizophrenic." The commercial artist does not appear to be alienated from his work. Yet, his complaints and the fact that he continues to paint in the fine arts tradition leaves us somewhat less than convinced, that he is not estranged from himself.

The meaning of work in advertising and the mass media, as shown by Griff, exhibits two basic patterns by which creative professionals people adapt to the bureaucratic nature of their work. First, the traditional artist is alienated from his work in the classic sense. He is a craftsman who would like to enjoy practicing a solitary

autonomous skill in a bureaucratic world. Alienated from a society which has labeled him nonutilitarian, he rejects the pragmatic ethic of success in "this world." His alienation from society is necessary so he will not be alienated from his work. Unable to earn a living from the sale of his work he joins the enemy camp to make enough money to be financially independent in order to pursue his real work. He expects nothing from commercial work and hopes his involvement in it will not corrupt his "God-given" talents.

Second, the compromise artist appears not to be alienated, estranged or self-estranged in his work. His dual identity with both serious painting and commercial art prevents a certain amount of conflict. Though he does not consider himself a "sell out" he is primarily in the commercial camp, much of his effort is given to finding good clients who will allow him to put art in advertising and raise the public taste. In effect, he feels involved in a crusade as did one of Whyte's executives. He escapes the alienation that the traditional artist cannot.

The commercial artist represents the link between all three studies. The commercial artist identifies only with the commercial world. The same is true for Bensman's ad man and Spector'sky's creative writer. They can identify with the field because they do not demand intrinsic meaning in their work nor perhaps were they ever serious artists in the first place. The structural nature of work drives out those who are serious artists, according to Spector'sky and Bensman. However, those who stay are still exposed to the same pressures that

made the others leave. They may avoid the pressure by finding instrumental meanings in the work for other areas of their lives or simply because they would be unhappy outside advertising. Let us not be misled into believing that because there is no apparent self-stated gulf between themselves and their work they are not alienated from their work. They never lose their pride in workmanship--the pride of technical virtuosity in work. They fight politely over the technical qualities of a layout in an ad. Yet, our researchers indicate that they disdain, as did the Nazi bureaucrats, their responsibility in the creation of the advertisement. They claim their duty is to meet the demands of the client because he is paying for the ad. Yet, more than any group, they complain that they can practically feel the client guiding their hand as they paint, and they are tired of painting sweat on beer bottles. The writer dreams incessantly of finishing his novel but never does. The painter says that he feels an intrinsic need to paint and he does so even at the expense of losing extra income. The more cynical yell loudest that their work has nothing to do with beauty or truth or any of that "crap." What really counts is money--everyone should "get wise" to that. They claim not to be frustrated or unhappy. They really do what they want.

Despite the fact that ad men seem not to demand serious intrinsic meaning in their work or perhaps were not seriously creative to start with, these studies all show that they react with something less than contentment in their work. The evidence is simply too

contradictory to believe that a good number of creative people in advertising do not at least feel some inner conflicts about their work much of the time. This may not be alienation in the classic sense but they appear to evidence a sense of self-estrangement because of a lack of intrinsic meaning in their work. They actively seek to find this meaning after working hours demonstrating alienation and estrangement from their place of work.

One way to account for this is that bureaucratic work takes on another meaning than does simple artistic discipline. The ad agency is organized as a profit-making concern on the theory that it somehow has the intangible expertise that will enable the client to more fully explore the market for his product which he is unable to do. The agency must have people who can and will perform the technical work which is needed. Better known as technical personnel, they are treated as a resource much the same as money or filing cabinets. The agency must plan and administer its activities and the individual work of its specialists. Management takes the responsibility that the work will be done as the client wants it. They supervise the work of the specialists to be certain that it corresponds to the original purpose and is up to standard. Management will also administer discipline to the degree that the specialist understands and performs the job he is supposed to do and actually does it. But the individual technician may be motivated by something other than a technical costs or profits based on the clients demands.

As we have seen, the creative people in advertising are motivated both by the need for money and the need to express their creative energies. In order to be successful, this creativity must be disciplined and subordinated to the goals of the organization. Advertising is, after all, a business. Management cannot allow its hired crackpots to turn their imaginations loose except under its rational and restraining hand. The client simply wants marketing recommendation along commercially feasible lines--not artistic or literary masterpieces. An objective, impersonal and professional approach toward work is needed for one to become a contributing cog in the bureaucratic machine. The successful ad man appears to have undergone a social lobotomy to function in the agency. In some cases creativity seems channelized by desire for money, fame or power. But the ever present "instinct of workmanship" and the creative impulses keep cropping up often enough for us to understand that these people are less fulfilled at their work than they often realize. Despite appearances and literacy, can we really believe the advertising man, whose words so often appear to be hiding apparent "despair and darkness in his heart," is fulfilled at his work? We must question if they can be fulfilled when their basic creative energies are being circumscribed.

The nature of advertising and the bureaucratic management of creative work combine to drive out the seriously creative. But our research studies make us seriously question whether those who remain

are merely ambitious men or frustrated, burned-out technicians.

Our research studies also leave us with the even more complicated fact that it is possible for people in an occupational group to maintain they are not alienated nor estranged from their work when the structure of their work and their personal behavior strongly indicate that the opposite is true. They may not recognize their own sense of alienation but be acutely aware of their own inner conflicts which are only symptomatic of their own alienation from work. This may be due to complex ego defenses or successful forms of self-delusion. Whatever, the complexities of this group makes it impossible to state with any great degree of clarity whether this group is alienated from its work. The important thing is the specific ways that ad men react to their work. Obviously this group does not appear to be alienated in the classical sense. This does not necessarily mean that the classical theorists were wrong in their predictions. It may ultimately mean that alienation from work in contemporary American society may be changing as the nature of work and society become progressively more commercial and consumer oriented.

Classical Theories of Advertising and Mass Media Work

In examining the relevance of the classical theorists in explaining the meaning of work in the advertising industry we encounter a somewhat different problem than with policy making executives and managers. To begin with all three main institutional processes, as

defined in our paradigm of institutional process, influence the immediate conditions of work. Two processes appear to be quite important. Another appears to be only of minor importance.

Although advertising is a bureaucratic industry it is precisely this quality which is least evident in our analysis. This may be due in part to the fact that we have focused on the creative technician. But this fact, as we have noted, is based on the available research. Capitalism and the division of labor are much more evident as institutions which create the immediate conditions of work.

As we have noted advertising is a subsidiary or, in Veblen's terms, "parasitic" industry created by the open competitive market under industrial capitalism. The primary point is that it is the market which creates the need for advertising due to the multiplicity of similar and competing commodities. Two characteristics of capitalism as defined by Marx, (a) the fetishism of commodities and (b) the irrationality of the market, appear to be the more outstanding features of the structure of advertising work. The creative technicians relate to each other and their own work in terms of commodity relationships. They relate to another as specialists who are working together to sell a product or at least to create an image that will sell a product. The nature of their work demands that they use their creative talents to sell commodities regardless of their personal feelings about the product or the aesthetic characteristic of their work. If they are successful in marketing a commodity they may achieve some form of common

interest with others. Individuals or consumers may find a pseudo
 57
 community based on their identification with commodities they consume.
 At least this is one device of advertising--to create an artificial community by inducing people to buy through identification with images and life styles created by advertising. Marx's description of personified, abstract, commodity relations appears to be realized to a strong degree in contemporary American advertising.

Veblen also recognized the fetishism of commodities but did not call it by that term. Veblen noted the commercialization of all products into all ensuing social relationships. He was more concerned with "marginal differentiation" or the creation of the illusion of difference between essentially similar commodities.

The irrationality of the market is not masked and is central in the studies of advertising. While Marx discussed the irrationality of capitalism as an economic system, Veblen saw it also in terms of its effect upon technicians and the community. As applied to the ad man this would mean that both the market success of his firm and his
 58
 own mobility are governed by irrational forces. For reasons beyond his control, capability and effectiveness, he may find himself unemployed; the client may withdraw the account; the public may not buy the product. The decisions of a client or of the public cannot be controlled no matter how intelligently he works. The ad man is thus at the mercy of a senseless market. He lives with and accepts the unpredictability which brings him both periodic unemployment and

glowing success. At this level Veblen affords a clear insight into the problem.

The metropolis as a market place is also important under capitalism. Advertising work is done in urban areas and largely for an urban audience. Simmel, basing his work on Marx, defines in classical theory the social relations to be found in the urban area. They also can be applied to advertising. He too noted the fetishism of the commodity but attributed it to different causes. Simmel saw the fetishism of formal relationship based on rational calculation in terms of money. All relationships, he argued, could be reduced to a quantitative expression. In this sense he expressed Marx's theory of capitalism in terms of generic characteristics of urbanism.

Exploitation is also described in our advertising studies but in different terms than those described by Marx and Veblen. The ad man is a hired employee who exploits himself both physically and also psychologically. He exploits his artistic talent for commercial purpose. However, it is not an unwilling prostitution that he undertakes.

Problems of ownership and control are revealed in our advertising studies, but again not as Marx and Veblen saw. It is rather the ultimate control of the job by the client that is important, and not ownership and control of the capital of the agencies.

Narrow specialization stands out as a major characteristic of the ad man's job. This characteristic was recognized by all of the classical theorists. Perhaps Veblen's description of the technician

is most closely related to the ad man's role because of the exclusive emphasis on technical work. Time buyers, account officials, agency management, including the president, are not specialists or technicians, but are "bureaucrats," managers, or "businessmen," i.e., oriented to clients. In various senses these titles suggest Veblen's businessmen (but not engineers), bureaucrats a la Weber or Mannheim, and "capitalists" a la Marx. In the sense that all of these are relevant to such detailed analysis, it suggests a convergence of perspectives that is not self-evident. When abstract concepts are given of detailed, empirical substance, much of the appearance of "generalization" appears lost. Yet it is the extreme specialization of the division of labor within the agency that is most central to why the agency works.

Bureaucracy, as we have implied, affects the ad man's work in terms of specialization. However, his career appears to be bureaucratic due to organization of specialized experts, artists and administrators. In this sense, Weber and Mannheim are of importance in defining advertising work. To some degree impersonality is characteristic of the ad man's work but not an impersonal adherence to rules. The ad man impersonally serves whatever client pays for the job regardless of the commodity to be sold. Weber and Mannheim recognized impersonality within the organization. However, one must question whether they implicitly recognized it in the sense of inter-organizational or market impersonality.

The social psychological consequences of advertising work

are numerous. The effects of capitalism are largely centered around monsterism. The ad man is the most narrow specialist we have yet discussed. Starting as a specialist the organization of his work narrows him even more. Marx, Veblen and Durkheim are the theorists who could clearly recognize these forms of "monsterism."

Instrumental meaning appears to be paramount in advertising. In many cases desire for lucrative work appears to be the reason for entering advertising. After a time however, prestige or personal glory emerges as an additional form of compensation. In some ways it is difficult to separate instrumental meanings from compensation for personal deprivation. Personal glory and ego-enhancement appear to be some sort of compensation for the ad man's submission to external demands. Marx and Veblen most clearly recognize these two consequences of powerlessness as we have noted. Simmel recognized instrumental meaning at this level of specialization in terms of the prestige of symbols. Veblen's emphasis on life style and a wide variety of pecuniary forms of overcompensation make his work most important in trying to understand the meaning of advertising to ad men.

The division of labor in advertising creates a loss of autonomy. In his work, the ad man is ever the handmaiden of a client or policy making executive. Again Marx and Veblen saw this most clearly. Durkheim was aware of this but saw it as a result of the ever increasing sub-division of labor, and did not relate it to the market as did Marx and Veblen. Mannheim recognized the loss of autonomy and

powerlessness but primarily as bureaucratic phenomena.

Careerism and self-rationalization are quite evident. There appears to be some evidence that the ad man is quite unhappy with the life style brought by his career. The systematic remaking of the self and devotion to one's career as described by Mannheim and Weber are wrought with ambivalence for the ad man. It is not certain whether he suffers loss of perspective, but dehumanization is evident. The ad man is dehumanized in the sense of being exploited for his talents. He may dehumanize those he works with through extreme impersonality. Finally he dehumanizes the audience his work is intended for to the degree he knows that he puts "hack" work on the market. Some advertising men are aware of their "alienation" and express it in self-deprecating humor, irony, satire and self-hatred.

59

The classical theorists to a very large degree manage to account for the apparent alienation and estrangement many technical people in advertising appear to exhibit. As the research studies we have examined indicate some appear more alienated or estranged than others.

Some ad men appear to be aware of their alienation although they do not call it alienation. They rather specify their particular problem or conflict about their work. They are able to because they are in a position where the market is central to their work.

Some appear not to be alienated or at least they appear not to recognize their condition. Many appear to be narcissistic. There

is very little if no intrinsic interest that the ad man or the commercial artist find in their work. Yet all three studies indicate a strong attempt on the part of the creative technician to retain some control over his work. Despite its corruption, he attempts to retain some pride in his work, if not at the substantive level than at the level of craftsmanship and technique.

These apparent contradictions, to whatever degree they are explainable, are more understandable in light of Veblen's idea of the instinct of workmanship. Veblen is one of the theorists whose work appears to be highly important in understanding the unique findings of the empirical researchers. Bensman, Spector sky and Griff all point out that many enter the field not expecting to find intrinsic meaning nor necessarily seeking instrumental meanings. Those entering the field expecting to find a great deal of intrinsic meaning, as Bensman states, are driven out. Those who remain become corrupted and find a great deal of internal conflict that they may or may not recognize as alienation. They seek to resolve or accommodate their problem with work. But the conflict and its resolution most often revolve around the corruption of their peculiar creative talent by the agency and the remnants of pride they maintain. The pride in their work is ever present, though often submerged, but reasserts itself intermittently. These are precisely the qualities which Veblen attributed to the "instinct of workmanship." The idea of the "instinct of workmanship" and its literal imprisonment by advertising work helps us to a very

large degree in understanding the conflicts and alienation of the ad man. The continual need to find solutions in work through compensatory mechanisms, outside of work and through styles of self-rationalization help to explain why many do not recognize their own apparent alienation, or exhibit its direct symptoms.

As we have stated the emphasis on capitalism, the division of labor and bureaucracy by the classical theorists only in part explain the behavior of the advertising man at work. One cannot adequately explain their alienation or lack of it without understanding Veblen's idiosyncratic notion of the "instinct of workmanship" and the inherent conflict between it and the special nature of advertising work.

Finally to whatever degree advertising work is understandable, one cannot adequately attempt to understand it without noting an important point brought out by the contemporary researchers, Bensman, Griff and Spector sky. The aspiring creative writer, artist, etc. is systematically drawn to the field. In some cases the choice is made with the knowledge of what to expect, in other cases the occupational choice is a naive one. Those who continue to demand intrinsic meaning in their work do not remain. This again leads us to believe that a specific type of social character is systematically drawn to advertising work and can remain in it despite its overwhelming pressures. In this sense Weber is extremely important in understanding the ad men. The social character may in part be characterized by creativity, quasi seriousness, narcissism and an ability to withstand great

pressures and ambiguity.

Regardless of the specific characteristics, a definite kind of social character appears to be drawn to and/or created by advertising work just as we noted occurs with the policy making executive. Here Veblen and Weber appear to be the important theorists in understanding the inner turmoil expressed by ad men.

The empirical studies tend to highlight several dimensions that the classical theorists focused upon. One dimension is the emphasis on commodity relations by Marx, Simmel, Veblen and Weber. The second is the division of labor emphasized by all the classical theorists.

The studies of advertising tend to emphasize more than do other studies the effect of the market on the employee. This is in part due to the highly visible nature of the market in this work. However, with the clear exception of Bensman's work, these studies do not emphasize or make note of the effects of bureaucracy on work. While it is true that ad agencies tend to be small bureaucracies, the empirical studies still do not show the effects of bureaucracy. It may perhaps be that the dullness of bureaucracy doesn't come out in contrast to the highly dramatic consequences of the market on careers in advertising. However, Bensman's study, the most systematic and thorough of the three, indicates the effects of bureaucracy are more important than the other studies indicate.

In microcosmic analysis it is possible for the researcher to

lose sight of the relationship between the work, bureaucracy and other bureaucracies or the economy at large. In this sense the researchers with the exception of Bensman, ignore or misunderstand Weber's emphasis on bureaucracy as a major dimension of work in contemporary industrial society.

In some senses these studies on artists, ad men and the other technical mass media people are furthest removed from the classical tradition. In part this is true because the classical theorists did not focus upon such occupations. In part such occupations did not exist. However, the mode of analysis used in the empirical studies would be easily deducible from the classical theorists. Certainly these studies, more than most empirical studies, emphasize the importance of the market in the determination of the work situation. The bureaucratization of work is a key concept that determines the amount of alienation that can be imputed in such work. Self-rationalization appears to be a basic process but does not appear to be successful in reducing awareness of self-estrangement. In part the ideas of autonomy which emerges in the creative arts are not easily crushed by the bureaucratization of work, even when the bureaucratization is not that noticeable.

The classical theorists suggested even in this area that work would lose its intrinsic meaning (Veblen); that extrinsic meaning and forms of compensation could in part provide substitute meanings (Weber, Veblen, Simmel); that self-selection into and exit from the field (Weber) could "solve" the pressing economic and personal

problems. The capacity for self-delusion, through self-rationalization (Mannheim) and the "comfortable" forms of overcompensation found in advertising work make it possible for the ad man to say that he is not alienated even though he exhibits the characteristics of such alienation. The classical theorists contribute elements to the understanding of the ad man; yet in total they leave parts unexplored. The concept of narcissism, as it is applicable to ad men, implies a psychological dimension that is not stressed by the classical theorists.

Perhaps Freud, Nietzsche and Burckhardt, who were especially interested in the arts, could better account for this dimension. In this sense advertising and mass media occupations are the most complicated occupations we have analyzed.

FOOTNOTES

¹
A. C. Spector sky, The Exurbanites (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955).

²
Ibid., p. 270.

³
Ibid., pp. 4-13.

⁴
Ibid., p. 217.

⁵
Ibid., p. 138.

⁶
Ibid., pp. 139-140.

⁷
Ibid., p. 150.

⁸
Ibid., pp. 153-155.

⁹
Ibid., p. 161.

¹⁰
Ibid., p. 163.

¹¹
Ibid., p. 160.

¹²
Ibid., p. 161.

¹³
Ibid., p. 267.

¹⁴
Ibid., pp. 7-13.

- ¹⁵ Ibid., p. 162.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., p. 270.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., p. 136.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., p. 271.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 272.
- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 273. For a detailed discussion of the exurbanites see chap. VII. For a discussion of traveling time see chap. V.
- ²¹ Ibid., pp. 275 and 55-58.
- ²² Ibid., pp. 273-276.
- ²³ Ibid., p. 274.
- ²⁴ Ibid., p. 130.
- ²⁵ Ibid., p. 135.
- ²⁶ Bensman, Dollars and Sense, pp. 39-44.
- ²⁷ Ibid., p. 44.
- ²⁸ Ibid., p. 45.
- ²⁹ Ibid., p. 50.
- ³⁰ Ibid., p. 46.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 53-54. Also see Daniel Henniger, "The One Eyed Slicker," The New Republic, Vol. 162 (May 2nd, 1970), pp. 17-19.

³² Bensman, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

³³ Ibid., p. 68.

³⁴ Mason Griff, "The Commercial Artist," Identity and Anxiety ed. by Maurice Stein, Arthur J. Vidich and David M. White (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 225.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 225-226.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 227.

³⁷ Bensman, op. cit.

³⁸ Griff, op. cit., p. 227.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 228-229.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 228. As they become more deeply involved, the rationalizations become progressively stronger. "Now I know where commercial art fits in." "Commercial art is used to beautify the industrial world." "Commercial art is getting better all the time."

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 229-230.

⁴² Ibid., p. 231.

⁴³ Ibid., p

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 232.

⁴⁵ Ibid.,

⁴⁶
Ibid., p. 237.

⁴⁷
Ibid.

⁴⁸
Ibid., p. 238.

⁴⁹
Ibid., p. 235.

⁵⁰
Ibid., p. 239.

⁵¹
Ibid., p. 238.

⁵²
Ibid., p. 236.

⁵³
Ibid., p. 238.

⁵⁴
Bernard Rosenberg and Norris Fliegel, The Vanguard Artist (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965) indicates that some alienation from society is true for the successful fine artist.

⁵⁵
Arthur Stinchcomb, "Formal Organizations," Sociology ed. by Neil Smelser (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 151-203. The idea of distinguishing work between those who manage the work of others and those whose work is managed is quite similar to Stinchcomb's distinction between those who plan or supervise the work of others and those whose work is planned for them and supervised by others.

⁵⁶
Dennis Wrong, "The Oversocialized Concept of Man," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (April, 1961), 193.

⁵⁷
C. Wright Mills implies the idea in The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 298-325. Merton also implies this in his phrase "pseudo gemeinschaft," see Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 109. In a sense both are derived from Marx's and Simmel's conceptions of the commercialization of social relations.

58

Bensman makes the point explicit, Sectorsky implicit, Griff does not discuss it.

59

Bensman and Sectorsky both make this point and illustrate it. Also see Jeremy Tunstall, The Advertising Man (London: The Shenval Press, 1964), especially chap. IV-VI.

CHAPTER VII

THE WHITE COLLAR WORKERS: SALESMEN AND CLERKS

Salesmen

1

Erich Fromm has written that Marx did not envision a new

2

proletariat--a salariat of white collar workers that would increasingly outnumber blue collar workers and Marx's alienated "workers."

Fromm's idea has largely remained untested except for a few studies of white collar clerks and sales people. Until recently there was a dearth of material in this area. However, our knowledge of these occupations is limited.

Every organization that sells a product or service must employ personnel to make presentations and consummate sales. After the presentation there is the mechanical routine of typing, posting and filing the endless forms and letters. This job falls to the salesmen and clerical personnel, who comprise an ever-growing white collar force. Clerks and salesmen are only a small proportion of this amorphous body of human operatives. We necessarily must exclude from this discussion, public relations men, secretaries, accountants, bookkeepers, buyers, office managers and other highly skilled office functionaries. There simply is little or no work in the sociological literature on these

occupations.

Our purpose in this chapter is to examine the few studies that do exist and to see what we may learn about alienation from work among the two specific white collar groups.

The classical theorists of importance in the analysis of this work are Marx, Weber, Mannheim, Veblen and Simmel. Marx and Weber are particularly important because of their respective emphasis on the nature of work under capitalism and bureaucracy. Veblen is quite important because of his emphasis on salesmanship and the machine process. Becoming a human cog in the machinery is a fate salesmen attempt to avoid. Karl Mannheim's emphasis on self-rationalization helps us to understand the salesman's ideology and the nature of his work. Sales and clerical work cannot be clearly understood without reference to such characteristics of cities as defined by Simmel, the impersonal manipulation, rationality and the cash nexus.

The basic model for examining the social structure and meaning of work at this level is Merton's contemporary, seminal essay on the social character developed by the structure of bureaucratic work. Merton's essay itself reflects the classical tradition, especially Marx, Weber, Mannheim, Veblen and Durkheim.

Merton's "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality" attempts an analysis of the development of a distinctive social character formed at different levels of bureaucratic work due to the structural arrangements at that level. The requirements for work tend to focus on work

routine and processes. In this instance work consists of the processing of letters, application forms, requisitions, etc. To the seeming exclusion of other matters bureaucrats concern themselves with correctness of forms and strict adherence to rules. The concern with the details and precision of their particular job causes a "trained incapacity," in Veblenian terms. That is, the means become ends to the petty bureaucrats. They lose sight of the overall mission of the organization in the details of their work and concern with their own career advancement.

Merton suggests, as does Bensman, that this level of work may attract a certain type of social character. In addition, the work situation may create this type of social character if the recruit stays long enough in the job. In part we will attempt to describe such a social character if it appears evident in the research studies.

Strictly speaking, of course, white collar people do not "make" a product unless one considers a typed letter, order form, or a neat filing cabinet a product. Similarly, a salesman does not make a product but sells a commodity.

The Marxian concept of commodities together with the Veblenian idea that work in the 20th century would increasingly be dominated by salesmanship and wastemanship is taken up by C. Wright Mills in his study of saleswomen.³ The importance of Simmel and Mannheim in terms of the commercialization of social relations and self-rationalization is also evident. Mills strongly maintains that, in the Marxian sense, salesmen make no product although they obviously

desire what they sell to others. In Mills' "great salesroom" the salesman stands symbolically as the prototype of contemporary occupations. Mills views the salesman as alienated from any product of his labor. Mechanized by the routine of his work, using smile and feigned sincerity as instruments to manipulate others, the salesman makes an instrument out of himself. Thus self-estrangement is an accompaniment to the salesman's alienated labor. Implicit in Mills' analysis are the sense of powerlessness and the meaninglessness of the salesman's work. To a lesser degree there is the sense of isolation from fellow salesmen while being in competition with them. This fosters a sense of normlessness, in that ethical norms are made up "as one goes," and are not based upon an independent standard. Underlying sales work then appears to be an ethic that the vocation of salesmanship is a means of self-validation and self-definition in the same way as more dignified occupations attempt this, i. e., scientists, teachers, etc.⁵

Mills' work is primarily a qualitative description of sales personnel in large department stores in metropolitan areas. The data are drawn from 128 intensive interviews with white collar workers in New York City in the Fall of 1946. Mills also relied on what he calls the "close up experience" of students and/or colleagues in department stores. This may or may not mean they were participant observers--Mills is unclear on this point. He states, "...I hope to present these materials, used here only as a source of quotations and an informal
6
limit to psychological statements, in full." Mills makes the

increasing bureaucratization and specialization of commodities and personnel a focal point of his analysis.

Following Weber's emphasis on bureaucratization, Veblen's on wastemanship, Simmel's on the urban mentality and Mannheim's on self-rationalization, Mills compares salespeople in small and middle sized cities to those in large cities. These salespeople have a small and personally known clientele. They feel they are always learning about "human nature" through contact with customers. There is a feeling of being worthwhile. One salesman expressed this view: "It is a pleasure to serve them. It makes you feel you are necessary and doing something worthwhile." A woman who sold cosmetics was more specific: "I like the satisfaction I secure in my work in improving my customers appearance." She added, "I have some very homely customers, as far as physical features are concerned whom I have transformed into very attractive women."⁷

Mills states that a central fact of life for the saleswomen in large cities in the middle 1940's is that she operates at the intersection of the bureaucracy and the vast urban impersonality called the public. Again we see Simmel's relevance in bringing Marx into the urban marketplace. Her customers are primarily strangers. Saleswomen in metropolitan department stores attempt to "borrow" prestige from their customers.⁸ Surrounded by the prestigious commodities she cannot afford, the differences between the saleswoman and her customers are sharply accentuated. Being in a position "to wait on them" many

attempts to identify with the customers fail. The result, Mills
⁹
states, is a feeling of "powerless depression" and hatred for the cus-
tomer. One woman expressed it this way:

You work among lovely things which you can't buy,
you see prosperous, comfortable people who can buy it.
When you go home with your low pay you do not feel
genteel or anything but humiliated. You either half
starve on your own or go home to mama, as I do,
to be supported.₁₀

The reaction to this form of powerlessness is not always depression
but sometimes aggression. Two types of saleswomen, The Wolf and
The Elbower are aggressive and "go after customers." The Wolf's
attitude is "Every well dressed customer...looks like a five dollar bill
to me."¹¹ The Elbower tries to monopolize the customers in order to
make her commissions. She does not want to be bothered with "pikers,"
"folks who can't make up their minds," "the ones who want to tell you
their life-history," "the bargain hunters," "the advice seekers,"
"the I'm just looking boobs." Let the new clerks learn on them.

I want the women who buy three pairs of shoes at
a time, stockings to go with them, and maybe slip-
pers, too. I believe I can satisfactorily wait on five
at a time, and keep them happy, so I wait on five!₁₂

The Charmer is less aggressive but more cunning and evi-
dences the notion of self-rationalization. She preys on her customers
in a similar manner, as does a prostitute.

