From the earlier discussions, it is quite perspicuous that the notion of work does not constitute a predominant theme in the raik of classical sociology. To put it simply, wherever and whenever there is some discussion (mostly indirect), reference or reflection on the notion of 'work', the usual approach has been not so critical, the coverage being largely marginal; the discourse revolves around the periphery and not the core of the notion. For example, none of the classical thinkers discussed earlier, has tried to discuss the idea of 'work' as a concept at methodological level. Their 'sociology of work' revolves around the notions of labour, division of labour, industry, bureaucracy, competition, specialization and the like. In other words, their sociology of work speaks of many things except the concept and essence of 'work' itself. Whatever insights we cull from their writings in relation to the concept, they would primarily locate the notion of work only in the so-called public-sphere; one that is bureaucratic, industrial, organizational or contractual. In the process of this preoccupation, classical thinkers have failed to explore the multiple, diverse, dynamic and peculiar meanings and philosophy of work that are publicly invisible. It will not be inappropriate to argue that the approach of classical sociology towards the idea of 'work' has not been that of an integrated or holistic one; rather it is one of marginal, partial, unsystematic, one-sided, casual and gender-insensitive in nature. Subsequently, the next exercise that ultroneously prevails upon one's mind is to interrogate how the notion of work is represented in modern sociology. Thus the principal attempt of this discussion is to enquire and delineate how the enigma of work has been worked out and represented in modern sociology. For this, attempt has been made to glean the idea of work from the dominant literature of certain prominent modern social thinkers.
SECTION-I

DAVID LOCKWOOD

a. Understanding the Office Clerk

Classical sociology is primarily concerned with the analysis of labour in an industrial and bureaucratic set up. However, in the late 1950s, the discourse of 'work' experienced a new twist with the contribution of the treatise *The Blackcoated Worker* by David Lockwood. The term *blackcoated worker* refers to the clerical grade workers in offices. Lockwood identifies the office-clerk as the central focus of his exploration. Throughout the treatise, the author tries to draw a resemblance between Marx's 'proletarian' and the office-clerk. He argues that the economic position and opportunity for upward mobility of an office-clerk coincide with that of a manual worker. The argument is that although the office-work separates the clerk from the manual wage labourer, the former is no different from the latter in terms of its social status, economic position, prospects for mobility and belief in false consciousness. Lockwood notes,

The fact creates consciousness not the consciousness the fact. The former may exist without the latter... In the case of a clerk, the common characteristics, which he has in common with a wageworker, are (i) he is divorced from the ownership and control of the means of production, (ii) as a consequence, he is obliged to sell his labour power in order to make a livelihood. He is, like the manual worker, propertyless, contractual labour; in Marxian terminology, 'proletarian'... The clerk also shares in common with the manual worker the features of propertylessness and identical economic consequences.¹

This is not to deny the fact that the office-clerk is different from the manual worker with regard to the hours of work, conditions of work, security of tenure, pension provisions and the like. Yet to Lockwood's mind, the clerks no longer enjoy an economic status clearly distinct from and superior to the wage-earning classes.² In other words, there has always been an overlap between the earnings of blackcoated one and that of the manual labour.

¹ The discourse of work has acquired a major impetus with the historic contribution of David Lockwood. He is one of the few scholars who have directly drawn an identity between a wageworker and an office-clerk. For an exciting reading, see, David Lockwood, *The Blackcoated Worker*. (Unwin University Books; London: 1958/1969), pp. 14-15.
² Ibid. p. 67.
Apart from the above analysis, Lockwood's distinction lies in the fact that he is one of the very few scholars in the discipline who directly envisage a sort of emerging feminization in the everyday office ethnomethodology. Given an option, the classical thinkers would mostly place and ascribe a woman's role inside the four walls of family only. Although in usual analysis women are seen as subordinates in family only, Lockwood is not blind to their increasing presence in public-office (clerical) work. He posits,

The growth of universal literacy, the recruitment of clerks from lower social strata, the gradual transformation of office work into predominantly 'women's work', and the increased emphasis laid on productive contribution have adversely affected the prestige of blackcoated work. 3

Perhaps the author intends to convey that the stigma attached to the blackcoated worker is not without its base; for the people who compete and create their space in this sphere are primarily drawn from the lower strata of the society. Moreover, due to one's location in these strata, it is not that possible and practicable for someone to aspire for a job superior to that of the clerical ones. By the phrase 'women's work' perhaps he means that there has been a growing transformation of office-work into women's work. That means more and more women are entering the office sphere corresponding to the changes in society.