It's really marvelous what you can do in this world
with a streamlined torso and a brilliant smile. People
do things for me, especially men, when I give them that
slow smile and look up through my lashes. I found that

out long ago, so why should I bother about a variety of selling techniques when one technique will do the trick? I spend most of my salary on dresses which accentuate all my good points. After all, a girl should capitalize on what she has, shouldn't she? And you'll find the answer in my commission total each week. ¹³

The Collegiate girl works part-time and is eager to work.

What she lacks in professionalism is buoyed by amateurish enthusiasm.

The Social Pretender claims she is selling because it is "an exciting proletariat experience." She claims to come from a wealthy family to which she will shortly return. She is well known among sales girls as a "phony." The Drifter is found almost anywhere on the floor. Known as a gossip, she claims to have a restless form of energy.

I just can't stay here at my counter like an elephant chained to a post, day in and day out...I have friends all around the floor and I want to tell them occasionally what I do and think and feel, and listen to their ideas too...I have to move around or I'll go crazy. ¹⁴

Here is some evidence of restrictive bureaucratic specialization and impersonality.

The Old Timer is the only type that appears to despise the customer and the store as well. She simply hates both and "lives off ¹⁵ her hatred." She sees herself as the backbone of the sales force, the cornerstone around which it is built. She is against the store's policies, the buyers, other personnel, and often projects resentment onto the customer. While some saleswomen hate the store and the customers, The Old Timer enjoys hating them. One old-timer states her attitude:

They (the customers) scream about the merchandise and scream about the service, and I just give 'em a dead pan face and chilly stare, and I ignore them... To hell with all of them - I work for me first, last, always; and the customers and the store can take it and like it. You ask me then why I stay here. I'm not sure I could do anything else. I get up, I wash and dress and eat, and I put on my things and come to Macy's. It's almost automatic; in fact several times I did all that on Sundays, once actually getting as far as the train before I came to and realized it was Sunday. Just an old fire horse listening for the bell, that's me. 16

Mills claims that selling is largely taken out of the hands of the salesman by the ever subdividing division of labor and increasing bureaucratization. The component steps of selling, contacting, arousing interest, creating preference are done by advertising--the absentee salesman. Two final steps are left to the salesman--making the specific proposal and closing the order. Separated from control over prices, product selection and the above, the only autonomy remaining to the salesman is the individual personality involved in the act of persuasion. The salesman then increasingly must sell himself to sell the product. The market personality, for Mills, is increasingly what is sold. Here Mills shows the development of Mannheim's idea of self-rationalization and approaches Fromm's conception of the marketing orientation. Kindness, sincerity and friendliness are donned as character masks and are there for hire. They become rationalized and mechanized into the salesman's personality with impersonal efficiency.

The salesman uses others as instruments and in turn makes

an instrument of himself. Not only is the salesman separated from the product of his work and alienated from the process, but the more successful he or she is, the greater the self-estrangement--thus the full cycle is completed. Built into the very structure of saleswork are powerlessness of the salesperson, isolation and a success ethic, which supercedes ethical norms. While salespeople do not appear to be concerned about meaning in their work there does appear to be an attempt on the part of some to justify their existence as with the Drifter and the Old Timer.

For Mills, the personality market "underlies the all pervasive distrust and self-alienation so characteristic of metropolitan people." As Simmel stated of the urban mentality, it is the cash nexus, without mutual trust, which binds men together in transient, impersonal contact. For Mills, bureaucratized saleswork is intrinsically part of this urban market structure which creates alienation and self-estrangement and epitomizes the relationship of men to the work and man to man in an urban, bureaucratized society.

The Social Structure of Sales Work and Self-Definition

In a similar vein¹⁸ Howton and Rosenberg have attempted to examine the self-imagery of salesman. Their work shows in detail how the process of self-rationalization develops in salesmen. The researchers interviewed a group of 66 salesmen drawn from a membership roster of an open, locally based association of salesmen and "sales

19

executives" in New York City. They, unlike Mills' department store saleswomen, were "outside men." They call on their customers or "trade" in contrast to clerks, canvassers and deskmen. They are salesmen of major products and services varying from hard and soft goods, automobile and industrial products, pharmaceuticals, insurance and advertising space. They varied in age from 30 through the 60's. Their income is said to be "probably from the middle through the upper brackets for the area." The group represents men who have achieved some measure of success in their field and are committed to it. Beginners and marginal men are not included in the group. The group was not meant to be a representative sample of elite sales people but they are, unlike Mills' salespeople, an elite. The data are apparently collected through depth interviews although the authors do not explicitly discuss this point.

The authors, taking note of Durkheim and Tonnies concern with the decline of the community, seek to specify the interrelationships of salesmen and their clients as an occupational community. Particularly, they probe for the self-imagery, the ideology of the subjective meaning of their work to these salesmen. Durkheim's idea that the occupational group could form a new community thereby recreating the lost *gemeinschaft* is implicitly analyzed. As related to saleswork the idea appears inadequate in light of the commercial market. The authors place a good deal of emphasis on the role relationships with other sales people. While the authors' purpose is to demonstrate the creation,

sustenance and development of the occupational self, their mode of analysis is curiously based on quasi input output models. At all levels of work they view the salesman as bringing something to the job and getting something in return. This form of analysis demonstrates with ringing clarity the dilemma of estrangement the salesman finds in his work. While some bureaucratic aspects of his work appear to be terribly unpleasant, if not degrading, the salesman finds forms of compensation within the structure of work just as Weber suggested the bureaucrat would be able to do. He tries to avoid being used by an ever-encroaching rationalizing bureaucracy but in doing so uses himself as an instrument to manipulate others. Through successful self-rationalization he avoids becoming an appendage to the process of the working machine the salesman uses himself as a tool to manipulate others and becomes self-estranged in the classic sense described by Marx, Mannheim and Veblen.

The clarity of the meaning of the salesman's work and its dilemma is presented by reduction to the level of the salesman's personal, social and ethical interests. At the personal level the salesman brings to his job certain skills and receives rewards in the form of "psychic income." This makes for a behavioral psychic input and output system.

Skill and Know How

There are two types of sales work skills in the salesman's

ideology. One is technical and may be acquired. The other is psychological and seen as an inborn gift. Neither skill is explicitly more important than the other to the salesman. The lacking of either qualification makes for a deficient and non-competent salesman in the eyes of other sales people. The psychological skill is a form of "know how." 20
 The salesman "must be a bit of an engineer...and a psychologist too." He must be able to "figure out" the customer's "motivation" on that particular day. The folklore of salesmanship is heavily leadened with allegiance to this indefinable, "inborn," delicate, sensitive understanding of "human nature." However, this general type of merchandising "know how" must be accompanied by a technical knowledge of the product or service. Through this additional requirement contemporary salesmen distinguish themselves from the fast talking, cigar chewing, "song and dance" man. The glib talker who sells his product with a loud greeting and a pat on the back is anathema. In their own ideology specific detailed product knowledge makes the salesman a professional man. Like the student or doctor, salesmen complain they must constantly struggle to keep up with journals and other trade literature. "To go 21
 into it deeper" is necessary if the salesman is to educate his customers while making his "pitch."

Although the two skills appear to be of equal value the salesman agrees that one cannot learn to sell by reading "how to do it" books on the subject. While they take pride in being able to keep up with technical changes, salesmen take more pride in their ability to

sell creatively. Selling and manipulating customers provides the basis of the salesman's psychic rewards. To some, consummating a sale is similar to "having a baby" or "hitting a home run with the bases loaded." All agree that there is a thrill, a "kick," a profound, almost ecstatic sense of satisfaction in the act of consummating a sale.²²

Establishing a relationship with a customer can be a trying and painful experience and salesmen refer to it as "breaking the sound barrier" or "getting to your man." Maintaining a customer's business despite other competition is an anxiety provoking experience. Intense gratification or "kicks" are a result of these thorny endeavors. The authors maintain of these rewards:

...is not that they compensate for painful anxiety incidental to the work of selling. While such discomfort is not sought for its own sake, it is perceived as inseparably bound up with the whole experience of getting satisfaction out of work, in kind and amount proportionate to the effort and skill put into the work.²³

Salesmen attempt to avoid the onus of the blame in case of failure.

Monetary income is not seen as a direct reward, it "is derivative in nature; it justifies and insures the unremitting pursuit of direct satisfaction in work, viz., 'kicks.'"²⁴ Money is taken almost for granted as seen by an example from one man. "I expect to make X number of dollars by the time I'm 35. I'm sure I'm going to make it, so I have no concern over that."²⁵

"Kicks" are a terminal value. Money is an incentive which acts as a spur to greater effort in work to achieve direct psychic

satisfaction. If income rises or falls it is a direct indication of psychic satisfaction and effort in work.

Presentation of Self and Bureaucratic Encroachment

At the level of personality and recognition, work takes on another set of meanings. Salesmen say that a salesman "should be easily liked, " "be yourself," never present a self that is "not honestly and truly your own." Simultaneously they say that a salesman needs "training in the techniques of making himself a trustworthy type." ²⁶ As the authors state, genuineness becomes an acquirable trait. A calculated presentation and appearance of a particularly pleasing social self is what a salesman must cultivate. One must question how genuine is a quasi-manufactured, genuine personality. Mannheim views this process of self-realization as the conscious remaking of the self. Fromm's marketing orientation is similar. It may also be evidence sine qua non of "other direction." Yet, to the salesman, it is not entirely manufactured. "He simply assumes there is ground outside the self on which to stand, and from which he can view and perform corrective surgery ²⁷ upon himself, an act which corresponds with his experience." This may be the effect of successful prior self-rationalization.

Another aspect of the fraud that is involved in this complicated game of the presentation of self can be expressed the following way. The job is easier "if you can believe in your company and in the product." Obviously this can be manufactured. The belief makes the

job "an emotional thing." If the emotion is not there, the job is meted out "mechanically." Again, the line between genuineness and fraud is vague. This means that sensitivity is manipulative and selective-- therefore self-manipulation. If one manipulates oneself--deceives oneself, one is deceiving others when one is "sincere."

In their work salesmen are subject to rebuff, rejection and often unkindness. It is an integral part of their work. As an occupation
28
selling is not humiliating. But salesmen find humiliating situations which are generic to their work. As one respondent said, "he can't
29
help but feel humiliated if he has any sensitivity." Salesmen claim one must "be tough skinned" or have "a thick hide" and have the ability to "take it" or "roll with the punches." The rub is, "it's very easy to get along with a man that's giving you a half a million or a million dollars worth of business."³⁰

This form of contradiction allows the salesman a mild reward for his quality of toughness. Paradoxically, he is supposed to develop sensitivity and toughness simultaneously. This cannot help but form a cleavage of the self.

Structured Competition

The opposite side of this coin is the respect and recognition of the salesman's peers. This is not easily gained for the salesmen work alone. In part, his success is based on "the chart on the wall" which compares him to his sales brethren. One's measure of success

may be based on another's failure. The isolation and competition with invisible others is not conducive to developing an occupational community. Thus bonds are formed with one's supervisor who the authors liken to a manager of a "stable" of athletes or entertainers. He will praise and reassure the man who does not have the recognition of his peers or, alternately neglect him making insidious comparisons with other members of the stable. In large measure the salesman's esteem is dependent on his ability to impress the supervisor who is the father image and matchmaker of structural competition.

Professionalization and Ethics

Another aspect of the prestige system is the professionalization of salesmen.

There's a great misuse of the word selling and the word salesman...the sales clerk in a department store should not be called a salesman or saleslady because there is just about no creativity in that field.

31

Salesmen deplore the tendency to call anyone behind a counter, every order taker and display man, a salesman. They regard it as scandalous to their honor. Their professional prestige is also threatened by the encroachment of an ever expanding bureaucracy. The salesman feels that the organization reduces him to a presenter of goods, a representative or an order taker. It dehumanizes him and above all takes the creativity out of his job thereby taking away his prestige claim and honor. They claim there is a tendency "toward attaching less and less

importance to salesmen as such and more to identification with the
 32
 company." Moreover, "the organization man routine where the organization swallows up the individual and the individual is just another one of its parts," is deplored. However, there still remains some remnant of pride. "Nothing," says one man, "will replace the human being... I think most big companies have realized that you can't replace the individual."
 33

There is basically an indifference concerning occupational ethics on behalf of the salesman. This is not to imply salesmen advocate that only the fit survive--anyway they can. They advocate honesty and a "square deal" not for pride or righteousness but simply to make and sustain connections.

Marriage is seen as a tool to facilitate the man's job. The wife and home should act as a place the salesman may "operate out of." And perhaps the final touch of cruelty.

A man without steady financial encumbrances might "cache some [money] away and feel he has enough to live on...[and] decide to take a nice vacation."
 34

The salesman's ethic appears to advocate a wife and family as an excellent device for maintaining dependence on his job.

With the exception of those most cut off from the community of man, each salesman wants to believe he is giving something to society.
 35
 He manages, the authors tell us, to incorporate the interest of others into his own "self-interest structure." He does so because it

"pays off" and not out of altruism. Yet there are justifications made.

Our standard of living here in America has increased, I believe, only through honest salesmen's efforts. They've educated the public, through their customers, that certain products...would do the job of enabling people to save time, money, and so forth. 36

In analyzing Howton and Rosenberg's salesmen it might be said they are not alienated from their specific occupational positions by the very nature of their work. The salesman's work is loaded with structural strains: the necessity of using an indefinable sixth sense as the basis of one's work as against the constant pressure of reading trade journals. However if one becomes too academic one cannot use one's sixth sense. One suffers self-abasement while justifying one's manhood on the basis of one's sales.

The necessity of being able to accept and understand rebuff is ego threatening. The salesman's ideology redefines rewards to emphasize individual "kicks" rather than money. Otherwise periodic failure might be ego debilitating. The emphasis on the humiliating situations of work not the job or the man takes the onus of the blame from one's self in case of failure. This emphasis legitimates the salesman's knowledge, skill and hard work rather than question his periodic rebuffs.

An Ego Confirming Social Character?

We tend to think there is a dimension here concerning

"kicks" that the authors may not have made explicit. Salesmen, as do narcissistic policy makers and advisory people, may represent a certain social character recruited to that position. Even Mills' Old Timer seems to represent the effect of years of saleswork in her social character. It would appear that these men are constantly trying to prove to themselves they can surmount difficult tasks in the manipulation of others. Following Bensman, Riesman, Fromm and Merton we could call this type of social character a constant ego confirmer. The salesman appears to be possibly suffering from insecurity and/or masochism. He seeks out situations where his ego is threatened and must surmount these situations by success in selling. Such success is short term and requires continuous repetition of its cycle. Because the "ego confirmer" never internalizes but accepts temporarily the evidence of the immediate moment of success, which is intensified and expanded through
 37
 kicks, he must constantly find new success as evidence of his own self-worth and competence. Like Piaget's other child he never becomes
 38
 emotionally autonomous. If not ego confirmers at the outset they become such if they remain long enough, as Bensman's ad men.

Their egos must be saved, soothed and replenished thus causing contradictory demands of sensitivity to other moods and toughness to their rejection. To build self-esteem the salesman looks to a supervisor to reassure him and put him in structural competition with others whose failure may define his success. He complains about "anyone" being called a salesman and strives to show the dignity and

complexity of salesmanship.

While it is prestigious and helpful to be a representative of a large firm this encroachment of bureaucracy threatens to take the salesman's pride and craftsmanship out of his work by reducing him to an order taker. Already alienated from price determination and product selection, he is threatened by the loss of his control over his art of creative persuasion. Yet this autonomy is only the salesman's freedom to use and perfect himself as an instrument to sell others.

The salesman must "sell himself" in order to sell his product particularly if marginal differentiation alone separates products. The salesman treats himself as a functional tool in selling his commodity.³⁹

Salesmen are at least one occupational group that show evidence that Durkheim's hope of occupational communities creating a new *gemeinschaft* in the urban society is denied by the processes of self-rationalization and the commercialization of social relations also termed the fetishism of commodities by Marx. Here Mannheim, Simmel and Marx prove better prognosticators. Instead of solidarity we find atomized competition; instead of ethics we find a "success ethic," instead of craftsmen we find salesmen.

The structural insecurity inherent in selling and the encroachment of an ever segmenting and rationalizing bureaucracy, limit the salesman's functioning. The increasing emphasis on presentation of self and self-rationalization and the non-ethical concerns point to

the salesman escaping one form of alienation only to be trapped in
 40
 another. It appears that the role of salesman in the structure of bureaucratic sales work is inherently filled with strains making in some form, some degree of alienation normative in the field. We have also shown there is some evidence that a particular type of social character is drawn to and created by the field. One cannot help but imagine a haunting laugh pierced with irony.

From the past, the ghost of Thorstein Veblen would certainly laugh with the recognition that alienation from workmanship wrought by the wastemanship of selling, has now come full cycle. Pride and skill prostituted by ownership and salesmanship as substitutes for workmanship appear difficult to find in saleswork. The bureaucratization that segmented and destroyed meaning in other forms of work now is doing the same for salesmanship.

"Merely" a Clerk

There are a small but incisive number of studies in the sociology of clerical work. Until recently little was known about the meaning of work for the vast clerical armies that man the files, typewriters, dictaphones, and telephones of offices. There are some tentative findings suggested in the works of Mills, Riesman, Blau, Crozier and Langer. These findings appear to indicate that there is little or no intrinsic meaning found in the work. These studies tend to suggest that young and middle aged women with a minimum of education are

recruited to these positions largely out of expediency or escape from the home. Indeed, any ideas of finding intrinsic meaning in work appear to be surrendered from the start. Work alienation is often expressed in terms of the conditions surrounding work rather than in the nature of the work itself. Work load, degree of involvement with people, machines, and social status on and off the job are other important considerations in determining work alienation.

Two categories of analysis appear to be quite important:

(1) the machine orientation of the work and (2) status and power on the job. The first demonstrates the structural conditions of work which helps to create work alienation. The second shows that many people recruited to this type of work do not expect to find fulfillment in their work. While they claim to be satisfied with their specific job they are alienated from the work they perform. They seek relative satisfaction in specific working conditions often not finding it. Others, hoping to find meaning and fulfillment in their work, are crushed by the harsh realities.

Machine Orientation

Clerical work involves the continual processing of papers by the use of office machines. In short, it is work where people relate to each other as part of a human processing machine. Clerks form the vast armies of invisible people without which the daily operation of offices would not be possible. They perform the necessary daily functions

of processing and filing orders. Without this human ~~folder~~ the wheels of bureaucracy would come to a grinding halt.

Mill's discussion of clerical work offers some deep insights into the structure of such work. Because of the sheer volume of work the increasing use of office machinery has made clerical work more rationalized, increasingly centralized and mechanized. Mills estimated that in 1951, 80% of office work could be done by machinery. Offices became increasingly centralized. Jobs that could be quantified, increasingly became standardized. Work flows from floor to floor and horizontally along each floor until the uniform desks and people form a human belt.

Orders are passed along by means of a belt and lights from a chief clerk to a series of checkers and typists, each of whom does one operation. The girl at the head of the line interprets the order, puts down the number and indicates the trade discount; the second girl prices the order, takes off the discount, adds carriage charges and totals; the third girl gives the order a number and makes a daily record. The fourth girl puts this information on an alphabetical index; the fifth girl time-stamps it; it next goes along the belt to one of several typists, who makes a copy in sextuplicate and puts on address labels; the seventh girl checks it and sends it to the storeroom.⁴²

The modern large scale office resembles a factory with its machines, human machinery and work flow. What Mills calls "finger dexterity" are the requirements for work. Increasingly the clerks become interchangeable because their functions become highly specialized. Thus their training period requires less time and cost. Consequently, they

have little chance for promotion, little or no opportunity for tenure and no contact with supervisors except to be supervised.

The glamorous girl Friday and private secretarial jobs which would require some degree of substantial rationality are on the wane. Rationalization of the office demands a stenographer whose function is to take dictation and a typist who does straight copy work. Individually assigned stenographers are viewed as wasteful by time and motion studies. Only the senior executives are afforded the luxury of a private secretary or stenographer. Stenographic services have been augmented into centralized typing pools of stenographers and typists. The executive now dictates into a dictaphone on his desk or a centralized dictaphone system direct to the typing pool.

This eliminates hurried dictation, hastily written notes, and frenzied work periods. The machines audibility is adjustable and the work flow made smooth and efficient. Also eliminated are knowledge of shorthand, status and some degree of substantial rationality. Clerks become interchangeable as do typewriter ribbons. The white collar office resembles a factory and highly regarded individual white collar jobs become more like unskilled factory jobs. Work, time, schedules, talk and people are transferred into an automatized collective mass.

The Strain of the Machine Orientation

Peter Blau affords us a detailed empirical study of a

department in a state public employment agency.⁴³ Data for this study were gathered over a three month period during the second half of 1948 in a state agency and a three month period in 1949 at a Federal agency. Using the case study method Blau gathered his data utilizing a form of participant observation. He received the permission of the top officials to be an observer. In turn, he was introduced at a staff meeting as a "sociologist" studying "the interpersonal relationships of civil servants." Blau notes that he was initially treated with suspicion. He claims that after a period of time most, if not all officials, accepted his role as researcher. He also claims that his ignorance of civil service and government agencies was revealed during informal activities. After collecting his "on the job" data Blau interviewed all of the people in this department at their homes "...to clarify the social relations and operating practices... Most questions elicited the respondent's opinions and feelings about his work, his career, and his clients."⁴⁴

Blau was able to study a section of clerical people in the state employment agency and supplement it with home interviews of clerical people who worked in the Federal agency. Blau chose for intensive study one of four departments in this division. The department served workers and the clothing industry in the principal city of this state.

The department had four sections each with a supervisor who was responsible to a central department head. Two sections served unskilled workers and a third handicapped workers. In each of

these sections the interviewers who numbered fifteen, interviewed applicants to discern their qualifications and then referred them to suitable jobs. A fourth section was comprised of five clerical workers who were responsible for screening applicants at the reception desk and the compilation of statistical reports and typing. This is the section with which we are concerned.

Two findings are of significance. All but one of the clerks wanted to work at the reception desk in order to work with people rather than papers. However, their duties at the reception desk caused a great deal of strain on the clerks. They were put in the unpleasant position of turning people away who desperately needed work. The strain of this duty caused them to modify the procedure and in effect to direct the flow of work for the interviewers.

Their preference for the reception desk is expressed in the following way:

I used to prefer work with figures; I'm getting away from that...[Now], I enjoy this job because it gives me a chance to talk to people.

45

Proof of this is evidenced by Blau's observations that the clerks talked more with clients than was technically required. The average contact by those who enjoyed their work lasted between 1.2 and 1.5 minutes. The average time for the clerk who did not enjoy this duty was 0.6 minutes.

46

The inherent difficulty of work at the reception desk is that

clerks must reassure people who cannot be helped on that day and another appointment made. Some of these people needed a job desperately, because they were not receiving unemployment benefits. The "due date" or reappointment procedure was broad enough to be interpreted differently at different levels. The rules specified that the applicant return for an appointment in one week to four months. This department generally used a 30 or 60 day "due date" period. Many factors had to be taken into account in assigning a "due date" i.e., ability, eagerness to work, etc. In short, need for discretion was recognized and the clerks all interpreted the rule in a liberal manner.

They gave earlier due dates and occasionally were able to have a client seated for an interview who otherwise would have been sent home. The unofficial norm, as stated by one clerk, was to give one month to clients who weren't "specially qualified." Clients not receiving benefits were frequently the beneficiaries of such preferential treatment.

The problem stated by one clerk is this:

The only thing that's hard is the applicant who's been here ten times and has been turned away because there are no jobs. If you have to turn those applicants away at the desk, it's a little heart-sickening.⁴⁷

If the above occurred and the clerk had to send the client away they would experience aggression by the clients which put them under severe pressure. As one clerk described it:

I prefer having contacts with people—It's strange, because often you get aggravated. (Why?) Sometimes they're stupid. They want something and they don't believe you if you tell them something else... They don't believe you that there are no jobs, and they argue with you that there are, and they want one.⁴⁸

The single clerk who did not enjoy work at the desk claimed this conflict was the reason. Blau argues that the clerks liberally interpreted the procedure and often acted contrary to rules because they identified with the service philosophy of the agency.⁴⁹ This, plus the clients aggression created conflicts for them. We do not wish to make an issue of this point but we cannot agree with Blau entirely. It would appear that empathy or identification with the clients also caused the conflict, thus the change in the due date procedure. We believe that the clerks status in the organization helped them to identify, or at least empathize, with the clients. Status is the topic of our next section. Other aspects of the study will be presented in a later chapter.

Social Status and Recruitment to Clerical Work

Following Merton and Bensman's hypothesis that certain social types are drawn to particular levels of bureaucracy, there appears some indication that white collar clerical workers form a particular type of social character.

Mills states that some office managers prefer to hire only girls who have no desire to rise above the clerical level.⁵⁰ It is obvious that someone too well educated or too ambitious for a clerical job may

not be content with it and desire promotion or termination.

Assuming that clerical workers are not especially bright and ambitious or masochistic, why do they take and keep these monotonous, boring, tension-filled jobs? Clerical jobs are normally province of middle aged housewives and younger unmarried girls, who aspire to become housewives. The former use work as an escape from the tyranny and boredom of their existence while the latter view the job as a way station on the road to the supposedly more glamorous role of wife and homemaker. Basically they are urban people in urban centered jobs. It is the anonymity and impersonality of this segmented urban existence that Simmel described which they both seek to escape.

According to Riesman, whose work we have examined earlier, white collar girls seek glamour and emotional involvement in their work. Yet, they seem thwarted by the anonymity of the typing pool and attracted by stylized personalization of their work. Ironically it is the false personalization of work Riesman claims, that drew thousands of middle and lower middle class women out of the house during World War II into factory jobs with poor working conditions, inadequate transportation and the growing complaints of husbands. Work still had a magnetic and real ring despite the monotony of the job. In short, factory or office internment is better than solitary domestic confinement. There appears to be substantial evidence for this in the work of Michel Crozier.

Convergence of the Machine Orientation and Social Status

52

Michel Crozier studied the meaning of work for a group of female clerical workers in a French public service bureaucracy. Crozier studied "The Parisian Clerical Agency," the Paris branch of a large public agency in a government department. This agency employed 4,500 people, mainly women, whose job it was to handle the daily financial operations of a great many customers.

There are two points of strong emphasis in this study.

(1) Expressed satisfaction in work varied by the girls status on the job, and social class outside of work. (2) Alienation was more frequently expressed in terms of the conditions under which work was performed rather than the work itself. Expectation for finding intrinsic satisfaction in work also was a function of social class status outside of work. As we will see this has Weberian and Veblenian implications that go beyond a macrocosmic analysis of bureaucracy.

The study was done by in depth interviewing of the women in the agency. There is no further methodological discussion mentioned. The work was done over a three year period prior to 1964.

The work was performed in special rooms with one hundred girls working in two shifts. They worked in production units on cross tabulating accounting machines. Work cannot be planned because it occurs on a daily basis at the wish of clients. At that level the market is quite important for this industry. Therefore, the organization of work is simple, control is stressed and experience with handling operations

mistakes is at a premium. Each room is divided into regular and special sections. In the special room, senior employees and some supervisors handle problems, special cases and information requests. There are two inspectors for each section of each room. There are four additional supervisors from each shift. One section chief is in charge of both shifts. Ten such rooms form one division--each with one division head. There were four such divisions. One formal chief with a small staff presided over the four divisions. His function was to coordinate all of the work of the Parisian branch.

The basic work unit is a four girl work team. Sixty percent of the employees, predominantly women, belong to such teams. They process the clients orders. The work teams are not dependent on each other although they all do the same work. Work never varies except in amount. The rhythm of work is constant--the daily processing of orders. All work received on time must be processed that day. If work isn't completed, the girls must work overtime.

Within each work team two girls work at the tabulators and two at checking. The first girl checks the customers credentials and the second girl, at a six tabulator machine, types all necessary forms to process the order. A third girl checks these papers and a fourth girl retabulates them for balancing the account. The first girl has the most important job in an unofficial capacity. She must check the order and decide whether or not it can be processed. She also, unofficially sets the pace and rhythm of work for the team. She is recognized as

the team leader. In theory, the girls are supposed to rotate their jobs but in practice only a partial rotation occurs. Few are experienced enough for the first job. However, the girls at the typing machine rotate because of the tiring nature of the work. It is clearly recognized that the girls who check customers' credentials have more prestige than the others.⁵³ Thus prestige becomes a Weberian form of compensation for their extreme specialization and functional rationality.

Supervisors had little control of the work flow but maintained a strong discipline to avoid mistakes. The fact that there was a high degree of discipline was dictated by the strict processing of all orders received by that day's deadline. Morale was quite low because of the atmosphere of coercion and strong pressures. This is attested by the fact that the average length of seniority was three and one-half years. No absenteeism was allowed. Mistakes were traced directly to the responsible party and a written excuse demanded of each. The firing of people was almost impossible because the supervisors were largely reduced to arranging transfers. However, the threat of public humiliation by official reprimands and criticisms in one's personal file was enough to keep in check women whose feelings were easily manipulated.⁵⁴ In short, the grinding effects of monotonous, repetitive work were heightened by an atmosphere which may be described as highly impersonal, authoritarian, quasi-militaristic, non-flexible and discipline oriented.

Crozier attempted to study work satisfaction among these women employees. The latter is not the same as work alienation, as it entails asking whether one is or is not satisfied with one's work.

Many people Crozier argues, believe that "the inhuman nature of the work"⁵⁵ itself makes it extremely painful for the employees to adjust themselves to the new technology. In Marxian or Veblenian terms they experience difficulty in becoming appendages to the machines. Crozier's study indicated that work satisfaction was not particularly low among the girls. While this would appear to invalidate the idea that they see the work as dehumanizing we will see it does not. If anything, it makes a stronger case for it by specifying the form their alienation takes by documenting the depth and intensity.

There appears to be an implicit recognition by the girls that little can be done about the work, they focus instead on conditions of work which can be improved. The meaning of work is based on three points: (a) work load, (b) attitudes about work and (c) one's social class.

Work Load

The amount of work was spontaneously mentioned by two-thirds of the interviewees. Only a small minority mentioned anything⁵⁶ about the intrinsic nature of work. This is one of the reasons that Crozier finds that work satisfaction is not particularly low. We think this is seriously misleading and instead advance the following idea.

Many of the girls stated that their work was inhuman and beyond the reach of human will, these girls did not seek to find intrinsic meaning in their work. They assumed that work of this type was not intrinsically filling before they entered the job. In essence, they surrendered before they started. They viewed work as monotonous, inhuman drudgery, alien to them. It would appear that this is a form of work alienation. To say that one is satisfied when satisfaction is viewed as a form of compensation in the form of a specific amount in itself constitutes a lack of pride or intrinsic meaning in work. We will now discuss their specific statements about work.

Positive Work Attitudes

Approximately two-thirds of the girls interviewed had attitudes towards work which indicated they were somewhat satisfied. However in looking at their comments it is evident that satisfaction is measured in terms of the extrinsic conditions of work not intrinsic conditions. This is what one woman said:

I like...having accomplished the task...It was hard to get used to this kind of work. At first I didn't understand it very well. I liked the ordinary typewriter much better: when one begins one finds it deadly dull, but when one is accustomed to it, it is all right... 57

Concerning pride in work another woman said:

Of course, we are all of us quite proud. And then there is the rivalry between the shifts. When I am at the checking job, especially, I like to finish early. I like very much being in charge of the team. 58

Concerning conscientiousness in work:

We must do our work if we don't want to be in trouble. 59

Concerning aptitudes:

It suits me very well, especially the checking job; typing at the accounting machine is all right, but checking is more interesting. As a typist, one does not have to care about what one is doing. 60

A forty-eight year old woman had changed jobs because she disliked working as a charwoman. She went back to school at the age of thirty. She worked in one of the special rooms. She felt disappointed if she could not finish her work. She emphasized being conscientious because it made her feel good. However, she added a comment, "this is how we hold on", indicating some tension in work. Young people, she claimed weren't as conscientious. Summarizing her attitudes she said:

This work suits me very well, it has helped me develop certain qualities: speed, carefulness, orderliness...I am happy. One is working in a different milieu, one is rising up... This was the dream of my life, I wanted to be a teacher, a clerk...I could never bear being a servant. 62

Negative Work Attitudes

About one-third of the women expressed attitudes about work which expressed both the content and the context of work to be unbearable. A typist at a light accounting machine in the special room said this:

It is very monotonous...In the morning I have to type Series X and in the afternoon Series Y. It is quite painful. I am a sort of dreamer...It is so mechanical; I am living in a different world; I never think about my work; you know it is a way of evading...Actually, it does not have the slightest interest. Sometimes I wondered. What meaning does it have?...One does not have the same personality here..., one loses one's own personality. 63

Concerning pride in work:

Where I was before it was sometimes possible to be proud of one's work, but here I do not see any possibility; if it were not for the chance to daydream, one could go mad. For my colleagues, for everyone around me, it is the same. If I could have done something else - but I had to go to work right away... 64

Concerning conscientiousness in work:

We are just like trained animals. Work has become completely mechanical, we are functioning just out of habit... We do not need supervision. Once the supervisor was away, and nobody noticed it. 65

Two middle aged women summed up their work with these comments:

It is a sort of a disciplinary camp, a reformatory, it should be reserved for mischievous people.

One must be proud of working at the branch... this is just like the gallows, a really well-known place. 66

Class, Status and Work

One's social status or class position outside of work was an important factor in determining these women's attitude about their work. In addition, one's position in the work team determined the

degree of perceived satisfaction in work.

Work alienation is partly a result of expectations about work
67
corresponding to one's social status. Different social classes have different expectations concerning work. Weber implies this in his analysis of commercial groups and Veblen in the idea of the "leisure class."

Crozier constructed an index of social class dividing these women into a middle or petit bourgeois class and a working class. Approximately two-thirds of the women were working class and one-third were middle class. According to Crozier "almost all" of the working class girls liked their jobs. Approximately half of the middle class women were "clearly dissatisfied."

Crozier does not speculate on the reasons for this, but we would offer this brief interpretation, based on sections of the few interviews he has presented. It would appear as if the working class women viewed their jobs as a means of upward mobility. The job as a position offered them a certain amount of prestige. This is no guarantee, however, that they liked the job involved. While it is possible the work itself may be menial and monotonous, holding the office may be the important thing. It also appears that these girls thought little about fulfilling themselves in their work. The middle class girls however may have anticipated interesting work and been disappointed. In this case their disappointment would be hardfelt and they might be more easily disposed to verbal complaint. In addition, this type of

job might not be a means of upward mobility for a middle class woman. In some instances holding such a job might be a step down on the prestige scale.

Crozier's recognition that social status outside of work is a cause of dissatisfaction in work is clearly a major contribution to our knowledge of work alienation. In this sense we see that the attempt to change one's life style through work is an attempt to raise one's social status and/or class position. The prestige order or prestige market then becomes a factor in determining alienation from work if one is striving upward. Also one's class position becomes an important fact if the job is not seen as being at least worthy of one's class and status position. Clearly any explanation of work alienation must attempt to include more complex data concerning the totality of one's life in a bureaucratic society.

Job Status

As we have seen being a team leader was also an important factor in determining work alienation. Crozier does not state what proportion of the middle class and working class girls were team leaders. This would be interesting to disclose. The working class girls tended to like their jobs regardless of whether they were team leaders. Among the middle class girls the team leader almost exclusively liked her job. Overall eighty percent of the team leaders liked their work while twenty percent of the non team leaders liked

their work. Crozier claims that age is not an important variable as the girls tended to be young. Youth itself would tend toward decreasing involvement on the job.

Crozier's discovery that relatively high social status on the job tended to decrease overt work alienation is consistent with our analysis of non policy making executives. Team leaders have social power as well as prestige. They control the pace of work for the rest of the team. The non policy making executive avoids alienation by using his power to control the work of others just as the team leader. In that sense both avoid one form of alienation at the expense of their subordinates.

Two Forms of Alienation

While these girls, particularly the working class girls, claim they are satisfied with their work we would suggest that this is a form of alienation from work. Just as those middle class girls who say they cannot tolerate their work are alienated from it the lower class girls appear to surrender any chance of finding intrinsic meaning in their work from the outset. If this is true they accept work as meaningless and do not seek intrinsic meaning. If there is a difference between these two groups of women it would appear that one group surrenders perhaps unconsciously while the members of the other are aware of their situation and verbally express their awareness. In this sense it is impossible to measure the number of girls who are

alienated from their work.

At this level Crozier shows the effect of one's "status group" or "community" in creating alienation from work. Crozier then shows the relationship between the prestige market and bureaucratic work. Veblen implies such a relationship in his discussions of the "irrationality of the market" under capitalism and bureaucracy. Weber clearly recognized status groups and communities as one "market" in relationship to other types of market. In some instances he relates bureaucracy to non bureaucratic prestige groups and shows interaction between them. At this level Crozier shows us again in subtle institutional ways what Veblen or Weber might not have foreseen. In that sense Crozier's work validates classical and contemporary theory.

As we have seen salesmen substitute one form of alienation for another. Rather than accept manipulation by the bureaucratic machinery they manipulate. Clerks function as the automatons necessary to do the daily mechanical work of processing and filing endless numbers of papers. Some are consciously alienated, others apparently deluded themselves to avoid the recognition of their alienation.

If we return to Fromm's thesis that a new white collar salariat has taken the place of the alienated manual worker, we appear to have some tentative affirmation. Yet the alienation is not as simple as Fromm assumes. There are forms and degrees that Fromm and we as yet may not fully understand because of the lack of empirical work in this field. We cannot fully understand work alienation from

the point of view of the white collar man without understanding the central place of such work in contemporary American society.

The Telephone Company

In some senses where Crozier leaves off Langer, a journalist, begins. Elinor Langer writing for The New York Review of Books, worked for a three month period from October to December, 1969, in the New York Telephone Company as a Customer's Service Representative in the Commercial Department. The job consisted of taking orders for new telephone equipment and complaints from customers. Her study is not in the classical participant observation tradition because she appears to be self-taught. The author admits to having certain "radical interests." She "knew" in advance of her work that she would see "bureaucratization," "alienation," and "exploitation," of Telephone Company employees. She felt that the telephone company was in a crisis and she wanted a woman's white collar job in a highly bureaucratized industry. She admitted going to college at her initial interview. However she claimed she didn't want a management job because she was going through a divorce and was a little upset emotionally and didn't know if she wanted a career with managerial responsibility. Although "overqualified" she was accepted by the company but was viewed as "management material" and was told

71

"management would be keeping an eye" on her.

Much of her study focuses on the techniques of self-rational-

rationalization which the girls are "forced" to undergo for several weeks in order to be considered as properly trained. The course is essentially programmed and the girls are taught in a prescribed fashion what to say in almost every conceivable situation. They are instructed always to gain control over the "contact," "to express interest," and get the customer's permission for subsequent company action and for purchase by saying, "May I"? and indicate the need in
72
case of a complaint for further investigation. It is the express purpose of the training program to "transform the trainees from humans into
73
machines." The emphasis is on the complete remaking of the trainee and particularly her telephone voice. It seems impossible to undergo successfully the training without being almost totally aware of one's techniques at least initially.

The result is a dehumanization of the representative and of her customers. The latter is accomplished "by extracting 'bits' of information: by translating the human problem he might have into bureaucratic language so that it can be processed by the right department."
74
The clerks have to use a rather complicated form of shorthand in taking down the customer's problem, etc. They simultaneously fill out an official form which is filed every fifteen minutes by a clerk. Most impressed upon the girls by various teachers and managerial representatives is that the only product they have to sell is "service" and that they process the information just as any telephone
75
representative in the United States. Thus, the ideology is used to

standardize all behavior in order to create efficient cogs out of individuals.

Much of her study shows that the job of the representative
 is in no small way to create a market for stylized phone equipment. 76
 Indeed, Langer argues that if it were not for a salesmanship, reinforced by giving the representatives gifts at holiday time, (dolls, key chains, shopping bags with slogans saying, "Joy is... Extensions in
 Color," or "It's Little, It's Lovely, It Lights") whole layers of the bu- 77
 reaucratic structure of the phone company would not be needed. The 78
 company could restrict itself, Langer argues, to essential services 79
 not profit making. Every representative had a quota of extensions, Princess phones, etc. to sell and the group itself had a quota. These elements of dehumanization, self-rationalization, salesmanship, culminate in the following type of conversation which Langer fantasizes:

...if a customer calls and says: "My wife is dying and she's coming home from the hospital today and I'd like to have a phone installed in her bedroom right away." You say, "Oh, I'm very sorry to hear that sir, I'm sure I can help you, would you be interested in our Princess model? It has a dial that lights up at night," meanwhile writing on your ever-present CF-1: "Csr wnts Prn inst bedrm immed." 80

The girls all work in a five unit group with a supervisor who can listen in on a phone conversation at any moment. The supervisor must do this unobserved for an hour each day. Then there are official "observers" who listen in from the central telephone company. One can never be certain when observation, which is one of the features

81

that the girls hated most about the jobs, ends. That correct information must be given is part of the ideology of the company, that it is
 82
 good for you and the company, is part of the training. Consequently, when customers inquire about "taps," bad service or obscene phone
 83
 calls the proper answer must be given. But, the knowledge that one is under constant observation is a hated part of the work.

84

The job itself to Langer, an intellectual, is more than boring. One works at a constant low level of panic. There is a constant fear that time is slipping away and that one will never "complete one's
 84
 commitments." The basic working unit is one girl and one phone that must be answered approximately fifty times per day. Each has its necessary amount of paper work. Work is divided into "open" and "closed" time. "Closed time" is approximately one hour in which to
 85
 complete forms. Part of the time is taken up by a break. Calls for new lines are dreaded because of the time taken up by filling out forms. These calls are frequently transferred. The job is such that the company's system stifles the natural urge to completion. According to
 86
 Langer, some contacts could be satisfying if they are well handled.

The other women help out one another if they have too much work to do. It is part of the ethic of what Langer calls "Niceness." These women did not appear alienated to Langer's surprise, although "...they object to the salaries; they hate the pressure; they dislike observation; and they resent the internalized time clocks which control

their lunches and breaks.⁸⁷ While they do not mouth the phone com-
 pany rhetoric they have an absolute identification with the company and⁸⁸
 the System which affords them upward mobility through what Langer
 calls "consumerism."⁸⁹

The women are mainly lower middle class with a variety
 of ethnic backgrounds, Polish, Jewish, Italian, Irish, Black, Puerto
 Rican.⁹⁰ According to Langer they appear to relate to each other through
 consumerism which is the topic of most of their conversations. They
 have a particular fetish about brand names and wigs. Consumerism is
 one of the main reasons they work, Langer argues, implying that con-
 sumption is if not a crime, a sin.⁹¹ Many are housewives supplementing
 a husbands income. Langer emphasizes the point that consumerism is
 a passion and is the primary way in which these women define them-
 selves.⁹² The work they do is relatively unimportant. This idea extends
 beyond a simple form of one's compensation for an intolerable job.
 Langer says that the amount of consumer goods they desire and what
 they will endure to achieve their desire is astonishing, i. e., low pay,
 a stifling job, unremitting pressures, and being subject to constant
 spying, etc.⁹³ The pressures of the job, the passionate need for consum-
 erism, scientifically structured manipulative work all help contribute to the
 the ethic of "niceness" and helpfulness and a lack of awareness of one's
 alienation.

In part the phone company and white collar work in general⁹⁴
 creates what Langer calls a new white collar working class. Yet their

real interests are not class defined conflict interests but consumer oriented middle class styles of consumption. Again we see the influence of Veblen and Weber. It is perhaps too indirect for Langer appears unaware of her intellectual "natural" ancestors.

Langer intimates that it is the consumerism in mass society which drives these lower educated and perhaps, in some cases, lower intelligent women into this work. However she did not have access to the telephone company files containing their I.Q. scores. She implies that their main, if not only, form of identification comes from appliances, TV's, wigs, etc. The image of efficiency and elegance in their households is desired from the extra income which was initially earned to pay for these household objects. Thus initial need or desire of objects becomes tied in with one's self-image and one becomes bound or trapped by the attachment to these consumer items. The individual consumption items, i.e., clothing and wigs Langer explains as "a kind of tax, a tribute exacted by the social pressures of the work-place. For the preservation of their own **eges** against each other and against the system, they had to feel confident of their appearance on each and every day. Outside work they needed it too: to keep up, to keep their men, not to fall behind."⁹⁵

Thus Langer, like Crozier discovered that a certain class group of women are systematically attracted to this type of work.⁹⁶ Unlike Crozier she does not know their reasons for entering. She,

unlike Crozier, didn't ask for such reasons. Her study is based on participant observation not questionnaires or interviews.

However unsystematic the study may be, Langer perhaps inadvertently shows just how deeply embedded and all-pervasive is the notion of conspicuous consumption, or "consumerism" and attachment to commercial symbols in America. At that level she validates Veblen, Marx, and perhaps Simmel.

The system of rationalization of industry has taken a job that is essentially a salesman's job, programmed it, organizationally produced a type of personnel training and instilled a type of bureaucratic style and ethic. This, when fully realized, causes the representative to internalize that style to the point where it is no longer alien to the person. Because these women are a lower middle class population, striving upward, they will accept all of the above as a condition for achieving some of the amenities that are deemed by a more "sophisticated" observer appropriate for new lower middle class life styles. With all this, the work as described does not seem as onerous as factory work, or as pressure laden as executive and managerial and advertising work. The greatest single strain appears to be maintaining a close connection between the work of answering the phone while simultaneously filling out forms. In this sense, Langer's threshold of disgust seems to be much lower than any other student's researching dehumanization in work.

Classical Theories of Sales and Clerical Work

We have already indicated the importance of some of the classical theorists in understanding sales and clerical work. All three of our major institutional processes in varying degrees are important in understanding the immediate structural conditions of work in this field.

The market under industrial capitalism creates an overall structure of work for salesmen and clerks. However, its immediate impact is greater on salesmen. Salesmen, as we have noted, are more subject in their relation to their customers to the effect of the "irrationality of the market." They find that irrationality in the form of the inexplicable refusal of a customer to buy their products. The concept of the fetishism of the commodity is strongly applicable to the salesman's work. The commodity market determines the form and content of the salesman's relations to his customers, peers and his employer. As we have seen self-exploitation, the exploitation of others, psychological brutalization, and manipulation are inherent in such work. The salesman suffers because he is torn between management, his company and his customers and is subject to rebuff from both sources. The characteristics of urban social relations, as previously mentioned, are important because the fetishism of impersonality and the cash nexus describe also the operation of the department store or sales bureaucracy. The salesman stands symbolically as the humble servant of management and the masses.

In its extreme form irrationality of the market, according to Marx, means large scale unemployment. None of the researchers have dealt specifically with this concept but it is perhaps implicit in the salesman's anxiety. No researcher, however, has made this concept explicit.

The industrial division of labor, as we have shown, creates narrow specialization for both salesmen and clerks. Clerks may in some instances be more specialized than the salesmen. The clerk may be a typist while the salesman may do more than one task. Both types of work are based on the separation of intellectual and physical labor. The salesman may have an ambience that provides for vast amounts of physical mobility. The clerk may figuratively be chained to a desk or typewriter. In some senses both are victimized by the machine process but the clerk more so than the salesman. The clerk must do his work in a rote like fashion. They often have no other choice than checking each item, typing each word. The salesman cannot set the price of his product. He is reduced to presenting the commodity and making the sale.

Industrial bureaucracy is quite important in understanding the immediate conditions of work for both groups. Their respective jobs are affected in a somewhat different way by it. As we have seen, both are placed in uncomfortable levels of the hierarchy. The salesman attempts to overcome the impersonality of the organization and retain the "human element" in his work. The clerks are more subject

to impersonality with their supervisors. Occasionally, the bureaucratically imposed impersonality breaks down between individual clerks and between clerks and their clients.

Rationality and specialization, as we have noted, are inherently part of the work of both. Neither group seems more clearly subject to its effects than the other.

In the classical sense both are subject to the office routine. The clerks however may be somewhat more affected by the necessity of following rules and procedural details. Their work itself is based in large measure on details, procedure, etc. In addition, their work is frequently double checked by another clerk because "it must be correct." The department store salesman is more subject to the constraints of rules than outside salesmen. However, by not being spatially confined, by not having a 9 to 5 routine and by not being under the immediate eye of supervisors they may develop a particular type of social character generic to this work. The career is particularly important for the salesman. For the clerk their career largely has meaning outside of the bureaucracy.

The social psychological effects of three major work related institutions vary in kind and degree. The effects of the market under capitalism do, in both cases, create monsterism. Clerks are seriously overdeveloped specialists as are salesmen. Instrumental meaning appears to be strong in some clerks. Some appear to identify with the agency's clients. Some women clerks attempt to fulfill emotional

needs through false personalization. Still others use their position as clerks as a sign of upward mobility. The prevalence of instrumental meaning is doubtful for the salesmen we have studied. The desire for money, power, glory and prestige all appear to be missing. Some salesmen appear to be a specific type of social character drawn to the work or created by it which we have called "ego confirmers."

Some clerks apparently find compensation for relatively low status position in society by having a white collar job. The "white collar" contributes instrumental meaning to this work. The salesmen discussed by Howton and Rosenberg do not overcompensate for deprivation. However, this is not to be generalized with any certainty or to Mills' salesmen in that their work situations are quite similar to clerks. They develop elaborate masks as forms of overcompensation.

The industrial division of labor substitutes salesmanship in place of workmanship. The irony is that whatever pride one takes in saleswork can only be found through unremitting work and the techniques of manipulation of one's self and others.

The loss of autonomy over the production process is found by both groups. The salesman, particularly, experiences the feeling of powerlessness and isolation. But there is a strong attempt to overcome this sense of alienation by using his "innate" sensitivity and understanding of human nature to keep the human element in saleswork. Ironically, it is techniques of self-manipulation that are used to fight the encroaching division of labor.

Clerks have little control over the work flow into the department nor do they control the internal flow of work within their department. They appear not to suffer as much isolation as do salesmen because of the tendency to work in teams. Some apparently compensate for deprivation through bending or stretching the rules. Others, as Crozier shows, overcompensate by becoming team leaders or acquiring jobs that are somewhat more prestigious than others.

The effects of industrial bureaucracy on salesmen are found primarily in self-rationalization, careerism and dehumanization. For the clerk, they are found in careerism and fetishism of rules and dehumanization. Salesmen, as we have noted, use self-rationalization to fight an ever-encroaching bureaucracy, structural competition and an ever-segmenting division of labor. The better a tool or instrument they make out of themselves, the better they avoid being alienated or estranged from the organization. Yet, in part, they are alienated from the organization although not especially from their work. They do become somewhat self-estranged because of the demands made in the process of self-rationalization for both sensitivity and toughness. Yet they do not recognize their estrangement. They recognize neither their own self-estrangement and dehumanization nor the dehumanization of clients and peers.

Some clerks do not expect to find meaning in their work even prior to entering the field. Yet some still continue in their career either out of economic necessity or for the prestige it affords relative

to other alternatives available for them. Some tend to lose a total perspective in their work. However, the stereotype of the clerk as worshipping the rules is not validated by our data. If anything there appears to be evidence that personal contact with low status clients gives cause for clerks to break rules. However, there is still strong evidence of dehumanization.

Conclusion

Salesmen, as we have seen, are in part alienated or estranged from the organizations that employ them, a phenomenon which the classical theorists, particularly Veblen and Mannheim, have predicted. However, the empirical investigators particularly Howton and Rosenberg show us that some salesmen are also self-estranged in the process of their self-rationalization even though they attempt to avoid this form of alienation. Although they do become self-estranged they do not appear to recognize it. Again we see the importance of Mannheim's concept of self-rationalization, as we saw with managers, in the subsequent understanding of the subtle and complex nature of contemporary work.

Clerks, while not necessarily a unique type of social character, are often bewildering as an occupational group. They appear to enter the field for varying reasons about which we know little. In addition, as Crozier shows, some do not expect anything from the work in terms of intrinsic meaning because the work is simply a means of achieving

some form of social mobility. Thus they are alienated before they enter the field and further alienated without recognizing it while remaining in it.

One question the classical theorists, with the exception of Weber and Veblen, and the contemporary researchers with the exception of Crozier and Mills, do not explicitly raise is why people from particular status groups are drawn to petty bureaucratic sales and clerical work? Crozier explicitly and Mills implicitly, show that the reason is upward social mobility. Weber suggests bureaucratic work had the advantages of tenure security, etc. Yet, for clerks and salesmen, white collar work may represent instantaneous entry into the middle classes.

Veblen suggests that a society dominated by salesmanship not only transfers the emphasis from production to consumption but makes some level of conspicuous consumption incumbent upon its members. Veblen never actually makes explicit the link between the institutional, ideological and cultural mechanisms by which this occurs. Yet, as we have seen, his insight is validated in the 20's and 30's in Middletown and in the 50's in Small Town. Certainly advertising and the proliferation of bureaucrats as members of the new middle classes provides models for new life styles. However, this does not explain the mandate to status mobility as defined by prestige consumption. It shows how this is intensified. There appears to be something in the nature of contemporary capitalist industrial society which may demean

work and alienate people from work, yet make it incumbent upon certain groups to become middle class through the life styles afforded by their work.

Another question raised but not answered by present research is why is it necessary to validate one's self-worth at jobs which demand extreme self-manipulation or which are intrinsically devoid of meaning? For the salesman validation of one's manhood is made in terms of bureaucratic and market ideologies. For the clerk it is made in terms of the ethic of status mobility. The extent to which these questions remain unanswered is the extent to which we do not understand the meaning of sales and clerical work.

However, it is clear that bureaucratic structures and the basic institutional fabric of technological society multiply jobs of this nature. Yet the success ethic still demands that people go into this type of work rather than white collar work. They then must find some type of technique of neutralization if they recognize their alienation, or they must successfully delude themselves so that recognition is not permitted. At this level Weber's predicted nightmare of a fully bureaucratized society becomes more and more real.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man, pp. 56-58.
- ² The term "salarial" refers to the idea that white collar workers receive a fixed weekly salary. Unlike the manual worker's hourly wage this is a more dignified manner of remuneration. However, this attempt at professionalization does not always allow the clerk or salesman time and a half or double time and other such "proletarian" benefits. See Bell, "Work and It's Discontents," p. 268.
- ³ Mills, White Collar, chap. VIII.
- ⁴ Ibid., p. xxi.
- ⁵ Ibid., pp. 165-166.
- ⁶ Ibid., p. 356.
- ⁷ Ibid., p. 173.
- ⁸ Ibid., pp. 173, 231, 243-244, 255-256.
- ⁹ Ibid., p. 173.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 174. It should be noted that in the twenty some odd years since this study was done there have been a multiplicity of low budget department stores, i.e., Klein's, Mays, Korvette's, Alexander's, etc. added to Macy's, Bergdorf, Sach's and Lord & Taylor. Increasingly, these are staffed by housewives working part-time and college girls, all of whom have other sources of income, i.e., husbands and fathers. With the initial low sales prices and employee discounts this argument may be less valid today than it was in 1946.

¹¹
Ibid., p. 175.

¹²
Ibid.

¹³
Ibid.

¹⁴
Ibid., p. 176.

¹⁵
Ibid., p. 177.

¹⁶
Ibid., pp. 177-178.

¹⁷
Ibid., p. 181.

¹⁸
F. William Howton and Bernard Rosenberg, "The Salesman: Ideology and Self-Imagery in a Prototypic Occupation," Social Research, Vol. 32 (Autumn 1965), 277-298.

¹⁹
Ibid., p. 278.

²⁰
Ibid., p. 279.

²¹
Ibid., p. 280.

²²
Ibid., p. 282.

²³
Ibid., p. 283.

²⁴
Ibid.

²⁵
Ibid.

²⁶
Ibid., p. 285.

²⁷
Ibid., p. 287.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 286.

³¹ Ibid., p. 289.

³² Ibid., p. 290.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 291.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 292.

³⁶ Ibid. Also see Bensman's essay on the ad man in Dollars and Sense.

³⁷ Harold Finestone, "Cats, Kicks and Color," Social Problems, Vol. V (July, 1957), 3-13.

³⁸ Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgement of The Child (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 401-411. One cannot help but notice the striking similarities between Piaget's non autonomous child and Riesman's "other directed" man.

³⁹ Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1959), pp. 1-16.

⁴⁰ Howton and Rosenberg, op. cit., 298.

⁴¹ Mills, White Collar, pp. 189-212.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 197-198.

⁴³ Peter Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955).

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 4. One consequence of defining the researchers role as "observer as participant" is the Potemkin Village effect-- whereby work is stage-managed. The only comparable study of a state employment agency was done while the author was an active participant over a three year period. Some of the author's conclusions about the workings of bureaucracy are different than Blau's. Unfortunately, there is no comparison of clerical workers. See Harry Cohen, The Demonic of Bureaucracy (Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1965).

⁴⁵Blau, op. cit., p. 73.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 29. See footnote 10.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 73.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 29.

⁵⁰Mills, White Collar, pp. 205-206.

⁵¹Riesman, Glaser and Denney, The Lonely Crowd, pp. 304, 305, 340.

⁵²Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964).

⁵³Ibid., pp. 15-19.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 20.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 25.

58 Ibid., p. 26.

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid., p. 27.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid., p. 28.

66 Ibid., pp. 37-38.

67 Ibid., pp. 28-30. See Weber, "Class Status and Party" on "status groups."

68 Crozier, op. cit., p. 30.

69 Elinor Langer, "Inside the New York Telephone Company," The New York Review of Books, Vol. XIV (March 12, 1970), pp. 16-24, and Elinor Langer, "The Women of The Telephone Company," The New York Review of Books, Vol. XIV (March 26, 1970), pp. 14-22. In the citations to Langer's work that follow we have cited the date of the particular article rather than the title. We have done this because the "articles" were a two part series during consecutive weeks in the same journal not distinct and separate articles. The source is clearer by date rather than title.

70 Langer, (March 12, 1970), p. 16.

71 Ibid.

⁷²
Ibid., p. 18.

⁷³
Ibid.

⁷⁴
Ibid., pp. 18-20.

⁷⁵
Ibid., pp. 18, 23.

⁷⁶
Ibid., pp. 20-22.

⁷⁷
Langer, (March 26, 1970), p. 16.

⁷⁸
Langer, (March 12, 1970), p. 20.

⁷⁹
Ibid., p. 22.

⁸⁰
Ibid., p. 20.

⁸¹
Ibid., p. 23.

⁸²
Ibid.

⁸³
Ibid., pp. 21, 23 and Langer (March 26, 1970), p. 18.

⁸⁴
Langer, (March 26, 1970), p. 14.

⁸⁵
Showing the effects of the market and bureaucracy and the rhythm of work which effects other industries Langer cites the 15 minute coffee break which the girls used to go to a Schrafts Restaurant downstairs. A Puerto Rican worker sold them "take out coffee." All he did during the day was fill up the coffee containers and put on the lids and write out the checks. He showed a severe disdain for these women, who were generally in a hurry, by working slowly. The women resented him and responded by calling him "Speedy Gonzales" in retaliation. Ibid., p. 14.

86
Ibid.

87
Ibid., p. 18.

88
Ibid., p. 17.

89
Ibid., p. 16.

90
Ibid., p. 14.

91
Ibid., p. 16.

92
Ibid.

93
Ibid.

94
Langer, (March 12, 1970), p. 20 and (March 26, 1970), p.
21.

95
Langer, (March 26, 1970), p. 16.

96
One such reason for entry may be due to the age of children and lack of demands that homemaking makes that work at such a dehumanizing level is made gratifying.

CHAPTER VIII

AUTOMOBILE WORKERS

The plain truth is that factory work is degrading. It is degrading to any man who ever dreams of doing something worthwhile with his life; and it is about time we faced the fact. ¹ Swados

We have chosen to study the automobile industry not because it is representative of industrial factory work but because it is representative of the sociological literature on such work. We will discuss other studies of factory work that may or may not employ assembly line technology and we wish to emphasize that conditions in other industries similar to those of the automobile industry are not to be taken as typical of factory work. Automobile workers and assembly line technology are not necessarily representative of factory work. Assembly line work affords us the possibility of examining a working situation where men may have become, as Marx predicted, appendages to machines. In a similar vein it may represent the culmination of the alienating work conditions that Marx, Veblen and Durkheim foresaw.

The automobile assembly line, to date, is the most automated form of factory work. It is expected on theoretical grounds that this extreme technological structure helps to create an alienating set of

work conditions. However, to understand automobile assembly line work it would be misleading to impose even the specific categories of analysis that Marx applied to factory work. In deference to the classical theorists, they never studied an auto assembly line although Weber and Marx and Veblen observed factory work. We will therefore concentrate primarily on discussing conditions that are generic to assembly line production.

There have been a number of firsthand studies of the auto assembly line. Those that we will examine are by Chinoy, Walker, Guest, Blum, Baluner and Friedmann.² Eli Chinoy worked on the line and interviewed his co-workers. Walker and Guest observed and gave questionnaires to several hundred factory workers. Friedmann's analysis is based on twenty years of observation of factory work. Blauner has studied many levels of factory work and has himself worked in a factory. Blum studied the meat packing industry.

We have chosen to present several categories of analysis that appear to be generic to work and working conditions in the automobile assembly line including mechanical pacing and rhythm, speed, monotony, extreme specialization, repetition, surface attention, degree of skill, etc. Chinoy, Walker, Guest and Friedmann all describe the intrinsic nature of work and conditions surrounding assembly line work.

Assembly Line Technology

A recent study of various types of work indicates that assembly

line technology as opposed to craft, machine tending or continuous process technologies (chemical mixing), appears to have the highest potential for work alienation.³ It intensifies already extreme divisions of labor, atomization and extreme efficiency. The auto industry contains two major divisions--parts and assembly. The components, axles, engines, parts, etc., are produced in the former. The assembly of these parts along a moving conveyer belt is done on the assembly line which is our special focus of attention. Production jobs on the assembly line represent the bottom of the hierarchy of unskilled work.⁴

At specified intervals along the line, men perform minute operations on the moving chassis of the car. Their tasks are too small, repetitive and take from several seconds to two minutes to perform. When one set of bolts, etc. is completed the worker turns to start work on the next chassis. The job may be completed standing in one spot or the man may ride along the moving belt with the chassis. After completing his job he walks back to his original spot. Work is done by hand with the aid of small tools or electric drills. Each job is timed so that it should take a specified amount of time to perform.

The basic theory of the assembly line is that it maximizes standardization of the product and efficiency. It minimizes wasted motion and flaws in "workmanship" by creating super specialists. Generally, Frederick W. Taylor, sometimes called the Father of Scientific Management, is given credit for developing and implementing

this extreme rationalization of the division of labor in American factories.⁵ However, the embryo of the idea was speculated upon far earlier by Durkheim and Plato's Republic and in Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations.

The human problems created by this extreme functional rationality center around the basic lack of direct control of the worker over his work. Under this type of technology the worker obeys specific instruction and initiates no creative action. He thus becomes as Marx, Veblen and Durkheim feared, a mere appendage to the machine. We do not wish to discuss larger implications of Taylorism as they have⁶ been discussed abstractly elsewhere. Our perspective will focus on the intrinsic nature of work, the conditions which surround it on the assembly line.

Methodology of the Major Studies

There are two major empirical studies of the auto assembly plant. Chinoy's study was done by participant observation and in-depth interviewing. The research was done in "Autotown," a mid-western town of 90,000, whose main industry was automobile manufacturing. Chinoy calls the factory the "ABC" Plant. It was located 80 miles from the nearest metropolis and was free from its domination. The data consisted of 78 focused interviews of 62 auto workers in their own homes. It was supplemented by a few weeks experience working on the assembly line, reports from informants and informal social

activities with the men. Chinoy secured the help of the local branch of the U.A.W. which gave him access to its membership files from which he could draw a random sample of names. This list was supplemented by names suggested by union officials and by the men themselves, in order to avoid including too many men of long standing seniority. The union "certified" Chinoy, allowing the workers to tell him anything he wanted to know. The sample, except for three men, was limited to native born whites to simplify the research problem. They varied in age from 20 to over 50, representing the full range of jobs in the plant. Interviews, in their homes, ranged from half an hour to four hours with an hour to one hour and a half being the ⁷ average.

Walker and Guest afford us the single most comprehensive and detailed empirical account of the nature of assembly line work. Although written in 1952 their study remains a classic. ⁸ The researchers gathered their data in 1949 at Plant X, a modern auto assembly line factory. They interviewed 180 men in their homes. The workers represented a large and stratified sample of production employees at the plant. Unlike Chinoy who gained only the help of the union, Walker and Guest approached both management and the union. Their task was made somewhat easier as they explained the work was being done under the auspices of Yale University as a public service.

The researchers used a questionnaire which elicited both factual statements and attitudes and opinion about all phases of work

on the assembly line. The majority of the questions were designed to obtain this type of response. Some of the questions were closed ended--"yes," "no," "don't know." Others were multiple choice with answers ranging along a graded 5 point scale. Any further explanations were recorded. Finally, open ended questions were used where it was thought the questions might evoke a strong emotional response.⁹

In addition to these studies and Friedmann's, we will mention at appropriate points in our analysis studies of factory work, that support or negate our findings.

The Intrinsic Nature of Assembly Line Work - The Immediate Job

Mechanical Rhythm and Pacing

It is the consensus of opinion among researchers that, of all characteristics, the enforced pacing of the conveyer belt is the single most dominant feature of work on the line.¹⁰ Men stand at fixed spots along the moving belt. All of their motions and speed are geared to the externally controlled pace of the line. For eight hours a day their movement, speed, rhythm are controlled by the line. They are literally its servants to the degree that they cannot leave even to use the toilet without being relieved by another man. As examples of pacing the workmen explain their job.

As the body shell moves along the line, I start putting on a baffle windbreaker... by putting in four screws. Then I put nine clips at the bottom which hold the chrome molding strip to the body. On another type of car there is a piece of rubber which

fits on the hood latch on the side and keeps the hood from rattling. I drill the holes in the rubber and metal and fit two screws in. Also, I put four clips on the rubber in the rear fender.

On another type of body, I put the clips on the bottom molding, and in the trunk space I put two bolts which hold the spare tire clamp. I repeat these same things all the time on the same types of car. ¹¹

Another worker rides in the car in order to complete his job.

I put in the two different toe-plates. They cover the holes where the brake and clutch pedals are. I am inside the car and have to be down ~~on~~ the seat to do my work. On one kind of car I put in the shift level while another man puts in the toe-plates. ¹²

After this man is done he walks back to the original spot and gets into another car.

Perhaps one man best summarizes life on the line this way.

The job gets so sickening - day in and day out plugging in ignition wires. I get through with one motor, turn around, and there's another motor staring me in the face. It's sickening. ¹³

Another study of foremen on assembly lines sums up the pace provided by the line in this way.

I like the moving line because you know where your people are... The line here... controls the man, and his speed. Then no matter how slow a man is, he has to keep moving. We're all human, we like to go as slow as we can unless we are pushed, and this line controls him perfectly. ¹⁴

The line may, in fact, control the man too much. A worker cannot leave his post until a relief man comes. According to the logic of assembly line production men should regulate their bowels to the

rhythm of the line--in reality natural functions obey no such rule.

Caught in such a grim predicament nearby containers or barrels have upon occasion been known to be used as functional alternatives to a toilet. In essence then the speed of the line sets the pace and rhythm of work forcing the man to do everything at the pace the machine determines. In the fight for control of the conveyers--the conveyor usually wins.

Repetitiveness - Monotony and Speed

The constant repetition of the same minute task at the same spot on the same line is another feature of work intensely disliked. The opposite of repetitiveness is variety--something which the auto worker does not experience. One plugs in the same wires or turns the same screw--at a predetermined pace in a scientifically prescribed length of time. As will be shown later, jobs with fewer operations to be performed are more likely to be considered repetitive and therefore disliked. Repetition was found to be universally disliked. Walker and Guest, Chinoy and Blum found it to be one of the more intensely disliked feature of assembly line work as evidenced by the following comments:

There is nothing more discouraging than having a barrel beside you with 10,000 bolts in it and using them all up. Then you get a barrel with another 10,000 bolts, and you know every one of those 10,000 bolts has to be picked up and put in exactly the same place as the last 10,000 bolts. 16

It might not be accurate to say that assembly line workers

pray or say novenas that the line may break down, but they do entertain such hopes.

The work isn't hard, it's the never-ending pace...
The guys yell "hurrah" whenever the line breaks
down...you can hear it all over the plant. 17

Chinoy found a similar response. "You get the feeling,
everybody gets the feeling, whenever the line jerks everybody is wishing, 'break down, baby.'" 18

Blum found the response in the meat packing industry.

I wish there was a breakdown...to break the
monotony.

Well, I wish a lot of times the damn thing would
break down so you could go home.

I wish somebody would drop a bomb so we could
get out early...But it never happens.

When you are tired, you wish the chain would break
down to get a breathing spell, but on long days only.
On short days you don't wish it, because you want to
get out of there. 19

However, break down evokes ambivalence among workers.

A fellow's always hoping something happens. It's
natural on the line. [(His wife interrupted: "Just so
you don't get sent home.") That's right. You don't
want it to break down so you get sent home but you
want it to stop for a little while and give you a chance
to stop for a minute. But you don't want to get sent
home because you need the money. You always need
the money. 20

There is some question as to whether monotony or speed is the problem created by the pace of the line. The speed of the line is a constant

issue of conflict in union and management contractual negotiations.
 Some manufacturers are said to keep up a faster tempo than others.
 But overall there appears to be agreement that there is less pressure
 currently than in the early beginnings.²¹

The X plant studied by Walker and Guest had a high speed
 conveyer and some of the workers comments reflected this. However²²
 the speed of the line was not the major complaint. Blauner calls at-
 tention to the fact that a rapid pace may not necessarily cause such
 discomfort but a lack of variety will do so. Some few workers although²³
 a minority, liked the speed of the line. Walker and Guest examined
 this minority and concluded that there were no unique characteristics,
 i.e., age, education, but that an answer might lie in examination of
 their individual personalities. Chinoy reflecting on this phenomenon²⁴
 concludes that such satisfaction can only be momentary. Others have²⁵
 found some type of satisfaction with such work. However, it must be
 said that this observation was made at the time of the depression when²⁶
 the market situation might have made any job appear to be a good one.

There are inherent gaps in these studies that only further re-
 search can illuminate. Apparently the speed of the line is not too
 great but enough to be annoying. It would also seem that age, partic-
 ularly old age might make for this being a hated aspect of the work.
 In Chinoy's study there did appear to be concern by assembly line
 workers over encroaching old age and not being able to maintain the
 pace.²⁷

If the assembly line, in Marxian terms, makes crippled monstrosities out of men by, all but, chaining them to the job it however, creates the need for a utility man. He is one who relieves the men who occasionally want or need to go to the toilet or to have a cigarette. It means that he must be able to step into any given job on the line, and maintain production and quality for ten, twenty minutes. This, theoretically, can be done with all of the jobs on a particular part of the line. Up to 28 different jobs keep him from getting bored. However, he cannot keep up with the line as fast as the regular man. One utility man describes it in this manner:

I work on the whole length of that part of the chassis line...My job is to fill in wherever I'm needed. A man might be absent or away from the job or may need help on the job...I go on each of these jobs, depending on where I am needed most. It is different each day. Some of the jobs are hard to learn, so when I take over one on which I haven't had much experience it's hard to keep up. I have been learning how to do the work ever since I've been in the plant. I can never learn everything because new changes are always being made.²⁸

Skill and The Extreme Division of Labor

None of the jobs on the assembly line demand the amount of skill exhibited by the utility man. However, not all jobs entail simply turning a single screw. Jobs on the assembly line are considered, by researchers, to be the least skilled jobs in the assembly plant. The whole concept of the assembly line is predicated on a minimum of skill but a maximum of efficiency by an extreme subdivision of labor. By reducing the amount and complexity of work and by constant repetition

a specialist of unparalleled minute skill is created.

Not all assembly line jobs have an equal number of mass production characteristics. Not all jobs are equal in the impact created by mass production. Some jobs require only one operation, e.g., turning a screw. Others have three to five operations, like operating a bumper. Skill on most assembly line jobs does not require skill in the sense of judgment, dexterity of hand, experience and special aptitude.

Men on jobs that require the least skill, i.e., turning a screwdriver, made some of the following comments:

Ten minutes - any junior high school kid could do it - except he wouldn't.

You can learn any of the jobs in two hours.

Took a week to get up speed.²⁹

Skill, in this sense, is "knack," "know how," "savvy," etc.

The somewhat more complicated jobs that have three to five operations require training as evidenced in the statements of these workers. A man who worked on a fly wheel assembly said:

At least a month to learn. It takes quite a while to get real savvy on the job. And it takes some practice to know how to tongue bolts and get them at the right tension.

Metal finisher: "I went to school two weeks - then on to a line. Took about three months before I could keep up with it!"³⁰

Utility men, "ding men" (who remove dents in the body) or final

repairmen ~~may~~ it takes several months or a year to learn correctly.

...I'm still learning. And a new model will be coming soon. A repairman just about really learns everything about the job on one model when a new one comes in. It took me a couple of months to catch on, but I knew something about metal and maybe that helped a bit. ³¹

Another related aspect of the degree of skill involved in work ³²
is that the tools and techniques of using them are predetermined. This
leaves the operative in the role of a tool just as the ratchet screw ³³
drivers, electric drills, and other small power tools which he uses.
Blauner reports a Roper survey in which less than half of the automo-
bile workers said they were able to use their own ideas or initiative.
This figure seems a bit high and Blauner's suggestion is that low and
medium skilled workers are more satisfied than skilled workers with
whatever small opportunities they may have. Unskilled workers would ³⁴
have less opportunity and perceive so.

Walker and Guest found a similar complaint among Plant X ³⁵
workers, in the phrase "cannot use my brains." However, workers
find ways of fixing the length of tools and making other minor adjust-
ments in their tools to facilitate their work. Possession of such tools ³⁶
becomes illegal.

Surface Mental Attention

Chinoy found in his brief stint on the line that he could do the
work but could pay little attention to anything else. The need for

constant attention kept workers occupied just enough so that they could not be completely disengaged to daydream freely. The work demanded constant attention but not the sort of attention which will involve and absorb the worker to any great degree. It is just this type of intermediate work which is most conducive to boredom. However, if the worker can learn to do his work automatically release via daydreaming and fantasy becomes an intermittent possibility.

The objective monotony of work and the subjective feeling of boredom is apparently neutralized by overcoming the sense of the slow passage of time. The chief condition for the rapid passage of time is keeping oneself busy. Blum reports the effects of monotony and boredom in the meat packing industry and workers attempts to cope with it.

Work...becomes a game which "breaks the monotony of having nothing to do." In its purest form the game becomes sheer movement for movements sake. "If I just can keep my hands moving, then I know the time is passing fast." And as long as the time passes fast, workers do not experience their jobs as boring.

As long as they keep busy working visiting, talking, sometimes setting a breakneck pace themselves they do not feel bored. They put "something ahead" of themselves in order to feel "pushed." No wage incentive plan appears more effective than the idea of "getting the work done in order to get out of there and get home." Work then is a game played in order to make time pass. Work itself would seem to be devoid of any other meaning.

Clean Work

Doing work where one does not get excessively dirty is also important. Most jobs are not dirty. When they are, the desire to escape assumes almost overriding proportions. Chinoy quotes a line tender who had a machine job off the assembly line but was transferred at his own request.

I had the dirtiest and worst job in the press room,
...My hands were all cut up and they were in grease
all the time. It was just so bad I asked for a transfer,
and when they told me that all that was open was
on the line, I took it.

41

Riesman suggests that, with increasing automation, dirty jobs are disappearing and having one is a blow to one's dignity and pride relative to his fellow workers.

42

Tiring Work and Monotony

Although this is not necessarily part of the immediate content of the job, the degree of physical exhaustion produced by the job is an important intrinsic feature. Assembly line work can be physically tiring because men must stand, stoop, bend, lie on their backs or perform other physical contortions. Assembly line work however hardly demands more than normal physical strength, but the necessary exertion along with the psychological tension caused by the pace of the conveyer make the job demanding. Chinoy reports that none of the men who were working in jobs off the line but who had previously worked on the line, would have gone back to them.

43

The first few days on a new job tends to create muscular soreness and stiffness. Chinoy reports a worker saying:

The first couple of days I was on a new job on the line. I used to come home so tired that the fellows used to rib me that I was wearing out the seat of my pants because my ass was dragging so low. 44

Blum reports a similar finding for packing house workers. Physical fatigue generally is associated with standing in one spot and the use of particular muscles. They overwhelmingly felt the effects of fatigue. But it is psychological as well as physical--the monotony and repetition 45 become a "grind" that wears down the worker. Walker and Guest report physical tiredness as important to utility men. 46

The human toll of assembly line work can be seen in physiological and emotional exhaustion after work. In both auto and packing house work some workers felt if was necessary to stop in for a few beers on the way home from work. The alcohol apparently had a 47 tranquilizing effect.

Chinoy reports of another man who suffered the emotional and physiological effects of his work.

I used to work on the chassis line. When I used to get home my hands would go like that. [He held his hands over the edge of the couch... and let them shake helplessly. His wife added: "That's right, he used to be all worn out!"] When I worked on the line I felt so bad that when I came home I couldn't do anything. Where I am now I don't have to work so hard and I feel a lot better. 48

Guest reports an interview with a worker named "Joe,"

who claims:

You can't beat the machine. Sure, maybe I can keep it up for an hour, but it's rugged doing it eight hours a day, every day in the week all year long. 49

His wife adds:

I often wish he'd get another job. He comes home at night, plops down in a chair and just sits for about fifteen minutes. I don't know much about what he does at the plant, but it does something to him. Of course, I shouldn't complain. He gets good pay. We've been able to buy... a lot of things we couldn't have had otherwise. But sometimes I wonder whether these are more important to us than having Joe get all nervous and tensed up. He snaps at the kids and snaps at me - but he doesn't really mean it. 50

It is obvious that the emotional and physical exhaustion are important in work. They are perhaps as important as the immediate content of the job.

In conclusion it might be noted that among the factors most disliked about their work, among Walker and Guest's men, were characteristics of the immediate job not the overall conditions of work in the plant. They particularly disliked mechanical pacing, repetitiveness and lack of skill. Ironically, as "Joe" said to one of the researchers: 51

These things are all good, but they don't make the job good. It's what you spend most of the time doing that counts. 52

The obvious similarity of assembly line work to factory work described by Marx by now needs no special mention. The conditions

of assembly line technology could literally have been taken from Marx's description of factory work.

The Social Structure of Work

Factory work has been compared to prison life by more than
 53
 one researcher. Factories are too often tall brick buildings, surrounded by wire fences and security guards which one cannot enter or leave without showing a numbered I. D. card. From Chinoy's study Riesman has concluded that factory workers feel work is a daily form of imprisonment, which is necessary and the price they pay for "fun."

Using this as a theme we can explain the conditions surrounding work which are not part of the immediate job. There are six such categories.

Salary and Steady Work

The auto industry pays its assembly line employees at a higher rate than other factory industries according to all of the present studies under consideration. Walker and Guest report that in 1949 (when their research was done) wages in the automobile industry were
 54
 20-25% higher than for manufacturing as a whole. They report \$1.51 an hour to be the median salary. Chinoy reports that the median
 55
 salary in the ABC plant between \$1.41 - \$1.50 per hour. Blauner
 56
 claims more than half of the auto assembly line employees in 1958 earned \$2.25 - \$2.40 per hour. The relatively high salaries are the

single most important source of satisfaction to many on the line.

Walker and Guest discovered that it was the sole reason for nearly
⁵⁷half of the men in Plant X not leaving their jobs. Chinoy also reports

that the attitudes of his men were most positive concerning pay and
⁵⁸steady work. No other single facts about work were more positive.

Again the Veblenian concern with consumption is implied. The relatively high salary is offset by two major factors. One, which we shall deal with in the next section, is opportunity for advancement. Salaries start out at a relatively high level and tend to remain there. No more than 15 cents per hour separates 75% of the salaries of the men on the line in all of the studies reported. There is little opportunity for individual advancement. Salaries tend to increase en masse. In essence the salary structure is "massified."

Any worker may then say, "There are hundreds of jobs like mine, not much better, not much worse. The differences are so
⁵⁹slight, or seem so slight to management, that I am interchangeable."

The cog-like nature of factory work portrayed here echoes Weber's description of bureaucracy. That it should be, of course, "perfectly natural" since Weber extended the concept of the dehumanization of the worker to the official, the soldier, the bureaucrat, and the officer. In doing so, he makes more general Marx's critique of factory work.

Secondly, due to the nature of automobile production there are numerous slow periods of production. This results in seasonal and temporary layoffs and short work weeks. The assembly line jobs are

the one's most often effected by layoff periods. While these jobs have a higher hourly rate of pay than some off production or machine jobs it is the latter which Chinoy found to be sought after by the workers. It was recognized that with such steady jobs a man could make more money during the year at a lower hourly rate than the more highly paid assembly line jobs. Typical of their comments were:

I can make about two thousand dollars a year on this job and I don't think the guys on the line can make that much even if they are making six cents an hour more,...I've got the best job in the shop... I work fifty-two weeks a year. I don't get paid as much but at the end of the year I'm better off than the guys on production. 60

Thus we see not only the Marxian emphasis in the irrationality of an undeniable market, but we see the relevance of Veblen in understanding the connection between the rationality of the technological system and the irrationality of the market under capitalism.

No such difference was found by Blum in the meat packing industry but this may be due to the technological structure of this industry more than anything else. "Knife jobs" were found to be the most desirable, apparently because they were more skilled.

"Who Gives the Orders"

As we have noted earlier, the degree that one's work is planned and organized by others is a factor contributing to an overall feeling of being alienated from one's work. The importance of the workers relationship, particularly his relationship to his immediate foreman

can hardly be questioned. Yet three studies appear to indicate an overall favorable attitude on the part of workers to their immediate foremen. Three fourths of those interviewed by Walker and Guest had favorable attitudes toward their foremen. Despite the fact that he had to reinforce the hated characteristics of the line they left him blameless. Workers typically commented as follows: "He gets along with everybody." "He works like a madman; right on the line with us!" "A good foreman makes it one hundred percent easier."⁶¹

Chinoy does not directly discuss this problem but quotes from his interviews indicate they looked unfavorably on the foreman's job because of the heavy responsibility which it entailed.⁶²

Guest noted that the foreman who will "stick up" for his men, treat them as individuals, establish personal relationships, delegate responsibility to them tends to be viewed by his men as a good foreman.⁶³

Blauner states that much of the foreman's job is taken over by the pace of the conveyer. His job is primarily to see that men are where they should be to insure full productivity. A bad foreman, though, can make work hellish, should he decide to do so. Management policy and the union tend to limit the arbitrary use of power by foremen. This would tend to indicate that the first line foreman, at least in assembly line plants, are not viewed as managers or as policy making executives as described in our previous chapters.⁶⁴

In sum, a good or bad foreman is important in the overall evaluation of work but it is far less important than pay and steady work

on one side and the mechanical repetitiveness, etc., of the immediate
 65
 job.

"The Group"

The social importance of the immediate work group cannot be denied but it can be overemphasized and made too often to appear to be the sole form of compensation in assembly line work. Starting with Mayo's rediscovery of the primary group and the Hawthorn experiments, a voluminous body of writing has grown around the idea of "human re-
 66
 lations" and "scientific management." Baldly, and perhaps vulgarly, stated this human relations ethic says that managers should "humanize" the work by treating workers as "individuals"; make the factory a warm, happy, informal place so the workers will be happy, satisfied, cheerful, and produce more. It is based on the twin assumptions that workers do not identify with management and work for money rather than love of their jobs.

Sociologically it draws on the themes of Durkheim and Tonnies. With the rise of an industrialized, urbanized and bureaucratized society people lost their sense of community or Gemeinschaft. They could no longer identify with family, primary group, and idealic rural community in the urban or Gesellschaft society. Man's quest for community might be met, according to Durkheim, in the occupational group created by the complex division of labor in the Gesellschaft society. The whole approach of the "human relations" school is for managers to recreate a sense of Gemeinschaft in the factory by being warm, sympathetic,

"human," and friendly. In essence, by skillful manipulation the factory becomes the community and the managers; wise elders, warm, loving parents, big brothers and above all peers and friends.

We do not wish to cavalierly summarize, misrepresent or undermine the importance of forty years of serious work. We simply seek to establish, if possible, the relative importance of the immediate work group as a factor in work alienation.

Three of our studies point to the importance of the immediate work group in mitigating work alienation. Assembly line production is not conducive to conversation. As one worker stated, "We are usually
67
so damn busy we don't have time to talk." Most of Walker and Guest's respondents stated that being able to talk and joke was one reason, although not the principal one for liking their jobs. Typical of their comments were:

Talking to the other fellows takes up the strain of the job. It relieves the tension.

Talking sometimes makes the time go faster. There are some days, of course, when nothing makes the time go fast.

I like to talk on the job because it breaks the monotony. We can talk all we want so long as it doesn't interfere with doing the job.

If I couldn't talk to somebody, I'd be talking to myself.

If it weren't for talking and fooling, you'd go nuts. 68

In the few cases when there were socially isolated workers,

they gave the lack of social contact as a reason for disliking the job. On the moving conveyer a form of group consciousness was found. These men discussed their group more in terms of how the job might be,, if they weren't allowed to talk. However most talk tends to be restricted to superficialities because of noise and the relatively close attention needed to manage jobs. According to Blauner auto workers are less able to derive social satisfaction than are workers in other industries. Group identity and consciousness is rare in the auto industry, but does occasionally develop when there is a first line foreman who is able to foster group identity and solidarity.

Blum reports much the same reaction to the importance of the group in the meat packaging industry. Time goes faster and monotony is broken when men can talk to each other. Again, the common denominator is what happens if it weren't possible.

In attempting to assess the overall importance of the immediate work groups one cannot deny its importance. It serves the function of lessening monotony and appears to have some enigmatic and mysterious quality about it. Perhaps it is the secret world which Simmel said was built alongside the real world. However, from our evidence we would have to agree with "Joe." It is still what one does during the work day that counts. From our data it appears that the relative importance of the work group is overshadowed by pay and security. In this sense we again find, as we did with salesmen, that the occupational community which Durkheim hoped would be created by

the division of labor has not occurred. Here the obstructions appear to be due to the conditions of factory work and specialization not necessarily the commercialization of social relations. Instead, Marx's emphasis on commodity relations at work and the appealing nature of factory work, which Durkheim understood, would appear to be the main reasons.

The Structure of Opportunity for Promotion

Chinoy found the lack of hope and desire for advancement to be the norm in the ABC plant. Approximately two-thirds of the jobs in the factory were non-skilled. The factory offered little or no formal apprenticeship programs ⁷² or training. Going to school was out of the question for many because of family responsibility. The seniority rule which allowed those with the longest service to advance to more desirable jobs when skill was equal was limited to non-skilled jobs.

Traditional requirements for mobility, i. e., initiative, ability, and individual effort, etc., are all but impossible to display in the "massified" atomized structure of fractionalized assembly line work. Advancement is simply collective.

Being promoted to a foremanship was dimly viewed by most men because of their advancing age, the general lack of opportunity ⁷³ and the recognition that they were not technically trained for the job. According to Blauner one in three would have liked to be foreman some- ⁷⁴ day, but only one in ten actually expected to make it.

Very often men do not know ~~what~~ to do in order to be promoted. The standards are not made clear. They believe that "pull" and "connections," not merit and ability are important. When they see a man promoted to foreman whose father-in-law is also a foreman, workers begin to feel despair, and they lose their desire to compete for promotion.

It also seems to bring out a largely cynical attitude concerning how men get ahead. Richly descriptive terms are used to describe the process, i. e., "brown-nosing," "how good a politician he is," "sucking the foreman's rear end," "driving the foreman to work everyday," "having a smooth tongue when you talk to the foreman," "running around squealing on everybody," "taking the foreman with you when you go fishing for a weekend." ⁷⁵

The widespread lack of hope and desire is an outcome of the structure of opportunity in the factory. The widespread desire for steady work is market related. Initially, the factory is an attractive lure. One does not plan to stay long. But the high salaries, lack of skills, age and increasing family responsibility all combine to keep workers in the factory and deter them from seeking a job in another industry. After gaining seniority, and the pay ceiling in their jobs, they become either grimly satisfied or bitter and frustrated because of inability to advance or move to better jobs. They may become resigned but do not accept their jobs.

As we shall see in the next section, they constantly fight the

machine for partial control over their immediate jobs. They daydream and fantasize about owning their own business and hope to send their children to college. They evidence another small spark of pride in their job. Some try whenever possible to do a good job, despite everything because they still have a remnant of the pride of workmanship.

The researchers have described in the Marxian and Veblenian sense the external, objective conditions of assembly line work and their relative importance. Now we will examine the subjective side-- the self-estrangement and its consequences in the work and peculiar fantasies of automobile workers. It might be simpler to look for indices of alienation, i. e., labor turnover, absenteeism and medically defined chronic anxiety. On that basis we might claim auto workers are alienated from their job. But this does not adequately reflect their spiritual despair.

Their alienation is more adequately reflected in their continuous attempt to (a) give their hopelessly meaningless work some type of meaning; (b) fight for partial control over the speed and quality of their work and (c) their daydreams and fantasies.

The first response is to the meaninglessness of work, the second to powerlessness and the third a partly unconscious reaction.

The Fight for Control

A recent article claims that public school students are treated like "Niggers." If this is true, automobile workers appear to be

treated with somewhat less respect. Unlike Veblen's tame and docile engineers, they do not claim professional dignity. They express their dignity by their dissatisfaction. Surprisingly they are not totally burned out but evidence the "instinct of workmanship" in as much as they want to do a good job for its own sake.

Walker and Guest, Chinoy and Blum report that the inability to put out quality work is a source of irritation to assembly line workers.

You cannot get quality and quantity... I don't like it. I always liked to be proud of my work. But I can't be on this job... Everyone is working under too much pressure for speed and "get it out."

I try to do quality work, but I'm too rushed. This keeps me from getting pleasure from the work. They say, "haste makes waste," and they're getting plenty of both.

I can't do a job without doing it good and properly. But I get no satisfaction from this job; I get no feeling like that. I wish I could. It would make the job more pleasant. I've had work satisfaction on my other jobs. 78

Some are able to find small satisfactions in doing a good job but their outlets appear to be makeshift substitutes for full emotional engagement and personal satisfaction in work. "When I put up a pile of doors or fenders and it's a good job I appreciate it." "I have an appreciation of myself when I do a good job." 79 The evidence is scanty but the instinct appears ever resilient and reappearing.

Their attempts to overcome being controlled by the line show

the autoworker is not totally crushed. We have already mentioned the

80

use of illegal tools, by the making of minor changes in their work.

Another example is called "working up the line." This is a process where a man does the job far more rapidly than scientific time and motion studies indicate. He, therefore, works at his own pace working progressively up the line, from his normal station. By getting ahead he may be able to rest for a few minutes until his work moves back to his normal station. However, this is not possible in all assembly line jobs.

81

Another method of gaining control over the conveyer is for one man to work exceedingly fast for an hour, performing his own job and that of the man closest to him. They then alternate every hour. Each achieves time off this way. This can be an invitation to disaster, because management may realize that the work load is too light, and retime the job. Unions warn against "double up artists" most stringently.

82

One worker expressed perhaps a common attitude toward time and study men.

It's easy for them time study fellows to come down here with a stop watch and figure out how much you can do in a minute and fifty-two seconds... But they can't clock how a man feels... These guys ought to work on the line for a few weeks and maybe they'll feel some things that they never pick up on the stop watch.

83

"Bank building" is another effort to control the pace of work although not particularly applicable for the main assembly line. It is

more applicable on small jobs off the main belt in the parts division.

"Banking" occurs where one may have partial control over one's output. One builds a bank or reserve of complete parts by working quickly then taking it easy during the last few hours of the day. It is most common where men have machine jobs. It is also a partial explanation for Chinoy's men wanting jobs off of the assembly line or machine jobs where there is a quota.⁸⁴

Outright quota restriction is another form of control. Although rare in the automobile assembly plant, it is common in machine jobs where men are paid on a piece work basis.⁸⁵ This restriction represents a silent social contract whereby men informally agree on what is a fair days work. Despite any and all managerial attempts to raise production levels a steady level is maintained. This guarantees that jobs will not be retimed or piece rates will not be changed by management. It also allows men to fill their quota by early afternoon and then rest. This is known as "making out." Any attempts by new workers to put out a higher quota is met with severe group sanctions. "Rate busters," as they are known, have suffered social isolation and physical abuse for their sins.

Finally, when one is totally exasperated and feels like "jamming it up" auto workers may express their bitter resentment by throwing a handful of nuts and bolts or a banana peel into the sealed fender of a car.⁸⁶

The Fight for Meaning

Their comments when asked what they thought of when they thought of work.

Damn it.

I think of something that has to be done in order to keep a family going.

I think of getting it done...get home again.

My goodness, such a question - nothing! 87

Their comments indicate they find only instrumental meaning in their work. The best that we can do is "get it done." However, one of Chinoy's interviewees had seen the possibility of meaning in work but it seemed unattainable in his world.

I've always heard of those jobs. Like in school I had an economics teacher who first told me that a person has a good job if you can make it your recreation, that's the job for you. Maybe lots of people have jobs like that, but most people have to work and some jobs are just disagreeable. You understand, if you get a job that you're interested in, when you work you don't pay attention to the time, you don't wait for the whistle to blow to go home, you're all wrapped up in it and don't pay attention to other things. I don't know one single job like that. 88

These men are alienated and they recognize it, but they fight the alienating conditions. At this level we must question who is more alienated from work and themselves, those who recognize it and fight it or those who successfully delude themselves.

They run, to escape from work. Within seconds after the whistle blows at the end of the day they disappear in an arrowlike

89

fashion. But they still struggle for meaning--any meaning they can find. Many appear to find compensation in steady work and relatively high hourly pay. This is translated into terms of "getting ahead." Getting ahead, means various things especially to the men Chinoy studied, the one thing it does not mean is personal growth and enrichment through work. It is expressed in success at avoiding unemployment and at maintenance of some level of consumption.

If you've got security, if you've got something you can fall back on, you're still getting ahead.

If you can put away a couple of hundred dollars so you can take care of an emergency, then you're getting ahead.

If you work during a layoff, like back in the depression, that's my idea of working up.

If you're secure, then you're getting ahead. 90

Advancement means that one will keep accumulating material possessions, clearly a Veblenian explanation of work.

If I can just increase the value of my possessions... instead of just breaking even or falling behind and losing, if I can keep adding possessions and property - personal property - too - and put some money away for when I can't work, if I happen to own two or three houses like this one (which had cost \$1,600 in 1940, of which he still owed eight hundred dollars) and have five thousand dollars put away in the bank, I'll figure I got ahead quite a lot.

We're all working for one purpose, to get ahead. I don't think a person should be satisfied. My next step is a nice little modern house of my own. That's what I mean by bettering yourself - or getting ahead. 91

In addition to "getting ahead" another frequently expressed goal

is sending one's children to college so they will not have to work as

92

hard nor in a factory. Here they seem to accept the system as open.

In

In sum, these men find no intrinsic meaning in their work. They cannot

identify with the products. They experience the processes of work

as external and mechanized. They would like to but are largely unable

to fulfill themselves in their work. Their infrequent identification

with the immediate work group is at best amorphously understood...

Auto workers tend to feel that "the only reason a man works is to

make a living" and "a job's a job." As one worker expressed it quite

summarily: "The things I like best about my job are quitting time,

93

pay day, days off, and vacations."

Fantasy and Daydreams

It would seem that men cannot spend the best hours of the best days of their lives at work which is almost totally devoid of intrinsic meaning. In order to bear the unbearable many assembly line workers develop daydreams and utopian fantasies. Both Chinoy and Blum report on this collective reaction to work. They dream of someday going into business for themselves, "buying some tourist property up North," "owning a farm, and being one's own boss. Traditional entrepreneurial independence was the major theme of their daydreams, another indication of acceptance of the system and internalization of guilt. Those who stressed owning property would make their living renting cabins and boats. Those who wanted to farm stressed being

close to nature, cooperating with nature and watching things grow.⁹⁴

Their daydreams, although utopian fantasies were carefully detailed and appear to be logical as evidenced by one man.

I figure I'll start just like I bought this house of mine...on a shoestring. I'll mortgage this place, then make a down payment on the farm. When I first go on the farm, though, I won't quit the shop. I'll rent out the fields and that'll pay for the farm while my wages will support my family. I figure in two years I ought to have five head of cattle and a tractor. I'll have to work hard, get some more savings, sacrifice some.⁹⁵

Daydreams are most common to manual workers who are in the lower income brackets. They dream of owning businesses. One might say that fantasizing becomes an institutionalized part of factory life. Chinoy shows management and union awareness of daydreaming in the publication of a somewhat derogatory poem about it in the local labor weekly. Yet many workers seem to realize that their dreams are only dreams.

Aside from the normal uncertainties and lack of alternatives, several other factors keep auto workers from leaving. Frequent layoffs and normal living conditions make it almost impossible to build up the capital needed for investment in small businesses. The businesses which are open to them have low profit, high mortality rates. In addition, those workers who have the least seniority are in their late twenties and thirties and have apparent plans to enter other fields. However, with additional family responsibilities and increasing seniority they abandon the plans and remain in the factory. Yet they continue

fantasizing and dreaming their cherished fantasies.

In this sense they are quite similar to Sectorsky's burned out ad men who have "the Novel" in their drawer or who also dream of buying property. Sectorsky's ad men never developed their original creative talents but interestingly enough they do not feel guilt-ridden. They express frustration in terms of dreams that are non-traditional but a bit bohemian in America. The same might possibly be said of auto line tenders. ⁹⁷ Blauner claims they understand car engines far better than their jobs would indicate. ⁹⁸ Friedman also claims their craftsmen-like skills are not shown on the assembly line. ⁹⁹ Blum claims meat packers have a strong urge toward creative activities outside of work. ¹⁰⁰ Marquart claims they have workshops in the basement and constantly are puttering with cars. Their urge to creative activity outside of work is at least indicative of their potential skills which go undeveloped at work. But they may be too emotionally spent to do much creative work outside of their work.

¹⁰¹ Their fantasies serve as an institutionalized safety valve for their frustration at being unable to find intrinsic meaning in work. Their release is through fantasy, secondary narcissism, and talk. The significance of their plans allows for a deep psychological release. Their fantasies enable auto workers to identify with the traditional American success ethic. The official American creed claims that there is room for mobility in the system. If a man cannot succeed it is he who is at fault rather than the system. Apparently auto workers

believe in this to a great degree. They avoid feeling self-blame and destructive guilt, even failure, by redefining their goals and by emphasizing fantasy as ambition. All of their defense mechanisms and rationalizations point to the single fact that if a man is ambitious he is not
 102
 a failure. The extent that assembly line workers cannot see the inherent contradictions in their work and the market is the extent to which they are unable to see that alienation is inherent in this form of work. Their real failure lies in not recognizing that the societal institutions which created their frustration won't allow their fantasies to become reality. Thus the technological and bureaucratic machinery, faith in the market and the success ethic is maintained at the price of self-blame, destructive guilts and complex defense mechanisms of auto workers. Such ego defenses destroy many attempts of personal fulfillment in work.

Chinoy claims that "men cannot spend eight hours per day, forty hours each week in activity which lacks all but instrumental
 103
 meaning." But this is exactly what they do. They attempt to find significance in small makeshift ways and compensate through the non-work life. Their overt dissatisfaction, i.e., their unwillingness to
 104
 accept defeat, is a source of dignity to them. They have largely given up hope of controlling or finding intrinsic meaning in their work, but they do not see themselves as complete failures. They have convinced themselves that they are not failures because they still have ambitions outside of work. In the sense that men do not control their work, nor

find intrinsic meaning in it but use work as an instrument to buy fun and comfort, they are alienated from their work.

Their alienation is a continuous process because they alternately fight and surrender for control and meaning. When they fight the conveyer for control, throw banana peels into bumpers and gripe¹⁰⁵ openly about their work whether they realize it or not they are attempting to overcome isolation, atomization, anonymity, impersonality, meaninglessness and powerlessness. The sad thing is they seem not to realize that "getting back" at the conveyer and their fantasies are only forms of compensation for deprivation. Their makeshift attempts at finding instrumental meaning do little to overcome their plight.

Thus the contemporary researchers not only confirm the classical theorists nightmarish vision of factory work but go a bit beyond it. They also show at the social psychological level the subtle institutional, ideological and cultural forms that alienation takes. Chinoy's study is the most revealing at this level and in that sense his work is an important link to the Marxian and Veblenian traditions. Hopes of business ownership, high salaries and satisfactory consumption opportunities become substitutes for finding intrinsic meaning in work. Auto workers are thus bound to the same success ethic as ad men, salesmen and clerks. At this level Veblen again appears to have been a more accurate predictor than Marx in understanding alienation from work.

Automobile workers are thus alienated from work in the

classic Marxian sense. They are, in many ways, appendages to machines. However, they recognize it and strongly resent it. Unlike policy making executives, ad men and salesmen, they do not represent a particular type of profession. They, in keeping with the classic Marxian tradition, represent a particular socio-economic and educational class. They are not necessarily representing a status group nor do they form a community.

Classical Theories of Automobile Work

The three major Western paradigmatic institutional forces all play major roles in creating the immediate structural conditions of work for auto workers. The market contains a strong degree of irrationality. Automobile workers are exposed to it in terms of seasonal and periodic unemployment. Hourly salaries, as noted, are comparatively high. Advancement however, is slow and collective. Social relations are clearly commodity relations. It is almost totally in reference to the product being assembled that auto workers relate to each other. Physical brutalization occurs because of the demanding nature of assembly line work. The work is also emotionally exhausting. The separation of ownership and the tools of production from the worker is, of course, accepted. But, as we have noted, the desire for ownership emerges in other ways--particularly in their desire to own a small business or a farm. Marx, particularly, postulated almost all of the above structural conditions of work under the market. Almost all of

other classical theorists focused upon particular aspects of the market.

The conditions created by the industrial division of labor complement the conditions of the market, particularly the periodic layoffs. The auto worker is extremely specialized in his task but not involved in long habituation to a craft skill. As we have mentioned previously jobs are measured, timed and to be done with precise tools. The separation of intellectual labor from physical labor is an accomplished fact. The necessity for this extreme functional rationality is based upon assembly line production. Thus one essential aspect of the division of labor is to fit the man to the machine. Nowhere is the Marxian idea of men becoming living appendages to the machine more evident in contemporary research. In these respects the process described by Marx goes further than Marx himself could have imagined at the time. Had they read Marx, the industrial engineers in question could have learned what they were doing. Marx, Veblen and Durkheim recognized all of these conditions created by their division of labor. Mannheim and Weber saw the separation of physical and intellectual labor and narrow specialization and took such conditions for granted in applying them to all forms of bureaucratic work. Simmel noted extreme specialization and described attempts of men to deal with or overcome it in their social relations.

The structural conditions created by the industrial bureaucracy coincide with those created by the market and the machine division of labor. The extreme formal rationality and specialization are

inseparable from the narrow specialization created by this division. Hierarchy and impersonality are not as important (in the studies reported upon) in shaping conditions of work in the factory as we might suspect. Most production jobs, as we have noted, are similar in prestige, function and salary. Differences between jobs on the line are more artificial than actual.

These apparent conditions of democracy or equalitarianism are, in part, a function of the fact that the studies reported upon all focus on one and perhaps two levels of the total organization. Since these levels are at the base of the pyramid the numbers involved are large. They appear to be a mass of undifferentiated atoms. If the bureaucratic administrative structure, the authority and economic structure, and the market relations were made central, to the in-plant studies, then it would be possible to see factory work as part of a larger mass. The pyramid would not be truncated. Impersonality is not predominant. The men talk to each other and gripe to the foreman who is known personally to them. Other than foremen their primary contacts with management are through their checks or a memo on the bulletin board. Auto workers are not salaried employees in the classical Weberian sense of the term, however, rules are particularly important for them. Many jobs can be done in less than the required time by one man and often two jobs can be done by one. Speeding up and doubling up are a threat to the men because management may retime the job if it is done flagrantly. Relief time is particularly important as we have

noted. Rules regarding any absence from the line are strictly enforced. The auto worker doesn't have a career in the sense of bureaucratic mobility. Yet, in reality he advances in terms of regular salary increments, theoretically has promotion opportunities and is guaranteed a tenure of sorts by his union contract. He is kept there because he can do little else, the market wage is still relatively high and he must consider mounting family responsibility, as we have already mentioned.

Weber and Mannheim recognized and discussed all of the internal mechanisms created by the bureaucratic structure. But only Veblen emphasized the career connection between the bureaucracy and the market. Veblen could also account for initial entry into the field, in part, by the idea of conspicuous consumption.

The social psychological consequences of the structure of assembly line work provide a classical Marxian picture of the alienated worker. Over developed (job) but not craft specialized they most clearly represented Marx's idea of monsterism. Nowhere in the research on work is the phrase "crippled monstrosities" more appropriate. But at most this is expressed by these researchers in an overall description of factory work. The researchers are perhaps unwilling to recognize workers as being in effect crippled by this overspecialization. But at most this is expressed by these researchers in an overall description of factory work.

There appears to be no intrinsic meaning for auto workers in their jobs. Many appear to prefer the factory because of its relatively

high starting wage. They plan it only on a temporary basis. They remain trapped within the structure through a series of life circumstances and remain, largely because of their salaries and lack of realistic alternatives. They find compensation for their intrinsically meaninglessness of work through money. The accumulation of material goods, paying off mortgages, and hoping to send their children to college serve as compensation. The emotional profitability of this work would not have been recognized by Marx.

Marx and Veblen recognized forms of compensation as consequences of such a work structure. Durkheim recognized monsterism, but never used the term. Simmel located instrumental meaning in the metropolis through the use of money and the cash nexus.

The main effect of the industrial division of labor is that it creates an almost total loss of autonomy over the production process. We have discussed the loss of rhythm, pace, control, flow, etc. at length. There is a feeling of powerlessness and for some a degree of isolation while they explicitly recognize their loss of freedom, control and autonomy it is precisely this loss that they consistently fight, as previously noted. They work up the line, double up, change tools and perhaps sabotage the machinery in small ways. The struggle in Mannheim's terms represents a struggle for substantial rationality in a world where formal rationality binds the worker to a narrow job.

Some find compensation in home ownership, in making things after working hours, and others held cherished fantasies of owning

land--all as various life styles.

Weblen recognized both of these consequences, particularly life styles. Marx, Durkheim and Mannheim all strongly recognized the sense of powerlessness and loss of autonomy created by the industrialized division of labor. Weber recognized the cog-like effect at the level of bureaucracy thus lending validity, at this level, to Marxian analysis.

The consequences of industrial bureaucracy are similar to those of the division of labor. The assembly line worker does not view his "career" in the classical sense of bureaucratic employment. Nor must he consciously make himself over through self-rationalization. He simply accepts a grim fate, fights it when he can, and fantasizes of owning a farm. This is a prime evidence of his alienation. Auto workers do not fetishize rules--they break them when they are able, without causing harm to themselves or other workers.

They do lose a total sense of perspective in their work because of their minute specialization and the high degree of functional rationality demanded. This is corroborated by the facts that some actually admit they did not at one time know how their finished product looked. Management, as we mentioned, put up a picture of the finished product to familiarize workers with it and perhaps, as a morale and protection booster as well.

In a sense, at the time of these studies management may not have been able to provide ideals of "the community of service" or

"reasons of state" that serve as "ersatz" for personal subordination. These studies do not report whether the workers do or do not accept this form of morale building and public relations. But the general attitude implies cynicism about managerial intentions.

Factory workers experience a sense of dehumanization at their jobs. It is different than the dehumanization felt by clerks and bureaucrats. They grimly perform their degrading tasks almost by narcotizing themselves in some cases. In a sense they may say this is not the real me much like concentration camp victims who survived by rationalizing this is not happening to me.

Conclusion

To, perhaps, best sum up auto work one is tempted to use Marxian analysis particularly because of its emphasis on the market and the idea of monsterism. We believe, however, that Veblen may be more applicable in understanding the reasons for entering into and staying in such work despite the market irrationality stressed by Marx.

Veblen joins together Marx and Weber in terms of the rationality of industrial production and the control of markets by corporate conglomerates that also control production quotas, seasonal unemployment and create relative high wage structures. The auto workers desire for money, consumption, ownership and life style in part as compensation for meaningless work are accounted for in Veblenian analysis more so than in Marx or Weber. Veblen appears to be able to explain

the bitter alienation of the assembly line workers as well as why they remain in the field. The concept of the instinct of workmanship explains why they are disgruntled and in part why they recognize their condition. In this sense one who is commonly believed to be a theorist of the "leisure classes" appears to better explain the alienation of the "working class."

The classical theorists and empirical researchers show almost no difference in presenting a clear cut case of alienation from work at this "blue collar" level. The empirical researchers, particularly, demonstrate the consciousness that these workers have of their alienation. Their constant fighting of the machine, their griping and dreams, expressing their own blame are indications of their conscious awareness. Yet they do not appear to suffer the conscious or subconscious mental anguish that ad men, clerks and salesmen undergo. Ironically those who are most alienated and are objectively and consciously aware of it appear to suffer less emotional strain than those who are not aware of their condition. It may well be that those unaware of their condition and their struggle, must struggle to prevent that awareness. That struggle, even when successful, may be more painful than the original condition. This is the only group for which we see such a stark similarity and agreement between the classical theorists. The subtle institutional and cultural forms of alienation shown by the empirical researchers tend to form a crumbling indictment of the nature of work in American society. An institution which should

ostensibly allow man his greatest self-realization systematically denies it, and instead stultifies human potential. That this seems to be inherent in the nature of industrial work in contemporary society is frightening.

Neither the classical theorists nor these empirical researchers asked if the division of labor, industrial capitalism, industrial bureaucracy necessarily had to create such alienating conditions of work. Would it be possible for other factors, i. e., personal sentiment, informal relations, primary group identifications to help mitigate some of the effects of bureaucracy? Would it be possible that the effects of the market on bureaucracy and the division of labor could to some degree mitigate against the alienating conditions of work? Would it be possible that managers could recognize alienation from work and attempt to avoid it? Could occupational groups with guild characteristics survive in the 20th century through reversing the subdividing effects of the division of labor? Does bureaucratic work in the 20th century necessarily have to bring despair and gloom? As we will see in the next chapter it may not be possible to win the battle in finding intrinsic meaning in bureaucratic work but it may be possible to avoid losing it.

The classical theorists saw the major dimensions of the problem but not its full scale development. Certainly the development of the assembly line time study operations, isolation of workers on an assembly line, the use of industrial personnel relations and other scientific means of applied manipulation are means of accentuating

alienation. Nor did they see the effects of unions mitigating to some extent against these conditions. They also did not see the effect of the shortened work week which could possibly provide alternative meanings and those found in work. In some ways modern industrial work may be more alienating than the brute alienation of the primitive factory system but in other ways modern society may provide the conditions for making out of work alienation the possibility for comfortable styles of life.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Harvey Swados, "The Myth of the Happy Worker," Man Alone, ed. by Eric and Mary Josephson (New York: Dell, 1962), p. 111.

² Eli Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955). Charles R. Walker and Robert H. Guest, The Man on the Assembly Line (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962). Fred H. Blum, Toward a Democratic Work Process (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953). Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, Georges Friedman, The Anatomy of Work (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

³ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 182-183.

⁴ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 65-66. Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, chap. V. Walker and Guest, op. cit., chap. III and IV.

⁵ See Frederick W. Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Bros., 1911) and Frederick W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Bros., 1947), also Frank Copley, Frederick Winslow Taylor; Father of Scientific Management, Vol. 2 (New York: Harpers, 1923).

⁶ See Georges Friedman, Industrial Society: The Emergence of Human Problems of Automation (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955), Bell, "Work and Its Discontents," Peter F. Drucker, The Concept of the Corporation (New York: John Day, 1946) and Peter F. Drucker, The Practice of Management (London: Heinemann, 1955).

⁷ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dreams, chap. III.

⁸ Walker and Guest, op. cit.

⁹
Ibid., Appendix A.

¹⁰
Ibid., chap. I and IV. Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, chap. VI. Friedman, The Anatomy of Work, chap. I, VI and VIII. Also Friedman, Industrial Society: The Emergence of Human Problems of Automation, Part II, chap. II and III. Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 95-103. Frank Marquart, "The Auto Workers," Voices of Dissent, ed. by Dissent (New York: Grove Press, 1956), pp. 143-157. Fred H. Blum, op. cit., chap. V. Eli Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," The Human Shape of Work, ed. by Peter L. Berger (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 51-81.

¹¹
Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 44.

¹²
Ibid., p. 45.

¹³
Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁴
Charles R. Walker, Robert H. Guest and Arthur N. Turner, The Foreman on the Assembly Line (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 13.

¹⁵
Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," p. 64.

¹⁶
Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

¹⁷
Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁸
Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 71.

¹⁹
Blum, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

²⁰
Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 71.

²¹
Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 100-101 and Marquart, op. cit., pp. 144-146.

- 22 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 51-52.
- 23 Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 101.
- 24 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 51-55.
- 25 Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," pp. 62-63.
- 26 See Wessel Smither, F.O.B. Detroit (New York: Harper and Bros.: 1938), pp. 121-122 and Stanley B. Mathewson, Restriction of Output Among Organized Workers (New York: Viking Press, 1931), p. 151.
- 27 Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, chap. VI.
- 28 Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 49. Also see Friedman, The Anatomy of Work, pp. 12-13 for a discussion of the utility man.
- 29 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 56-57.
- 30 Ibid., p. 57.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Ibid., pp. 19 and 57. Also see Peter F. Drucker, "The Human Being in Individual Production," Proceedings, Fifth Annual Time Study and Methods Conference (1950), pp. 52, 74.
- 33 Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 95, 104-105.
- 34 Ibid., p. 105.
- 35 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 62, 149-152. Also see Friedman, The Anatomy of Work, chap. III and IV for a discussion of job enlargement.

- ³⁶ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 104.
- ³⁷ Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 58, 155. Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," p. 72. Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 65-70.
- ³⁸ Walker and Guest, Ibid. For a discussion of monotony in industry see Ferdinand Zweig, The British Worker (Middlesex, Great Britain: Pelican Books, 1952), chap. X.
- ³⁹ Blum, op. cit., p. 84.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 83-85.
- ⁴¹ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 74.
- ⁴² Ibid., p. xvi. This is also true in the meat packing industry. See Blum, op. cit., p. 88.
- ⁴³ Ibid., p. 71.
- ⁴⁴ Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," p. 70.
- ⁴⁵ Blum, op. cit., pp. 79-81.
- ⁴⁶ Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 50.
- ⁴⁷ Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," p. 66.
- ⁴⁸ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 71.
- ⁴⁹ Robert H. Guest, "Men and Machines: An Assembly Line Worker Looks at His Job," Personnel, Vol. 31 (May, 1955), p. 499.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 500.

- 51 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 62-67.
- 52 Guest, op. cit., p. 500.
- 53 Marquart, op. cit. Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. xix.
- 54 Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 82.
- 55 Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 37.
- 56 Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 111.
- 57 Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 90.
- 58 Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 62-68.
- 59 Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 161.
- 60 Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 67.
- 61 Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 98.
- 62 Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 56-59.
- 63 Walker, Guest and Turner, op. cit., pp. 12-33.
- 64 Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 107.
- 65 Walker and Guest, op. cit., pp. 100-101.
- 66 See Elton Mayo, The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Compass Books edition; New York: The Viking Press, 1960).

F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947). For discussion of the development of this see Whyte, The Organization Man, chap. I. Rhinehard Bendix, Work and Authority in Industry (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1952). Georges Friedmann, The Anatomy of Work. Bell, op. cit. Wilbur Moore, Industrial Relations and the Social Order (New York: Macmillan, 1957).

⁶⁷ Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 69.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 68.

⁶⁹ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 114.

⁷⁰ Walker, Guest and Turner, op. cit., pp. 126-141.

⁷¹ Blum, op. cit., pp. 77, 83, 84, 86.

⁷² Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 41-43.

⁷³ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 50 and Friedmann, The Anatomy of Work, p. 138.

⁷⁴ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 113.

⁷⁵ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 52-57.

⁷⁶ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 121. Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 82 and Friedmann, The Anatomy of Work, pp. 141-147.

⁷⁷ Jerry Farber, The Student as Nigger: Essays and Stories (North Hollywood, Calif., Contact Books, 1969).

⁷⁸ Walker and Guest, op. cit., p. 60.

⁷⁹ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 131.

⁸⁰ Also see Joseph Bensman and Israel Gerver, "Crime and Punishment in the Airplane Factory," Mass Society in Crisis, ed. by Bernard Rosenberg, F. W. Howton, and Israel Gerver (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 141-151.

⁸¹ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 100.

⁸² Marquart, op. cit., p. 144.

⁸³ Guest, op. cit., p. 499.

⁸⁴ "Bank building" was first observed by Mayo, op. cit., and Roethlisberger and Dickson, op. cit. See Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 102 and Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 71-72 for similarities in the auto plant.

⁸⁵ Donald Roy, "Restricting Output in a Piece Work Machine Shop," (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952). Bell, op. cit., p. 239. Crozier, op. cit., p. 161 and William H. Whyte, et al. Money and Motivation (New York: Harper, 1955).

⁸⁶ Swados, op. cit., p. 113.

⁸⁷ Blum, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

⁸⁸ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 70.

⁸⁹ Blum, op. cit., chap. VI and Chinoy, "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker," p. 65.

⁹⁰ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p. 125.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 126.

⁹² Blum, op. cit., p. 95 and Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 104, 126-128.

85. ⁹³ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 91. Blum, op. cit., p. 105. Seymour Martin Lipset and Rhinehard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959), pp. 156-182.
91. ⁹⁵ Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, p.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 20-21, 110-111.
- ⁹⁷ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 122.
- ⁹⁸ Friedman, The Anatomy of Work.
- ⁹⁹ Blum, op. cit., pp. 94-111.
- ¹⁰⁰ Marquart, op. cit., p. 149.
- ¹⁰¹ Lewis Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956), pp. 151-157.
- ¹⁰² Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, pp. 127-130.
- ¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 130.
- ¹⁰⁴ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 121-123.
- ¹⁰⁵ Some of these methods were not unknown to Weber. He speaks of the "murmering of the workers" and the "slow down." See "Class, Status and Party," pp. 183-184.

CHAPTER IX

NON ALIENATED WORK

This last empirical chapter represents a procedural departure from those preceding it. In each of the earlier chapters we examined specific work in specific industries to determine in kind and degree the type of work alienation present. In this chapter we have chosen five studies in various industries at various levels of the bureaucratic structure where work alienation appears not to be present, or at least not discussed by the researchers.

In three cases problems of work are examined, but such problems are not posed specifically as problems of alienation from work. Other theoretical preconceptions and issues were the immediate problems for the researchers, hence, they did not discuss alienation from work as a specific research problem.

The methodological limitations are that we have only one study at the managerial level, and it examines the work of white collar functionaries as well as managers. There are two studies of printers who in effect represent the elite of the blue collar hierarchy. Their counterpart at the white collar level would be the advertising technician. There is a study of an emerging skilled blue collar occupational group

in the chemical refinery industry. Finally, there is a study of factory workers and miners in heavy industrial work. Although this section is weighted in the direction of blue collar non managerial work it has two major strengths: (a) It presents two distinct occupational groups where work alienation is apparently most ~~present~~ or at least mitigated to a large degree; (b) Two studies compare and contrast within different occupations and at different levels certain bureaucratic conditions which when absent appear not to create work alienation and when present appear to help form it.

The State Employment Agency

Beginning at the white collar managerial level we have an example of apparently non alienated work contrasted with alienated work. A study of employment interviews by Blau indicates the importance of management in adhering to bureaucratic rules. The study is an excellent application of Weber's emphasis on rules as a bureaucratic characteristic and Merton's emphasis on adherence to rules in a bureaucracy. It also indicates the senselessness of bureaucracy when concern with what Mannheim termed functional rationality results in a lack of substantial rationality in terms of the goals of the organization.

Blau studied, as we have indicated in Chapter VII, two departments of a particular division of a state employment agency that was responsible for unskilled occupations in the clothing industry.

Most of the interviewers had college degrees and had been

working at the agency for more than five years. The interviewers had undergone an orientation period where they learned the history and philosophy of the agency but primarily concentrated on their specific job duties. This included the processing of job order requests according to specific formulas and techniques. Occupational codes, "job formulas" and application forms, greatly discussed during the training period, were never mentioned in actual job practice. The seasonal nature of the industry, and the somewhat ambiguous, abstract rules caused a change in actual work done with clients. Jobs were filled from the flow of incoming applicants not from application files. The work flow was based on the speed of sending out referrals in accord with the demands of the prospective employees. Thus the most suitable job for the applicant or the best qualified applicant for a job were ignored.

The actual work procedure was modified with the not always so tacit knowledge of the agency administration and immediate supervisor. The department's operations were judged largely on the number of placements because this was the basis on which the state legislature granted funds.²

This dependence on funds is a point which Blau largely ignores in his conclusion but is apparently an important structural fact in determining alienation from work. Funding this type of work represents a bureaucratic alternative to the market mechanism. The irrational consequences are multiplied when bureaucrats rigidly adhere to

bureaucratic rules. One of the primary reasons for such adherence is to use up the allocated funds so that the agency will be funded again the following year.

Job counseling was virtually abandoned because of the emphasis on placement. Interestingly, counseling was one of the chief sources
3
of reward in work for the interviewers and was denied them.

A statistical record of the performance of each interviewer was kept by the department. At first it was a rudimentary statistical record of the number of interviews each month. It was then changed to a more complicated series of indexes including number of interviews referrals, and placements, and their varying ratios and proportions to each other.

Thus interviewers, as are salesmen, are put into structural competition with one another to gain a higher placement rating. If one were either overly meticulous or sent out too large a number of referrals that were not placed, he would be penalized. This created an atmosphere of cutthroat competition where a series of fraudulent and Machiavellian techniques were invented to monopolize job orders among the interviewers, and by innuendo threaten clients to go out on
4
referrals, regardless of their sense of the appropriateness of the referral. This provided the basis for an atmosphere of suspicion, mistrust, and competition. This atmosphere differed between the two departments.

Department A was more competitive than Department B, but

the latter had a higher overall percentage of job openings filled.⁵

Department B had sixty-seven percent of its job openings filled in contrast to fifty-nine percent for Department A.

However, the more competitive interviewers in Department A made more individual placements than did those in Department B. The members of Department B were cooperative. They tended not to monopolize jobs, but helped each other. While all members weren't equally cooperative, competitive monopolization of jobs was rendered ineffectual.

The reasons for this contrast lie in the different structural arrangements of the two sections. The supervisor of section A relied heavily on production figures in evaluating his interviewers. The section B supervisor tried to rate the whole person and relied less on productivity records.

This produced less pressure and status anxiety in group B. The pressure and anxiety were noticeably important for those in group A. They were on probation pending permanent civil service appointment. Those in group B were veterans who could be fired only for cause. Therefore they were less subject to pressure. Those in group A were insecure about their jobs, and had to show high productivity to their supervisor. A third critical factor was that those in section B had been trained as a unit while those in group A had been trained separately. Moreover, those in group B had been trained by a supervisor who was especially interested in counseling and intensive

interviewing at a time when those aspects were being stressed. Those in group A were not trained during such a period. Thus, one of the more rewarding features of the interviewers job was intensified in group B and minimized in group A.

Given these structural conditions both groups developed spontaneous, informal work habits. One supported individual competitive aspirations, the other emphasized a professional image. One group free from the rigidity of rules by a thoughtful supervisor did not suffer anxiety, but gained more freedom and discretionary power in dealing with clients. The other group had less freedom and discretionary power. It was these elements of the work, as previously noted, that the interviewers said were deep sources of work satisfaction to them.

It would appear that the members of section B had more of an intrinsic involvement with their jobs than those in section A. Certainly more in group B achieved more job security tenure than those in group A. Yet, if neither group were professionally trained nor had some job security those in group A would appear to be more alienated from their work because of the atmosphere generated by rigid adherence to rules by its supervisor. Let us imagine that even if group A still were pending permanent appointment and group B were not, but group A's supervisor did not count heavily on statistical productivity. The atmosphere of insecurity and anxiety certainly would appear to decrease in group A. In short, the degree of rigid adherence to rules and the degree of professional training between the groups intensified the

chances for those in group A to be more alienated from their work. It apparently decreased the chances of those in group B of being significantly, if at all, alienated from their work.

This is not to suggest that a deeper analysis of the interviewers by Blau might not have revealed that those in group B, trained in placement, coming to their jobs with high expectations and experiencing a gap between expectation and the reality of the state employment service, did not experience some form of alienation. It also does not mean that those in group A might not have represented a specific type of social character who, like the ad men, were trained on pressure and competition and, therefore, weren't alienated. In short, we are not saying that in reality the opposite of what the evidence indicates might not exist.

We are simply saying that the evidence indicates that three structural conditions of work, (1) training which stressed the professional aspects of the work, (2) a lack of rigid adherence to rules by the supervisor and (3) lack of vulnerability before a compulsive boss who exploited the vulnerability, created an atmosphere of freedom, control and professionalism in one group. In another group the lack of these conditions created an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust, anxiety, individual competition and monopolization of job orders. These opportunities still existed for group A, but less for group B.

One group had a far greater opportunity to enjoy what the interviewers called the satisfying aspects of their jobs, while the others

had almost no opportunity. Even at the most skeptical level one thing is clear concerning group B. An instrumental attitude was most clearly not present in its members while in group A it was apparently present due to, among other things, anxiety caused by approaching tenure and by competition for tenure.

In sum, our point is that the apparent alienation from work in one group, and its absence in the other, was caused by the supervisors lack of rigidity in adhering to organizational rules and the stressing in training of those aspects of the job which create the greatest opportunity for satisfaction in work. There was the lack of anxiety about approaching tenure and the lack of competition for tenure. Finally, the cohesive group atmosphere spontaneously created by different training and guarantee of tenure tended to diminish alienation from work. The importance in some senses of Blau's study is that it shows that the fetishization of bureaucratic rules can be avoided in work due to the evoking of other rules particularly those granting tenure.

The Printing Industry

Printers, who are among the elite of the skilled manual workers, offer us a picture of non alienated workmen both in the social organization of their work and their attitudes and perceptions of work. There are two excellent studies of printing work by Robert Blauner and Seymour Martin Lipset. Lipset's Union Democracy is perhaps the better known of the two. It is a study of the I. T. U. but is not specifically concerned with work alienation. The data collected were 500

interviews of an hour and a quarter to an hour and a half in duration, and follow up questionnaires with 500 printers and chapel chairmen. The men were selected by a random sample of printers in shops that were stratified according to size and the number of men working in them. This procedure yielded 454 printers which was supplemented by interviews with 66 chapel chairmen. The interviews were collected between December 1951 and January 1952. Six months later a supplemental questionnaire was sent out to the 500 printers. Blauner's study is less complicated. His data are compiled from an Elmo Roper--⁷ Fortune study. Blauner was, himself, a factory worker and a student of Lipset.

Two theoretical questions that we pose here are derived from Mannheim and Veblen and to some extent from Durkheim. 1) Does an increase in substantial rationality decrease alienation from work? 2) Do craft skills tend to decrease alienation from work?

As a group, printers are highly skilled and specialized craftsmen who through their union have gained remarkable control over their working environment and the immediate work processes of work. This and their craft pride have seemingly made them one of the least alienated occupational groups in American society. The printing industry is a craft industry where there is a relative lack of mechanization and standardization of the product, the machinery and the process of work. Although printing plants are bureaucracies and have a complex division of labor, minute specialization occurs far less than in the automobile

industry. The low level of mechanization, specialization and subdivision and the high amount of skill demanded at the time of these studies allowed for an unautomated type of industry where much of the work was still done by hand.

The social organization of the plant and the union structure is based on the fundamental premise evolving from past craft and bargaining history that the worker "owns" the job and has the right to set the conditions under which he works. So strong is this proprietary right that the worker has the right to select his temporary replacement. Employers must accept these conditions traditionally imposed by the union.⁸ Rather than suffer job insecurity printers have remarkable control over their working conditions and the potential market.

They exercise similar control over the immediate work process. Both pressmen and linotype operators retain traditional crafts skills which they cannot or will not use under great pressure or periods of hurried activity. These skills allow printers to use their judgment, initiative and some artistic ability. The printer sets his own rhythm and pace making all the endless adjustments on the galleys. They have, unlike other manual groups, a high degree of control over their immediate work process and do not suffer from these kinds of powerlessness, isolation, separation of physical and intellectual labor nor a narrow degree of specialization.

The printer may also turn to a page in a newspaper, brochure, etc. and see the results of his work, i. e., column 5. According to

Blauner he may know that he set the type for that page. Both the pressmen and the linotype operators must use a variety of skills and perhaps work on several pages at once. They do not suffer from boredom or monotony. Their work remains meaningful and responsible and contains a high degree of substantial rationality.⁹

Printers also have little need for external control, i. e., close supervision. As craftsmen their adult socialization has internalized standards of workmanship and craft discipline as well as craft identification. This, in turn, is supported by a craft discipline reinforcing collective high standards of workmanship. Their loyalties and commitments are based on the crafts norms rather than the company or organization.¹⁰

Rather than suffer from alienation, estrangement or self-estrangement, printers as a whole, appear to find intrinsic meaning in their work and have a high degree of dignity and self-esteem. Because their work offers opportunity for self-expression and development of potential most printers appear to be oriented toward the intrinsic rewards of craftsmanship rather than instrumental rewards, i. e., the pay check. This is not to imply that the instrumental rewards, particularly wages, bargaining, and restriction of entry are neglected as considerations. Apparently this is more true for men in small shops than in larger ones.¹¹

Blauner makes the point that "work is almost the expression of an inner need, rather than the grudging payment of a debt imposed

12

by external sources. This raises the possibility of a theme we have pursued in preceding chapters on policy making executives, ad men, and salesmen. That is a certain type of social character may be created by the structure of an occupation if the recruit stays in the occupation long enough, whether the recruit was latently predisposed at the outset. Our data do not allow for further speculation. Printing, as other craft unions, i. e., electrical, motion picture, projection, has a strong tendency for sons to follow father. 13 Regardless, it appears that printers are strongly oriented toward the intrinsic work and rewards of their craft.

The structure of the printing industry is such that once a man leaves the apprentice stage he feels he has reached the top of the working class hierarchy. His identification with the normative structure of the industry and its promotional system, plus the overriding identification with their craft and its rewards does not make promotion too important. Printers as a group appear to believe promotion is based on "quality" of work and "willingness" to work. Even the lack of formal advancement is not felt as deprivation. 14

According to Lipset, printers do not experience social isolation on the job. Rather, printers are strongly integrated both in small and large shops. Many printers work night shifts which increase the degree and amount of association with one another and decreases socializing with non printers. 15 This increases identification with the craft. In addition, some printers, i. e., pressmen, carry out their

work in teams with journeymen and apprentices which again causes
 16
 integration.

In addition this identification, according to printers, is
 strengthened outside of work by the high amount of prestige accorded
 17
 printers by other manual workers.

We have tried to discuss the basic features of printing as an
 occupation. The preceding discussion of printing work does not at-
 tempt to be all inclusive or a definitive statement about the industry.
 In sum, the printer does not appear to be alienated from his work.
 Printers experience a strong degree of intrinsic meaning and identity
 with their work. This is based on socialization into, and identification
 with, his craft. The work not being mechanized, standardized or
 fragmented offers a high degree of intrinsic satisfaction. It also may
 systematically recruit a certain type of social character predisposed
 to this craft. The work itself allows the printer a high degree of tech-
 nical control and offers him the opportunity to exercise skill, judg-
 ment, artistic ability, responsibility and self-expression and self-
 actualization through its very nature. The union regulations and the
 nature of the work allow for a high degree of control, power and mean-
 ing minimizing identification with the immediate ends of the organiza-
 tion, practically nullifying supervision and decreasing to a great degree
 18
 the amount of bureaucratization. A high degree of social integration
 is found both on and off the job due to the nature and structure of the
 work.

The printer in mass industrial society remains something of an anachronism as a highly skilled craftsman with a deep involvement and commitment to his work. A member of a powerful "guild," he seems strongly out of place in an increasingly specialized and fragmented world of work. He retains some of the qualities of the preindustrial craftsmen Veblen discussed prior to the machine era. The printer is proof that the "instinct of workmanship" has not completely vanished.

19

The Chemical Operator

Blauner discusses another type of factory work in a changing industry. Like his study of printers much is based on survey data but is supplemented by his own work experience and participant observation. This is a study of chemical operators in an industrial chemical plant called "Bay Chemical."

20

Both the oil refinery and industrial chemical plants are examples of automated factories employing continuous process technology. These industries employed extensively advanced technology long before automation became a social problem. An industrial chemical plant is a series of buildings with networks of pipes, reactor units, and towers, through which pass mixtures of chemicals in gaseous and liquid states controlled by devices which regulate, speed, flow, mixture temperature. The industry by its complex nature and high combustible material is decentralized into many middle sized factories lessening the effect of excessive bureaucracy. Although automation reduces the size of the

21

work force it produces another trend which tends to decrease work alienation. It reverses the historical pattern of an increasing division of labor and minute specialization, while increasing skill and responsibility.²²

Unlike the automobile industry there is no seasonal fluctuation or layoff period. The chemical operator then has almost no fear of job insecurity. The market conditions of output and cost not only prevent layoffs but also influence a college trained managerial group to obtain a permanent and stable work force. The chemical operator then thinks in terms of a career--not a job, with tenure, fringe benefits, promotion, etc.²³

Blauner argues that responsibility, purposefulness, skill, control and group cohesion are the predominant characteristics of the chemical operators work. All of these conditions are antithetical to those found in the historical development of the division of labor. The operators job largely consists of monitoring the flow of chemicals, taking readings of temperature, mixture, flow, pressure, etc. The emphasis is changed from doing a job to the processing of a product--²⁴ from product to function within a larger process. "Knack" and semi-skilled operators are eliminated but responsibility rather than skill²⁵ per se becomes the main feature of this work. The chemical operator is responsible for the quality of the product, the trouble free flow of operations and the very expensive equipment. In the Marxian sense the product no longer stands external to him, a power unto its own,

demanding his submission. In essence commodity relations are eliminated along with the extreme sub-division of labor.

The operator makes a periodic round approximately every two hours and takes readings on approximately fifty instruments. All such jobs require at least ten operations at widely disbursed points. This is in contrast to the assembly line workers fractionalized operations.

The repairmen, who constitute forty percent of the work force, have an even greater variety of work. The repair crews rotate each week working in the five zones that divide the plant. They rotate each week for a five week period. Repairmen have no way of knowing when or where equipment will break down. Operators, likewise, at times are required to work frenzied periods of arduous activity if there is a break in production.²⁶ It is obvious that monotony at work is not a problem for the chemical operator.

The chemical operator has free physical movement and does not do physically demanding work. He is free to establish the rhythm and pattern of his work,²⁷ except during a crisis. Supervision is not²⁸ strict, thereby eliminating managerial pressure from management. A head shift operator is often a worker who is thoroughly acquainted with all of the operations in that plant by his own working experience, as does the printing foreman. He also has the freedom to develop his own techniques and methods of his work. Here he can superimpose his own personal idiosyncratic work habits rather than have them dictated to

him by a job.

While the pace and output of the processing of chemicals is not controlled by the operator he does control the pace at which he monitors the automatic equipment. This is in contrast to the auto worker who is literally an appendage to the machine. The operator can and does alter the flow within the reactors in order to assure the quality of the product. This is not only the operators greatest source of responsibility but there are some indications that it is a great source of satisfaction and hints at bringing out the "instinct of workmanship."²⁹

Chemical operators have a great degree of control over their work, perhaps not as much as the printer. They express varying opinions of their degree of control. However, they all agree the automatic³⁰ processing equipment does not control them. The only time the operator feels he has lost his control is when the equipment breaks down.³¹

Even then the chemical operator wants to get the problem fixed. It challenges his knowledge, ingenuity and skill, etc. This is in marked contrast to the auto assembly line workers who feel satisfaction when the line breaks down.

The problems then, of lack of control, narrow specialization, separation of intellectual physical labor and powerlessness are not serious nor real problems for the chemical operator. Social isolation is not a problem either for two reasons. While automation has reduced the number of workers it has made it necessary to work in teams. Each plant has teams of men assigned to its various sectors twenty-four

hours a day, seven days a week. The emphasis on production process and team operation as the division of labor helps to foster group identity and collective consciousness. The chemical operator identifies with his particular shift, department and company. So strong is the group cohesion that one's fellow workers were more consistently mentioned as the part of the job liked more than intrinsic work,

32

security, pay, etc. Ironically when the complex division of labor does not undergo extreme subdivision, cohesiveness not atomization appears to be a result.

The job and status structure of the industry is elaborate and complex. It is arranged in a hierarchy of pay, skill, and responsibility. It allows for the maximum number of people to be promoted in vertical and situs positions. There is also a conscious effort to promote from within while not making a large gap between those at the top and at the

33

bottom.

The social organization of the chemical plant is comprised of fewer men than the factory. With perhaps twenty men working both day and night shifts in a single department anonymity is decreased. Because of the decentralization of operations, small departments, and frequent necessary consultation with superiors the appearances of bureaucracy are decreased.

The meaninglessness of his work may be the most interesting problem not encountered by the chemical operator. There is not only a strong sense of responsibility but an interdependence reminiscent of Durkheim's organic solidarity. It is accomplished in part because of

the rationality of work organization. While the crews and areas of the plant are functionally rational, and the members of the crews functionally interdependent on each other, the result for the chemical operator is a strong degree of responsibility for a total job. The sheer fact of his responsibility and mobility increases the chemical workers understanding of the total operation, without his necessarily having a knowledge of chemistry. We would say this is the only type of bureaucratic work where functional rationality, of sorts, appeared to increase substantial rationality.

The chemical operator then despite his erratic work rhythms of periods of free time and hurried activity is engaged in self-fulfilling work not self-estranging work. They do not experience boredom, monotony or heightened awareness of time as a problem. There is a sense of involvement and interest in their work as we have seen before by trying to perfect the various chemical mixtures. Automatic processes are never perfect and often it is impossible to predict when and where unexpected breakdowns occur. Locating, fixing the trouble, and restoring the operation was for many the chief source of satisfaction. Again it heightened, intensified and expanded involvement in the immediate present. The drama and total challenge afforded by fairly frequent sets of crises helped void any possibility of self-estrangement. The time between regular readings and crises is filled in by reading books, magazines, etc. This is another example of what Dalton, Blau and Gouldner would see as "bureaucracy's other face."

The chemical operator then enjoys dignity and responsibility in factory work which Marx and the other classical theorists might never have thought possible.

The Gypsum Plant

There is a similar point made in a study of a gypsum plant by Alvin Gouldner. Located in a rural mining community where the mining of gypsum and its processing into board is the local industry, Gouldner and his colleagues studied this plant in depth through participant observation and in depth interviewing. The plant was separated into a mining area and a surface area (the factory) where raw gypsum was processed and refined into sheets of board. The overall supervisor of the plant was a manager--"Old Doug." Doug was a "local" and acted as a patriarch rather than a bureaucrat. The plant had a formal set of rules from its main office that Doug did not strictly enforce. There were rules about smoking, job rotation, loafing, punctuality, working with injuries, etc., over which Doug evolved his own system. A man could smoke, loaf, clock in late or early as long as his work was done. A worker who was injured, but needed his salary, was given a "hospital job" counting board. If men wanted board, for any reason, they could take it from the plant if they informed Doug beforehand.

The gypsum miners were treated separately. Mining is extremely hazardous work. The miners develop a set of fatalistic beliefs

about mining. They believe ultimately that a mine shaft will collapse and kill them. It may be today, next week, or ten years, but that mine gets one in the end is central to their ideology. The excitement and camaraderie of the mine, in part, keeps them at their subterranean profession. An occupational ideology which envisions death as the ultimate occupational end allows men special status privileges. It allows them to "act as if"--a claim which Old Doug supported.

37

Similar to the American Indian steeplejacks who work on skyscrapers they are subject to "feelings." If they simply felt they didn't want to get into the shaft one day they simply did not go to work. This happened frequently with these miners, especially on Mondays and Fridays. They would go drinking as a release rather than go to work. Miners as a special status group made their own set of rules. Doug respected them and only in an emergency would he drive to the local bar to get the miners. They would cease drinking and go if Doug "was in a jam," because Doug was "a right guy."

When Doug died he was replaced by an "organization man" appointed by the front office. Bureaucratically oriented and promising to put an end to sloppiness and loose discipline the new plant manager, and his eventual successor, attempted to implement and enforce a set of bureaucratic rules and impersonally adhere to them. He eliminated smoking, free time, hospital jobs, free gypsum board, and laxness in punctuality. He met with compliance in the plant, although not without significant resentment and resistance. There was much complaining

and resistance especially by Doug's former lieutenants.

The mine, however, remained relatively unaffected by this new system. Although the new manager attempted to apply it equally to all of its personnel the miners treated his intrusion of their privacy as one might react to an annoying fly. The miners reaction can be understood in light of one of the rules which was to come to work neatly attired and clean shaven. The comic ludicrousness of this may be seen in contrasting this rule with the values and attitudes of men who feel that the conditions under which they work will be responsible for their deaths. For the surface men, however, who had no similar group protection, the strict adherence to rules concerning close supervision were less comic and more serious. The men complained of the way in which the new plant manager behaved, i. e., "cracked the whip," "kept a close watch," "didn't trust or give a damn about the men" were recurrent themes. Two examples are:

The only word I know for him, like the men call him, is just a plain p---k. He is a guy that wants the men to work on their job and stick a broom up their ass and sweep the floor at the same time. 38

Take this new guy, he's a Southerner who just came up from the South...He's a slave driver and a pusher. Used to talking to a lot of "niggers" so he acts superior. Probably knows what he's doing, but doesn't treat the men right. 39

Tension, low motivation, low productivity were created when the enforcement of new rules, particularly by new supervisors who weren't integrated into the line workers informal system. The

impersonality, discipline and particularly the manner in which the supervisors implemented these new changes were resented. The final effect culminated in a prolonged wildcat strike.

40

The irony of the strike was that it resulted in increased bureaucratization of the mine. A return to trust and faith were no longer possible with the initial enforcement of bureaucratic rules. Therefore, the agreement that ended the strike strictly delimited authority and spheres of confidence along hierarchical lines. It reinforced centralization, formal rules and impersonal adherence to them. In short it increased bureaucratization to reduce conflict. It strictly segregated the interaction between supervisors who used close supervision and those workers who had strained relations with them. In practical terms it reduced potential conflict between management and line workers by applying the bureaucratic rules to both sides.

41

With their Gemeinschaft gone the line workers effected an even stricter enforcement of bureaucratic procedures as a result of the drive to regain their dignity and status. Perhaps one form of alienation was substituted for another as the "solution" solved none of the underlying problems. But the irony is clear. When the rules were winked at, dissatisfaction with work appeared to be absent. This is also confirmed to some degree at various managerial levels discussed in Dalton's work. With the enforcement of bureaucratic rules and procedures line workers expressed open hostility. The problem of the strike was solved only by guaranteeing both sides equality in the strict enforcement of bureaucratic rules and

procedures.

These studies indicate that changes in market policy, a more effective use of the division of labor and leeway in the application of bureaucratic rules and procedures tend to substantially decrease the effects of alienation and estrangement from work. The printing studies have shown that where craft skills and union power take precedence over bureaucratic rules, alienation is largely absent.

It would seem that Durkheim's idea that the work group would replace the lost "community" is applicable in the studies of printing and in the chemical operators work. This is true because these kinds of work have retained large measures of "substantial rationality" (Mannheim). In addition, the printers union controls the market. The management policies and practices of the chemical industry create careers for the chemical operators in the same sense that the bureaucrat has a career. The study of the chemical industry has shown that it is possible for people to enjoy work. Blau and Gouldner within another framework have suggested something else entirely. That is, within the framework of bureaucratic rigidities, it is possible to avoid the feeling of alienation by not treating workers as automotons.

Summary of Non Alienated Work

Three of the studies we have presented, those by Blau, Lipset and Gouldner do not deal specifically with the problems of alienation and bureaucratic work but have apparently shed some light on the problem.

They have dealt with some problems of bureaucratic work and have attempted to demonstrate the possibility of democratic and traditional humanistic theory by showing that bureaucratic work is not totally bleak and oppressing. They have tried to demonstrate the possibility for humanistic action to counteract the pessimistic analyses of bureaucracy implicit in Weber and Michels.

42

Lipset's analysis is essentially an anti-Michels argument and by implication anti-Weberian. The iron law of oligarchy and individual personal repression, Lipset would have us believe, is not iron after all.

Blau and Gouldner would have us believe that Weber was unaware of "bureaucracy's other face." We would suggest that their analyses infer that Weber only set forth bureaucratic conditions as an "ideal type." Weber was aware of the informal interdepartmental power struggles and "favors" granted by officials to certain families. This however is a subject which we will discuss in the final chapter.

43

Blau and Gouldner, on the other hand imply that the individual repression, authoritarianism and impersonality inherent in bureaucracy may be overcome if management becomes more humanistic and adopts a "human relations" approach as similar to that suggested by Mayo. Alienation from work would then cease to be a problem because of enlightened managerial techniques. Neither addressed themselves to or analyzed at length the importance of the institutions which create the everyday character of work especially the market. In each case

the role of the market under capitalism is mentioned in a passing fashion but neither researcher expands on its importance for creating the social atmosphere of work. To the degree that each ignores the determining effect of institutions and their effect on the characteristic of everyday work they continue in a voluntaristic tradition and ignore specific institutional features which create alienation.

Lipset, Blau and Gouldner also assume that the plant or office is both distinct and separate from the economic or market situation. Blau ignores the importance of the funding mechanism in State Civil Service; Gouldner low pay; and Lipset the fact that printing newspapers was until recently local in basis. Unions can achieve local monopoly over the labor market and thereby gain bargaining power. This is an effect of the market. To ignore such external economic factors is to create an artificial image of the immediate work situation.

Blauner, unlike the others, deals specifically with the problem of work alienation. In doing so he makes the following contributions: (a) In highly automated industries the structure of work allows highly skilled workers a feeling of control and power over the process of work; awareness of the entire processing operation and discretion over their own individual work; (b) In the printing trade, due to other technological factors and the traditionally strong guild like nature of their union similar social psychological characteristics exist as in chemical work. Again he emphasizes that the sense of power, control and awareness over the technological process at least mitigates against

alienation from work. In addition he demonstrates that the historical process of an ever subdividing division of labor is reversible.

In sum, then, not all bureaucratic work is totally alienating, bleak, and oppressing. Meaning, pride and individual self-fulfillment may be begotten under certain of the above conditions despite the operation of the market, the industrial division of labor and industrial bureaucracy. It should be remembered that with the exception of Blauner none of these researchers were interested in the particular problem of alienation from work. Their research interests lie elsewhere. In addition, the methods they used did not allow them to see alienation or the lack of it particularly in relation to the market and the industrial division of labor. At these levels their work may be minimized to a degree. Ironically by not making these points explicit they show the importance of institutional characteristics by their relative absence.

That printers and chemical operators would not suffer alienation at work would not have surprised Durkheim because of the strong emphasis on cohesion and solidarity. Nor would it have surprised Veblen because of the nature of the 'instinct of workmanship' that shows itself in these jobs. Mannheim and Weber also are relevant in understanding the lack of alienation in these two occupational groups because of the strong emphasis on substantiated or substantial rationality. Marx would not explicitly be helpful. It is possible that he might have understood the printers survival as a craft group but his conceptual model

might not have made allowances for the cooperative efforts of management and labor in creating conditions that decrease alienation.

Blau and Gouldner both focus on industrial bureaucracy and neither takes into account the market mechanism. In this sense Veblen rather than Durkheim is a more accurate guide to understanding the gypsum plant. Weber, Mannheim and Veblen all with their emphasis on bureaucracy understood the effects of tenure, supervision, funding, anxiety and training in bureaucratic work. At this level the explanations of Blau and Gouldner are somewhat limited by the artificial context in which the researchers studied work.

Yet all of the classical theorists would find it very difficult to account for the lack of alienation demonstrated by these few groups although none would accept the "personnel" theories of Blau and Gouldner. The fact that they are so few in number is perhaps an affirmation of the gloomy predictions of the classical theorists. They however, never appeared to ask the question to what degree could bureaucratic work be managed, and alienation controlled. Durkheim's optimism has time and again apparently been proven to be wrong. Veblen's "crackpot" notion of a Soviet of engineers and Mannheim's concept of substantial rationality appear to show that alienation is not inevitable but none of the classical theorists was carried away by his own optimism. They all operated in the context that increasing bureaucratization and the division of labor and capitalism would create gloom and despair in work.

Perhaps with the advantage of hindsight we may argue that in their concern for the world they had lost, they did not see the inevitability of world-wide bureaucracy. In that sense none asked if bureaucratic work could be made more humane, human and manageable. At that level, they did not ask if it were possible to avoid losing the battle against bureaucratic work although they recognized it was impossible to win. In a sense if this small group of studies represents the only possibility that contemporary man has in finding intrinsic meaning in work it is an affirmation of the alienation predicted by the classical theorists.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy.

² Ibid., p. 25.

³ Ibid., pp. 83-86.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 58-63. Among these practices were the distortion, falsification, hiding, and "personalized" filing of job orders when filled at all. This occurred so frequently that the hiding of job orders was referred to as having something "under your rug." Also arrangements were made with those interviewers who were friendly with the phone operators to monitor to them any promising calls for jobs.

⁵ Ibid., p. 61.

⁶ Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 33-37. Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow and James Coleman, Union Democracy (New York: The Free Press, 1956), p. 24.

⁷ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, see Appendix.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 40-44. Lipset, Trow and Coleman, pp. 24-25, 31. Selig Perleman and Phillip Taft, History of Labor in the United States (New York: Macmillan Co., 1935), p. 51.

⁹ Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 45.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 43, 47.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 53-54.

- 12
Ibid., p. 56. Also see Lipset, Trow and Coleman, p. 139.
- 13
Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 47.
- 14
Ibid., pp. 48-49, 53. Also see Eugene Friedman, "The Meanings of Work for Skilled Craftsmen," The Meaning of Work and Retirement, Eugene Friedman and Robert Havighurst (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 132-137.
- 15
Lipset, Trow and Coleman, pp. 153-159.
- 16
Ibid., pp. 160-163 and Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p.
50.
- 17
Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, p. 55.
- 18
Ibid., pp. 35, 56.
- 19
Veblen, The Instinct of Workmanship.
- 20
Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 124-190. The author's experience was in the chemical industry which is what this section emphasizes although there are similarities in the oil industry.
- 21
Ibid., pp. 127-146.
- 22
Ibid., pp. 124, 127, 131, 143.
- 23
Ibid., pp. 128-131.
- 24
Ibid., pp. 172-173.
- 25
Ibid., pp. 132-135.
- 26
Ibid., p. 142.

27

Blauner quotes one workman who said if soup was cooking on a hot plate when it was time to take readings, the readings would be done before or after having the soup. See Alienation and Freedom, pp. 137-138.

28

If anything it is minimal. Blauner reports the case of a former construction worker who took a ribbing from the others because he kept looking around for someone to be "breathing down his neck." Ibid., p. 147.

29

Blauner quotes an operator whose responsibility was to keep a chemical mixture at 32 to 36 percent. The operator ~~says~~ "it's running okay at 33 or 35 percent. But I want to see if I can get it set at 34. I keep adjusting the controls until it's 34." Ibid., p. 156.

30

Ibid., p. 141.

31

Ibid., p. 142.

32

Ibid., pp. 146-148. Identification with the company is in marked contrast to the printer who identifies with the profession not the company. Yet each achieve a strong group cohesion.

33

Ibid., pp. 149-152. This serves to legitimize the normative structure in the eyes of the workers, thereby promoting company identification not relative deprivation. See Alvin Gouldner's, Introduction to Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Ill., : The Free Press, 1954), and George Simmel, Sociology, ed. and trans. by Kurt Wolff (Glencoe: Ill.: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 300-303.

34

Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, pp. 144-146.

35

Ibid., pp. 155-156.

36

Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy.

37

See Edmund Wilson, Apologies to the Iroquois (New York: Random House, 1959).

38 Alvin Gouldner, Wildcat Strike (Harper Torchbook edition; New York: Harper and Row Pub.Inc., 1965), p. 73.

39 Ibid., p. 74.

40 Ibid., pp. 78-87. It should be noted that both the miners and the factory men worked for very low pay. This fact is quite important as it is related to the indulgency pattern. Leniency was a form of compensation for low salaries. The men recognized this but apparently new management either did not or chose to ignore it. In that sense, insult was added to already damaging injury. Yet, even with low pay the workers appeared not to be disgruntled as long as there was adequate compensation. See, pp. 32-33.

41 Ibid., pp. 117-123.

42 Robert Michels, Political Parties (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1915), especially pp. 185-188.

43 See Weber, "Bureaucracy," section 12 and Max Weber, The Religion of Ancient China, ed. and trans. by Hans Gerth (New York: The Free Press, 1950), p. 118.

CHAPTER X

THE CONVERGENCE OF CLASSICAL THEORY AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

At the outset of this study we reviewed the theories of alienation from work as embodied in the work of the classical theorists. We have extracted from these theories six different conceptions of bureaucratic work raised by the classical theorists and the evidence of their empirical existence presented by the contemporary theorists and researchers. Our attempt was to discover the presence or absence of alienation in bureaucratic work. We will now attempt to summarize what the classical theorists and empirical researchers explain; what each does not explain; what each group explained that the other did not and finally we would like to suggest questions that neither asked.

As we initially posited, and have seen, the concept of alienation from work is an elusive one and often hard to locate. Ultimately, alienation means to experience work as alien from oneself, yet, this is hardest to keep in mind when people appear, to an observer, to be alienated but suggest by their enthusiasm and by their affirmation of the work, the opposite. Alienation from work has different nuances, degrees and subtleties in the way it is experienced and how it is

understood by the participants involved. There are difficulties (which will be discussed later) in saying that some occupational groups are alienated but they do not realize their condition.

This suggests a kind of alienation which is not subjectively understood though the consequences may be inferred by an outsider who arrogates the "right" to make judgments. To justify this non subjective use of the concept we have tried to use the concept of alienation from work as Weber might have used it in two senses; (a) as an ideal type perhaps never to be found in its entirety in the real world; and (b) we have asked what the meaning of work is to those who work and have tried to understand its meaning both as it is cognitively understood and by "imputing" "motivation and meaning" when that meaning is expressed in the action of the participants. In this case we have used the concept of "Verstehen" to suggest models of motivation that render the behavior under discussion most consistently coherent.

The Classical Theorists-Questions and Contributions

The paradigm which we have used throughout our analysis represents the basic questions asked by the classical theorists. In discussing the structural institutions that regulate work the classical theorists emphasis on characteristic features of industrial capitalism (particularly the market), of the industrial division of labor, and of industrial bureaucracy appears to be fairly central and comprehensive

in view of the evidence mustered by empirical research. If anything, the emphasis on the market mechanism is stronger in the classical tradition, particularly in the Marxian and Veblenian, than that of the contemporary researchers. In some cases the classical tradition serves to demonstrate the narrow limitations of some contemporary analysts who focus upon the social psychological consequences of work and less upon the structural, social, economic and administrative character of work. In addition the classical theorists outlined and described almost all of the possible consequences turned up in the contemporary research. The empirical researchers however have shown in more subtle detail the various processes of self-rationalization. Writing at a time when these three major institutions were just beginning to make their impact felt the classical theorist could not envision the subtle details and forms they would take. Therefore they could not give a full deliniation to the role of conspicuous consumption in society, the idea of finding compensation at various levels of bureaucracy, nor the degree to which the bureaucracy could mold and/or recruit various types of social character. Yet all of these ideas can be found in the works of Veblen, Weber, Marx, Mannheim, Simmel and Durkheim.

The chief value and validity of their work appears to be in their genius for understanding the turmoil wrought out of the 19th century industrial revolution in Western Europe and America and their consequent prediction of what work would be like under similar conditions

in the 20th century. At this level their work contains an embarrassment of riches that present sociological work appears to be just approaching.

Their chief contributions appear to be in the poignant and rich concepts and their sense of the course of social change contained in such concepts. Bureaucracy, the division of labor, the market are all rich and far reaching ideas expressing the structure of work. The idea that the structures of work created various types of social character is seen in Weber's notion of bureaucrats as "cogs," Marx's concept of "monsterism," Veblen's "habits of mind," and Mannheim's idea of "self-rationalization."

The notion of the rationality of bureaucracy, as opposed to the "irrationality of the market" described by Marx, is found in the concepts of formal and substantive or formal and substantial rationality by Weber and Mannheim respectively.

The "fetishism of commodities" or "commodity relations," the commercialization of social relations in the urban market place; the notion of "salesmanship," "wastemanship" and "conspicuous consumption" are found in Marx, Simmel and Veblen respectively.

Any analysis of alienation from work must take into account its opposite which is expressed by Veblen as the "instinct of workmanship" against the "instincts of wastemanship," (a) invidious distinction, (b) pecuniary emulation and (c) conspicuous consumption. The idea of anomie, not the concept of normlessness, a similar yet vastly

different concept often confused in terms of structures and consequences, must be considered in attempting to understand why or why not an occupational community can replace the lost "Gemeinschaft." Nor can one leave out the importance of the secularization of Weber's "Protestant Ethic."

Any study which attempts to discuss alienation from work is incomplete and to that extent invalid without understanding the relevance or the nonrelevance of these concepts and their historical development in the 20th century.

In sum then Marx differs substantially from Weber--emphasizing the effects of the market under capitalism and the irrationality of the market while Weber emphasized the advantages and depersonalization of technical man under a bureaucratic society whether capitalist or not. Veblen emphasizes both and understands the irrationality of the market and the rationality of bureaucracy. In that sense he had a surer grasp of the totality of industrial technology than either Marx or Weber. Weber finds much at the level of bureaucracy that Marx located only under capitalism and the industrial division of labor, thus making Marxian analysis more thoroughgoing. Veblen goes beyond either by positing the polar opposite of alienation and the self-realization through the instinct of workmanship. He goes still further by showing that conspicuous consumption could become inextricably intertwined with various levels of bureaucratic work, as bureaucracy became an all prevailing institution in industrial society.

Mannheim deals primarily with one aspect of bureaucracy i.e., the development of formal rationality and the process of self-rationalization. In this sense he joins together Marx and Weber but, because of his emphasis on bureaucracy he leans more to the Weberian tradition. He notably intensifies and expands Weber but he also emphasizes, in the Marxian tradition, that men make themselves over to fit the requirements of a bureaucratic "market" and thus convert themselves into "monsters."

Simmel also suggested that social character was formed by aspects of the social structure. His special focus of attention was the urban marketplace. The urban area intensifies and expands the commercialization and fetishization of social relationships as well as salesmanship creating the overall habits of mind he terms the blasé attitude. As we have seen urbanism also creates the need for further degrees of minute specialization. Simmel located in urbanism what Weber and Mannheim found at the level of bureaucracy, what Marx discovered at the level of the market pecuniary and what Veblen saw in both institutions.

Durkheim's positivism leads him to believe that the occupational community could replace the lost Gemeinschaft. Time and again we have seen this proven wrong. At that level Mannheim's emphasis on self-rationalization, Simmel's on the commercialization of social relationships and Veblen's emphasis on salesmanship and consumption are more specific according to the historical development of work

alienation. Yet where a trade union like the printers survives, according to Blauner and Lipset, social solidarity can be maintained. Where the subdivision of labor is reversed, as in the case of the chemical operator, the division of labor can take place between plants rather than within plants, thus maintaining plant wide unity in continuous process industries.

The Durkheimian concept of the anomic division of labor is similar to the Marxian concept of alienation. Because the two terms are so often confused with one another contemporary sociologists often fail to realize that anomie in a mild form is inherently a part of the gap between the formal and the informal aspects of bureaucracy and creates the possibility of self-actualization at informal levels.

The relative absence of norms, of routines, formal procedures or of standard "solutions" to problems, creates the very stimulation challenge and possibility of self-actualization to highly motivated, energetic or narcissistic managers who would be stifled by an organization that gave them no room or freedom to use their creative energies.

The chief value of the concept of alienation from work as used by classical theorists has been the use in relation to historical, structural and institutional change in the 19th and early 20th century. The relevance of the explication of this concept to empirical researchers has been in providing specific questions and specific models of the society, the social structures and work structures which they were

attempting to explore.

The overall value of classical theory lies in the questions it poses, the hypotheses it suggests, the ideas it evokes and in its value as a guide in the understanding of a highly developed industrial society. The claim that the classical theorists had few scientific or systematic hypothesis may be arguable. Much that has taken place in this area and in others would not make sense without the insight provided by the classical theorist nor would research on work and alienation from work be fruitful if we were to ignore these theories, concepts and ideas.

The Contemporary Researchers - Questions and Contributions

Unlike the classical theorists the empirical researchers were not reacting to the sudden, sharp impact of the industrial revolution itself. They focused upon the impact of creeping bureaucratization on work, particularly upon the changing meaning of work, the types of social character created by a society where work was predominantly bureaucratic and where bureaucrats constitute an ever larger part of the middle class. The interests of the 20th century researchers have varied, and few besides, Blauner, Howton and Rosenberg, Mills, Langer and Fromm were specifically interested in the concept of alienation in work. Some such as Underwood and Henry were interested in the psychodynamics of the executive and have used vastly different concepts. Blau, Gouldner, Dalton, Crozier and Presthus were all

organization theorists whose research interest and methods were also varied. Chinoy, Walker and Guest, Roy, Blum and Friedman were all interested in assembly line work and did not focus on the administrative levels of industrial bureaucracies. Sectorsky and Griff were interested only in advertising work. Whyte, Mills and Riesman and Fromm were not interested in work per se but more in directing themselves to the larger issue of conformity in the 1950's. Merton and Bensman are sociologists, working in the tradition of Marx, Weber, Veblen and Mannheim, who are interested in the problems of the meaning of work at different levels of bureaucracy and the development of social character.

For some their original research questions, problems and/or the methods used to study, did not allow them to pose or see the problem alienation specifically when it might have been present. They instead concentrated on the meanings of work at various bureaucratic levels, the internal problems of bureaucracy and the changing meaning of work in contemporary American society. Some, like Blauner, Howton and Rosenberg, Mills and Langer focus directly on alienation from work. However, the chief contributions of the researchers appear to be the following.

- 1) A specific type of social character can be systematically drawn to certain levels of bureaucratic work. If the person did not have the desired or necessary characteristics at the outset of his employment, the individual would develop the characteristics should he

remain at the job for a long enough time. This is specifically shown by Bensman at the policy making level and to some extent at the advertising level. This point accentuates and expands Marx, Weber and Mannheim in the sense that it appears to show that the society creates certain types of social character which are systematically drawn to various levels of bureaucracy. This implies that they are not simply created by the structure of the work as had previously been posited. That a person (the narcissist) would not be able to separate work from the rest of his life is found in Marxian theory but is demonstrated at a microcosmic level by Bensman, Underwood, Henry, Whyte and Spector sky.

2) Mild forms of anomie appear, as we have indicated, to be a minimal and essential part of the structure of bureaucratic work as evidenced by the separation of the formal and informal aspects of bureaucracy. This looseness in structure appears to help managers in overcoming possible forms of alienation by providing a sense of challenge in their work. This is also true of chemical operators in a different sense. When the chemical compound processes goes awry, the crisis is in part compensation for the boredom and routine.

3) Self-rationalization appears to be even more important an element in managerial and saleswork than it originally appeared to be. Mills, Whyte, Riesman, Langer, Howton and Rosenberg all demonstrate this at the social psychological, organizational and societal strata level in cultural and institutional ways more subtle and far

reaching than Mannheim or Weber appeared to have focused upon.

These processes of self-rationalization, self-manipulation and successful self-delusion are the fundamental social psychological processes of our time and constitute much of what is called adult socialization for an entire social stratum.

4) Alienation from work is so elusive a concept and people's ego defenses are so complicated, overcompensation so prevalent and self-delusion so successful that even when all objective criteria of the social structure point to a person being alienated from his work and their objective statements of subjective feelings indicating the same the person may say that they are not alienated from work. This is shown particularly in advertising, managerial and clerical work by Bensman, Spector, Whyte, Crozier and Langer. What appears to be equally as important as whether they are or are not alienated are the following: What form the alienation takes, what areas of the job does it strike at, to what degree is the person conscious or unconscious of it? Is the alienated person who knows that he is alienated from his work and who fights it suffering, more or less than the person who does not know that he is alienated from his work and fights himself inwardly? The two classical examples of these cases are the ad men and the automobile workers, both of whom are the only groups reported in the empirical research to exhibit fantasies and reaction formation respectively of owning farms or writing The Great American Novel (or creating other work of art). Both groups appear to be highly

alienated, the former knowing it, the latter denying it. Self-awareness then is not necessary to a sense of alienation.

5) The lower levels of bureaucratic sales and clerical work appear to be avenues of mobility into the middle classes or into patterns of middle class life styles and consumption patterns, especially for lower middle class women. Many of these women, less skilled and low educated women will withstand degrading, low paying, monotonous jobs to attain mobility and/or the pattern of consumption afforded by having the extra income. This is shown by Cozier and Langer. In a sense they go even beyond Veblen in demonstrating just how pervasive and compelling some form of conspicuous consumption and life style would become in America for the lower middle classes and that it would weigh so heavily upon the lower echelons of white collar bureaucratic work should also be noted. Some sociologists of work, Gouldner, Blau, Walker and Guest and those who have researched work satisfaction focused so much on work itself that they have not seen the effect of non work life. It is doubtful that one can study these alienating conditions without studying the non work life of the worker because of the complementarity of work and leisure.

6) At some levels, what appears to be non alienated labor has much more to do with the relationship of the organization to the market or to its source of revenues--whether customers or governmental funding. Blau ignores this in terms of clerks and interviewers in the employment agency. Gouldner cites but apparently plays this down in

terms of the low salaries paid to the miners who worked less as compensation. The development of managerial sociology by Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson and as we have seen continued by Blau and Gouldner show the importance of the market despite their relative omission of this factor from their work. In so doing they create an artificial type of work situation and to that degree do not understand the importance of the market for the clerk, the placement interviewer, the miner or the printer.

7) This historical process of an ever subdividing and ever rationalizing division of labor is not, according to some researchers, inevitable. A shift can be made from production work to watchful responsibility; from functional rationality to substantial rationality in industries that use continuous process technology. With much of the detailed craft work and physical processes absorbed by the machine the major area of work left for the men who man the plants are (a) keeping track of the flow of industrial processes through the reading of the instruments and (b) troubleshooting.

However since the work force decreased in such plants this may only be operable within a particular plant and not the society as a whole. As labor is displaced in such capital intensive industries the displaced labor may move to other industries where similar processes do not take place i.e., service industries.

8) Although none specifically say this, the potential for some alienation from work in some form or another appears to be high in

human work everywhere in contemporary industrial society. What appears to be equally important are the following questions: What type and what degree of alienation? To what extent does it exist? To what degree does it exist? In what types of work is there adequate psychological compensation and what types of compensation? Is the job basically non alienating and self-realizing with some alienating features or the opposite? When do the alienating features outweigh the non alienating features? Why is it that basically similar conditions will create alienation from work for some occupational groups and not for others? These questions seem far more pertinent in understanding alienation from work than simple notions of alienation per se. In short to believe that non alienating work can exist to any great degree in bureaucratic work is to ignore how mechanically stifling can be the effects of bureaucracy, the division of labor and the market in contemporary industrial society.

After our review of the research findings it would appear to us that approximately a dozen of the empirical researchers and contemporary theorists are more important than the others in widely varying degrees. They represent the "links" between the concepts and ideas of the classical theorists and each in their own way to beyond the basic ideas and concepts of the classical theorists. They show at the social psychological, cultural and institutional levels what the classical theorists predicted. However they go beyond the classical theorists by showing how all pervasive and subtle the processes i. e. , self-

rationalization, self-manipulation, successful self-delusion, the division of labor, conspicuous consumption have become at the institutional and cultural levels and their effect on the development of social character in a bureaucratized society.

1. Bensman as researcher and theorist and Merton as theorist show at the level of policy making, advertising and by implication at the clerical level, the direct and explicit connection between various levels of bureaucratic work and the development of social character. Specifically, they validate and go beyond Weber and Mannheim in terms of self-rationalization, and the creation of bureaucratic social character. By implication at the clerical level they also validate Veblen's concepts of trained incapacity and conspicuous consumption but in ways more subtle than Veblen portrayed.

2. Mills, Whyte, Riesman and by implication Fromm form a link between Weber, Shumpeter, Mannheim and Veblen at the managerial level. They specifically show just how all pervasive self-rationalization has become; that the managers have become the new middle classes; that increasingly nicely presented personality packages of themselves is the chief work of managers, is also their contribution. Riesman and Fromm both present this at the social psychological level, Mills presents it at varying degrees at the latter level and at the bureaucratic and class levels, Whyte presents the phenomenon at all levels particularly locating it in ideological supports of the social structure. In so doing he went beyond Riesman, Fromm or Mills, In this sense

then researchers demonstrate the utility of concepts developed by Weber, Mannheim and Shumpeter in comparison with simple Marxism. Ironically they show that what Marx termed "monsterism" existed at the bureaucratic level. Thus Weber goes beyond Marx but makes the latter's work more universal in its application.

One other issue that Riesman, Whyte and Mills in some sense touch upon is--the Protestant Ethic. Whyte more explicitly than the others deals with this point. Whyte, Mills, and Riesman all attempt explanations of causality. Riesman and Whyte see the Protestant Ethic being replaced in an evolutionary and cultural sense by mild mannered "other-direction" and the Social Ethic respectively. Both tend to view the managers as quasi willing victims of bureaucratization. Whyte however indicates that they are perhaps more willing than simply victims. Mills in contrast, treats them as self-conscious, aware, deliberately manipulative, self-manipulative and bordering on being schizoid. For Mills and Riesman they appear to exist happily on the precipice and are able to move back and forth in relative comfort.

3. Crozier and Langer at the clerical level and Spectorisky at the advertising level show that Fromm and Bell's ideas of an alienated white collar salariat replacing an alienated proletariat is sociologically simplistic. It assumes a new brutalized proletariat when in fact these groups are not brutalized in the same fashion as the former. They willingly enter into this ~~system~~ system for the prestige and consumption it affords them. They are simply not victims of external forces or economic

poverty. If these groups are victims or are brutalized they are victims of (a) their own desire to enjoy positive social, psychological and economic rewards of the system and (b) of their inability to perceive more meaningful alternatives which may or may not exist for them. Thus the new forms of brutalization, if they are to be called that, are more subtle, attractive and comfortable than those of the primitive forms of early industrial capitalism. Such forms do exist but for smaller segments of the population. In discussing the clerical workers and the advertising technician in great detail the researchers form a specific link between Veblen's concepts of salesmanship and "conspicuous consumption," Mannheim's self-rationalization and by implication Simmel's commercialization of social relationships in the urban marketplace. The connection to Marxian and Weberian concepts of social character is also obvious. It is only in the detail and the demonstration of the all pervasiveness of these qualities of work, in contemporary industrial society, that go beyond the classical theorists.

4. Chinoy represents the contemporary researchers on assembly line technology. His work combines all three major paradigmatic aspects of work showing the connections between the division of labor, bureaucracy and the market mechanism. In this sense he stands squarely in the tradition of Marx, Veblen and Durkheim as they predicted man would become a mere appendage to the machine process. He validates Marx and Veblen's emphasis on the market and Weber's emphasis on bureaucracy. Moreover Chinoy shows the importance of

conspicuous consumption among the working classes as Veblen had shown earlier for the leisure classes. He also shows that the commercialization of social relationship can be found in small midwestern industrial cities as well as in the great commercial metropoli that were described by Simmel. But perhaps his most important contributions are (a) to demonstrate the pervasiveness of the need for some levels of conspicuous consumption as a form of compensation for intolerable work; (b) the deep seated guilt Americans seem to have in blaming themselves rather than the market for their degrading and alienating work. He goes beyond the Lynds in showing the internalization of personal guilt by blue collar workers. Fantasizing about owning "a piece of land" is not only compensation but a mechanism for alleviating the guilt of "personal failure." He demonstrates by implication a comparison with ad men who have similar fantasies. Alienation from work may be less painful when recognized than when one is successfully self-deluded and not aware of the delusion.

5. Blau, Gouldner and Dalton are included together because they are all in a sense theorists of informal organization or "bureaucracy's other face." In this sense they combine Weber's ideal type presentation of bureaucracy and the Harvard tradition's (Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson's) emphasis of the discovery of the primary group in industry. Blau and Gouldner along with Mayo and later "industrial sociologists" are thought to be responsible for discovering the "flaw" in Weber's work of not recognizing the "informal side of

3

bureaucracy." Weber was by no means unaware of this. He recognized power struggles between bureaucratic departments both under the Czar in Russia and in Ancient China. In addition he shows informal favors granted to sons of princely families when taking their qualifying exams in ancient China.

It is Dalton however who makes no pretentious assumptions but through detailed analysis presents the idea that large scale organizations cannot and do not operate according to an organizational chart. He also shows by implication that this quasi normlessness or mild form of anomie is a major factor in mitigating work alienation for managers. Dalton's work shows Durkheim to be dogmatic about the solidarity he believed would be brought by the division of labor. Ironically the presence of mild forms of anomie is a way of avoiding more serious alienation for managers.

6. Robert Blauner's work focuses directly on the problem of alienation from work. His work on the printing industry shows the link between the survival of a guild like craft (Durkheim) and the instinct of workmanship (Veblen). Moreover his work on chemical operators shows us that the historical processes of the continual subdivision of labor and formal rationality a la Weber, Durkheim and Mannheim are not inevitable. Blauner in this sense is the only researcher whose work indicates we are not necessarily to be smothered by the "crunch" of the industrial revolution.

Questions and Issues Not Raised by the Researchers and the Theorists

It has been our contention thus far that the classical theorists raised almost all of the pertinent questions that help to explain alienation from work in the 20th century. Their work in large measure has been validated by the empirical researchers. The major contribution of the empirical researchers appears to be that in many cases they went much further in explaining the subtle institutional complexities of alienation from work than did the classical theorists. The major contribution of the classical theorists appears to have been in the far reaching consequences of their grasp of socio-historical change wrought by the industrial revolution in 19th century western Europe and America and their predictions about the future of man's fate in work under these conditions. Their rich descriptions appear to be their great legacy to the sociology of work... It is at this point that the classical and contemporary sociologists meet. In many senses neither group explains what the other did not. It is the contemporary researchers who in many cases went beyond the classical theorists. Yet most contemporary researchers failed to make full use of the arsenal of conceptual tools left to them by the classical theorists.

Questions Not Raised by Empirical Researchers

It would seem to us that the contemporary researchers in too many cases ignored the effects of the market mechanism under capitalism and to that extent ignored much of Marx, Simmel and some of

Veblen's work. We have already shown this importance by its omission in Blau and Gouldner. We do not wish to restate this point. However it exists at other levels particularly the policy making and managerial levels. We may only speculate on what else we may have learned about policy making and managerial work, if Underwood, Henry, Presthus, Whyte, Mills, Riesman and Fromm, to name a few, had focused more on the market than they did on bureaucracy and upon the division of labor.

Our second criticism of the empirical researchers and contemporary sociologists in general is the tendency to take a term, i. e., alienation, anomie, ecology, phenomenology, cybernetics, humanism, psychoanalysis, etc. distort and confuse its meaning and then apply it in a shot gun like fashion to explain major social problems. This type of analysis often implies that the elimination of this diffuse, fuzzy and, in actuality, undefined condition will bring relief to mankind. One reason we suspect that so little research and so little good research has been done on alienation from work is an uncritical acceptance of this early Marxian concept or not having read Marx. A major consequence of so few studies is a recognition of the apparent limitations of sociologists to do such thorny work.

Questions Not Raised by the Classical Theorists

There appear to be two major omissions in the work of the classical theorists as revealed by work of other classical theorists and

by contemporary research. One centers around the period in which they wrote. The classical theorists appear to be tied to themes of gloom, pathos and despair. This is natural, given the horrors of the industrial revolution in the 19th century. They focused on anomic suicide, bureaucratization, and the dehumanizing effects of the factory system. As compared with the empirical studies they appear to have overemphasized man being completely overwhelmed by massive institutional forces at work. This is not to suggest that work will or even can become unalienated. The classical theorists may have been unable to imagine man's capacity to adjust to bureaucratization and massification of institutionalized work. Or perhaps they could not envision the amount of pain that men could endure, their capacity for self-delusion and the compensations that a fully developed industrial society could create so men might endure this pain.

The second criticism is specifically one of Durkheimian analysis not of Durkheim. No one else has enriched the language of sociology more than this French genius. But his obvious fault in believing that a new *Gemeinschaft*, or organic solidarity, would be created by the industrial division of labor has been shown at least until the present inaccurate. The fault appears to be in Durkheim's positivism and the positivistic tradition of Comte and St. Simon. Durkheim using positivism and an equilibrium model, was hoping for a "Science of Sociology." In hoping for a science of society Durkheim looked for easy and apparently utopian solutions which would solve the problems

of anomie by means of appropriate scientific social action. At the present the utopian solutions lie still before us and if we are to judge by the past, may perpetually be so. This failure compared to the historical, cultural, institutional and comparative tradition of those of the Teutonic school leaves serious doubts about the usefulness of the positivistic tradition in the sociological enterprise, at least in understanding the sociology of work.

Questions Raised by Neither Group

With the obvious advantage of hindsight and being in the favorable position of figuratively standing "on the shoulders of giants" or "fleas in the hairs of midgets" we may now state three areas where neither the classical theorists nor the empirical researchers raised substantive questions. However we would make it perfectly clear that we would not be able to raise these questions had the empirical researchers in particular not implicitly given impetus to them in their analysis.

With the exception of Weber, none were fully able to imagine an entire world where bureaucracy would be the major form of the organization of work. Knowing something about man's seemingly infinite plasticity we have only a small awareness of the possible ways of adjustment and/or self-delusion that are possible. Therefore the specification of alienation in work may not be the central task of the sociologist. It may be more in specifying and describing new forms, processes and styles of alienation in work and from work may be continuous tasks, since these forms, styles and processes are continuously

changing as they have changed in the past. But the central task may be one of specifying new social, psychological, cultural and historical processes, content and forms of ego defenses against alienation.

With some obvious exceptions neither the classical theorists nor the empirical researchers appear to specify in any great detail the forms of compensations industrial society provides for alienation at work both in the bureaucracy and outside of it as well. The emphasis on conspicuous consumption which we have frequently mentioned, and life styles should be examined as a counterpart to work.

Finally, although none have said it specifically, while work may have been the single most important self-defining activity of man in the past three centuries, it appears that it no longer occupies that position in the 20th century. One's occupation appears now to be the single most important institutional arrangement for self-definition in a massified prestige and social structure. Increasingly other arrangements are being developed for man's self-actualization which will center around leisure and consumption and life style. We may or may not be entering an era where the use of leisure defines a man to others and to himself.

However, the empirical studies we reported on were done in the late '40's through the mid sixties. One can speculate, not on the basis of the studies, that the process of alienation from work and even "alienation from consumerism" has proceeded to an even increasing pace. A substantial segment of youth appears to be alienated from the

idea of work in bureaucracies and perhaps even from the self-discipline implied in the self-rationalization needed in becoming an "organization man" or member of the "square establishment." Some groups especially drawn from middle class families seek to withdraw into forms of "romantic poverty," especially with the assistance of remittances, while other groups actively seek to destroy the mass bureaucratic "fascist," "imperialistic" system. Other groups, older, seek elegant consumption styles which are "mod," "swinging," "radical chic" "now" and disaffiliate themselves from the system. All of these groups regardless of their specific approach reject the Protestant Ethic no matter what form of secularization it has taken. In total, they represent a relatively small percentage of the population. Moreover they resemble in many ways upper class elements in societies which were not strongly affected by the Protestant Ethic. They represent a new form of response in the United States and among those population segments which were effected by the Protestant Ethic. Thus those forms of response to alienation which were recorded by the sociologists of the '40's through the '60's may already be obsolete. The extent to which this trend is likely to continue is problematic. If it were to continue, industrial society as described and reported here would not be able to continue. But, to the extent, that such trends occur within the framework of affluence provided by industrial society the structure of industrial society provides a limit to the extent of these trends.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Dalton, Men Who Manage and Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, see the section on the Chemical Operator.

² Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1959), chap. IX.

³ See Weber, "Bureaucracy" section 12 and Weber, The Religion of Ancient China, p. 118.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Avineri, Shlomo, ed. Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.
- Bendix, Rhinehard. Work and Authority in Industry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1952.
- Bensman, Joseph. Dollars and Sense. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Blau, Peter. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Blum, Fred H. Toward a Democratic Work Process. New York: Harper and Bros., 1953.
- Chinoy, Eli. Automobile Workers and the American Dream. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955.
- Chomsky, Noam. American Power and the New Mandarins. New York: Vintage, 1969.
- Cohen, Harry. The Demonic of Bureaucracy. Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1965.
- Copley, Frank. Frederick Winslow Taylor; Father of Scientific Management. Vol. II: New York: Harpers, 1923.
- Coser, Lewis and Rosenberg, Bernard. Sociological Theory. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- DeGrazia, Sebastian. Of Work, Time and Leisure. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor & Co., Inc., 1964.

- Dahrendorf, Ralf. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Dalton, Melville. Men Who Manage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Djilas, Milovan. The New Class. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957.
- Drucker, Peter F. The Concept of the Corporation. New York: John Day, 1946.
- _____. The Practice of Management. London: Heinemann, 1955.
- Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. Translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1951.
- _____. The Division of Labor in Society. Translated by George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1933.
- _____. The Rules of Sociological Method. Translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller. New York: The Free Press, 1938.
- Engels, Frederick. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and The State. New York: International Publishers, 1942.
- Farber, Jerry. The Student as Nigger: Essays and Stories. North Hollywood, Calif.: Contact Books, 1969.
- Feuerbach, Ludwig. The Essence of Christianity. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.
- Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and Its Discontents. Translated and Edited by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1962.
- Friedmann, Georges. Industrial Society: The Emergence of Human Problems of Automation. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.
- _____. The Anatomy of Work. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Fromm, Erich. Escape From Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.
- _____. Man for Himself. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1966.

- _____. Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1961.
- Galbraith, John K. The New Industrial State. New York: The New American Library, 1968.
- Gerth, Hans and Mills, C. Wright. Character and Social Structure. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1953.
- _____. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1961.
- _____. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1959.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- _____. Wildcat Strike. Harper Torchbook edition; New York: Harper and Row Pub. Inc., 1965.
- Granick, David. The Red Executive. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1961.
- Green, Robert W. Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1959.
- Hegel, Georg, W. F. The Phenomenology of Mind. Translated by J. B. Braille. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1931.
- _____. The Philosophy of History. Translated by J. Sibree. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.
- Hook, Sidney. From Hegel to Marx. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Hughes, Everett C. Men and Their Work. New York: The Free Press, 1958.
- Josephson, Eric and Josephson, Mary. Man Alone. New York: Dell, 1962.
- Kafka, Franz. The Trial. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1937.

- _____. The Castle. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1930.
- Kahler, Erich. The Tower and the Abyss. New York: George Braziller Inc., 1957.
- Lasswell, Harold. Power and Personality. New York: Viking Press, 1948.
- Lerner, Max, ed. The Portable Veblen. New York: The Viking Press, 1914.
- Lewis, Roy and Stewart, Rosemary. The Managers. New York: Mentor Books, 1958.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Bendix, Rhinehard. Social Mobility in Industrial Society. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin; Trow, Martin; and Coleman, James. Union Democracy. New York: The Free Press, 1956.
- Lynd, Robert and Lynd, Helen. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1929.
- Mannheim, Karl. Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1940.
- Marx, Karl. Capital. Vol. I. Modern Library Edition; New York: Charles H. Kerr and Company, 1908.
- _____. Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. New York: The International Library, 1904.
- _____. Critique of Gotha Programme. Revised Translation; New York: International Publishers, 1938.
- _____. Early Writings. Translated by T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.
- _____. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Edited by Dirk Struik and Translated by Martin Milligan. New York: International Publishers, 1964.
- _____. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Translated by Martin Milligan. Moscow: no date.
- _____. Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. Translated by T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.

- _____. The Poverty of Philosophy. Translated by H. Quelch.
Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1934.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. The German Ideology. Edited by
R. Pascal. New York: International Publishers, 1939.
- Mathewson, Stanley B. Restriction of Output Among Organized
Workers. New York: Viking Press, 1931.
- Mayer, Julie P. Max Weber and German Politics. 2nd Edition;
London: Faber and Faber, 1943.
- Mayo, Elton. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization.
Compass Books Edition; New York: The Viking Press, 1960.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1934.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.:
The Free Press, 1957.
- Michels, Robert. Political Parties. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press,
1915.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University
Press, 1959.
- _____. White Collar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Moore, Wilbur. Industrial Relations and the Social Order. New York:
Macmillan, 1957.
- Nisbet, Robert. The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books,
1966.
- Pappenheim, Fritz. The Alienation of Modern Man. New York:
Monthly Review Press, 1959.
- Park, Robert E. and Burgess, Ernest W. Introduction to The Science
of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.
- Perleman, Selig and Taft, Phillip. History of Labor in the United
States. New York: Macmillan, 1935.
- Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgement of The Child. Translated by
Marjorie Gabain. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

- Poggiolio, Renato. The Theory of Avant-Garde. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- Riesman, David; Glaser, Nathan; and Denney, Reuel. The Lonely Crowd. Abridged Edition; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1953.
- Robertson, H. M. Aspects of The Rise of Economic Individualism: A Critique of Max Weber and His School. New York: Kelley and Millman, Inc., 1933.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. and Dickson, W. J. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Rosenberg, Bernard. The Values of Veblen. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956.
- _____. Thorstein Veblen. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1963.
- Rosenberg, Bernard and Fliegel, Norris. The Vanguard Artist. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.
- Samuelsson, Kurt. Religion and Economic Action: A Critique of Max Weber. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Schumpeter, Joseph. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. 3rd Edition; New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Seeley, John R.; Sim, R. Alexander; and Loosley, Elizabeth. Crestwood Heights. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Smitter, Wessel. F.O.B. Detroit. New York: Harper and Bros., 1938.
- Spectorsky, A.C. The Exurbanites. New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1955.
- Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1947.
- _____. The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1911.

- Tucker, Robert. Myth and Philosophy in Karl Marx. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Tunstall, Jeremy. The Advertising Man. London: The Shenval Press, 1964.
- Veblen, Thorstein. Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times. New York: The Viking Press, 1923.
- _____. The Engineers and the Price System. New York: The Viking Press, 1921.
- _____. The Higher Learning in America. New York: The Viking Press, 1918.
- _____. The Instinct of Workmanship. New York: The Viking Press, 1914.
- _____. The Theory of Business Enterprise. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- _____. The Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Macmillan, 1899.
- Venable, Vernon. Human Nature: The Marxian View. Meridian Edition; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.
- Vidich, Arthur J. and Bensman, Joseph. Small Town in Mass Society. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1959.
- Vogel, Ezra. Japan's New Middle Class. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1968.
- Walker, Charles R. and Guest, Robert. The Man on the Assembly Line. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Walker, Charles R.; Guest, Robert H.; and Turner, Arthur N. The Foreman on the Assembly Line. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Weber, Max. The City. Translated by Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwirth. New York: The Free Press, 1958.
- _____. The Religion of China. Edited and Translated by Hans Gerth. New York: The Free Press, 1951.
- _____. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Translated by Talcott Parsons. Revised Edition; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

- _____. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press, 1947.
- Whittfogel, Karl A. Oriental Despotism. New Haven: Yale University Press Inc., 1957.
- Wilson, Edmund. Apologies to the Iroquois. New York: Random House, 1959.
- Whyte, William F. Money and Motivation. New York: Harper & Bros., 1955.
- Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1957.
- Yinger, J. Milton. Religion in the Struggle for Power. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1946.
- Zweig, Ferdinand. The British Worker. Middlesex, Great Britain: Pelican Books, 1952.

B. ARTICLES

- Bell, Daniel. "Work and Its Discontents." The End of Ideology. Ed. Daniel Bell. New York: The Free Press, 1960, pp. 227-272.
- Bensman, Joseph and Gerver, Israel. "Crime and Punishment in the Airplane Factory," Mass Society in Crisis. Ed. Bernard Rosenberg, F.W. Howton and Israel Gerver. New York: Macmillan, 1964, pp. 141-152.
- Birnbaum, Norman. "Conflicting Interpretation of the Rise of Capitalism: Marx and Weber." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 4 (1953), 125-141.
- Blauner, Robert. "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," Labor and Trade Unionism. Ed. Walter Galenson and Seymour M. Lipset. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1960, pp. 336-354.
- Burns, Tom. "Friends, Enemies and Polite Fiction." American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (December, 1953), 654-663.

- Chinoy, Eli. "Manning the Machines - The Assembly-Line Worker." The Human Shape of Work. Ed. Peter L. Berger. New York: Macmillan, 1964, pp. 51-81.
- Drucker, Peter F. "The Human Being in Individual Production." Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Time Study and Methods Conference, 1950.
- Feuer, Lewis. "What is Alienation? The Career of a Concept." Sociology On Trial. Ed. Maurice Stein and Arthur J. Vidich. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1963, pp. 127-147.
- Finestone, Harold. "Cats, Kicks and Color," Social Problems, Vol. 5 (July, 1957), 3-13.
- Fischhoff, Ephriam. "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: The History of a Controversy," Social Research, Vol. XI (February, 1944), 53-77.
- Friedman, Eugene. "The Meanings of Work for Skilled Craftsmen." The Meaning of Work and Retirement. Ed. Robert Havighurst and Eugene Friedman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 132-137.
- Gerth, Hans H. and Mills, C. Wright. "A Marx For Managers." Reader in Bureaucracy, Ed. Robert K. Merton, Ailsa P. Grey, Barbara Hockey and Hannan C. Selvin. New York: The Free Press, 1952, pp. 165-178.
- Griff, Mason. "The Commercial Role Artist." Identity and Anxiety, Ed. Maurice Stein, Arthur J. Vidich and David Manning White. New York: The Free Press, 1960, pp. 219-240.
- Guest, Robert H. "Men and Machines: An Assembly Line Worker Looks at His Job." Personnel, Vol. 31 (May, 1955), 496-503.
- Henninger, Daniel. "The One Eyed Slicker." The New Republic, Vol. 162 (May 2, 1970), pp. 17-19.
- Henry, William E. "The Business Executive: The Psychodynamics of a Social Role," Personality and Social Life. Ed. Robert Endleman. New York: Random House, 1967, pp. 354-361.
- Howton, F. William and Rosenberg, Bernard. "The Salesman: Ideology and Self-Imagery in a Prototypic Occupation." Social Research, Vol. 32 (Autumn, 1965), 277-298.

- Langer, Elinor. "Inside the New York Telephone Company." The New York Review of Books, Vol. XIV (March 12, 1970), pp. 16-24.
- _____. "The Women of The Telephone Company," The New York Review of Books, Vol. XIV (March 26, 1970), pp. 14-22.
- Lowenthal, Leo. "Historical Perspectives of Popular Culture," Mass Culture. Ed. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 46-59.
- Marquart, Frank. "The Auto Worker," Voices of Dissent, Ed. by Dissent, New York: The Grove Press, 1958, pp. 143-157.
- Marx, Karl. "Alienated Labor," Man Alone, Ed. and Trans. by Eric and Mary Josephson, New York: Dell, 1962, pp. 93-105.
- _____. "The Communist Manifesto," Essential Works of Marxism, Ed. Arthur P. Mendel, New York: Bantam Books, 1961, pp. 13-44.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Fredrich. "On Alienation." Images of Man, Ed. and Trans. C. Wright Mills, New York: George Braziller Inc., 1960, pp. 486-507.
- Roy, Donald. "Restricting Output in a Piece Work Machine Shop." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952.)
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (December, 1959), 783-791.
- Simmel, Georg. "Metropolis and Mental Life," The Sociology of Georg Simmel. Ed. and Trans. Kurt H. Wolff, New York: The Free Press, 1950, pp. 409-424.
- Slater, Philip E. "On Social Regression." American Sociological Review, Vol. 28 (June, 1963), 339-364.
- Solomon, Albert. "Money and Alienation," Georg Simmel, Ed. Lewis Coser, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1965, pp. 135-137.
- Stinchcomb, Arthur. "Formal Organizations." Sociology, Ed. Neil Smelser, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967, pp. 151-202.
- Swados, Harvey. "The Myth of The Happy Worker." Man Alone, Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson, New York: Dell, 1962, pp. 105-113.

- Tumin, Melvin. "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis." American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (August, 1953), 387-393.
- Underwood, Kenneth. "On the Pinnacles of Power: The Business Executive." The Human Shape of Work, Ed. Peter L. Berger, New York: Macmillan, 1964, pp. 181-210.
- Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 196-244.
- _____. "Class, Status and Party." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 180-195.
- _____. "Politics as a Vocation." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 77-128.
- _____. "Religious Rejections of the World and Their Directions." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 323-359.
- _____. "The Meaning of Discipline." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 253-264.
- _____. "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 302-322.
- _____. "The Social Psychology of World Religions." From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. and Trans. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 267-301.
- Whyte, William H. "The Wives of Management." Man, Work and Society, Ed. Sigmund Nosow and William Form, New York: Basic Books, 1962, pp. 548-555.
- Wrong, Dennis. "The Over Socialized Concept of Man." American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (April, 1961), 183-193.