b. Interrogating Lockwood

However, Lockwood's delineation of clerical work and its homologization with the manual wage labour raise more doubts than certainties. On the one hand, he says that the office clerk has got a scheduled working hour, certain working regulations, job securities and pension provisions; on the other hand, he constates that the clerk is no different from a wage-labourer (in terms of social status, economic position, prospects for mobility etc.). The argument that automatically emerges is that a wage labourer can be thrown out of his work at any point of time but not an office clerk. It is job security that underlines an office work. Secondly, the social status of a clerk is somewhat superior to that of a wageworker and thus the former has an upper edge. As regards economic position, although the clerk is not

---

3 Perhaps, Lockwood is the first social thinker to acknowledge women's intervention in unambiguous terms. More than that, he is the first scholar to explicitly brand secretarial office work as women's work. Ibid. p.133.
sufficiently paid, still he has got economic security; but the same cannot be said in case of a wageworker as he always lives in conditions of uncertainty. He does not know whether he will get work every tomorrow. Next, the prospects of mobility. A wageworker may not have mobility, but a clerk has. Except primary and secondary schoolteachers, all employees have mobility in their respective job spheres in some form or the other. Even these schoolteachers do get some sort of increment along with their salary. Thus, to equate an office clerk with a wageworker is starkly malapropos. Moreover, Lockwood commits a methodological-cum-factual error in ignoring the mobility prospects and the relative superiority of the office clerk as against the wageworker. Hence his conclusion that the whole life of an office clerk is no different from that of a wage labourer is nothing but a non sequitur.

SECTION-II
WILLIAM H. WHYTE

a. Work and Individualism in the Face of Organizational Determinism

Like Max Weber, William H. Whyte's orientation to 'work' can be viewed from the perspective of organizational settings. Whyte is talking about a form of work that unites individuals in an organisation. Of course, he is only analyzing various dimensions of work in an organizational setting. But question arises, is it the form of work that provides the individual an opportunity for self-realization and self-expression? What is the kind of work that Whyte is talking about? A careful journey through his text *The Organization Man* reveals that work in organizations has become an all-encompassing phenomenon that conquers all aspects of individuals' life. Organization is not simply a place of work; rather it has become an image of worship and its working rules, ethics have turned to be sacrosanct rituals. Not only do the individuals perceive their organization (mostly industrial and bureaucratic) as a sphere of economic pursuit, but also they propend to internalize it as the source of their identity. Like Weber who maintains that man has become a 'cog in the machine', Whyte avers that instead of man being the conqueror, these organizations have conquered all aspects of his life. At a materialistic level, individuals reside in a world of plenty and affluence. Ironically, *the economic pursuit in 'organizations' and the autonomy of individual agency are negatively*
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correlated. In other words, in the process of working in organizations, the autonomous existence of the individual, his volition, his independent thinking, his personal freedom, his humanly inner life, his scope for self-realization and self-expression get submerged under the influence of organizational ethos and rules. Moreover, these organisations continue to be a source of constant fascination in which individual strives to remain immersed into. In his words,

These people work only for the Organization... They are ones of our middle class who have left homes spiritually as well as physically, to take the vows of organization life, and it is they who are the mind and soul of our great self-perpetuating institutions... With reason it could be called an organization ethic or a bureaucratic ethic: more than anything else it rationalizes the organization's demands for fealty and gives those who offer it wholeheartedly a sense of dedication in doing so-in extremis, you might say, it converts what would seem in other times a bill of no rights into a restatement of individualism... For it is not the evils of organization life that puzzle him, but its very beneficence. He is imprisoned in brotherhood... People do have to work with others, yes; the well functioning team as a whole greater than sum of its parts, yes all this is indeed true. But is it the truth that now needs belabouring? Precisely because it is an age of organization, it is the other side of the coin that needs emphasis. We do not need to know how to cooperate with The Organization but, more than ever, so do we need to know how to resist it... But in searching... we have gone very far afield, and in our attention to making organisation work we have come close to deifying it. We are describing its defects and virtues and denying that there is or should be - a conflict between the individual and organization. This denial is bad for the organisation. It is worse for the individual... The fault is not in organization; in short, it is in our workshop of it. It is in our vain quest for a utopian equilibrium, which would be horrible if it ever did come to pass; it is in the soft-minded denial that there is a conflict between the individual and society... As our organs have grown larger and more bureaucratic, they have created great layers of staff functions and the people in them often feel neither fish nor fowl - intellectuals, yet not of the intellectual world; managerial, yet without authority or prestige.4

---

4 Whyte postulates that there exists an apparent equilibrium between individual and his organization. But he states that such equilibrium does not denote a state of equipoise or harmony. It only reflects the surrender of individual to the ethos/demands of organization. Organization has completely invaded his life-world. Speaking in Durkheimian parlance, it is a sort of sui generis which lies outside the individual, controls him and constrains him. For a thought-provoking analysis, see, William H. Whyte, The Organization Man. (Penguin Books; Harmondsworth: 1956/1969), pp. 8-30.
b. Organization versus Individual: Need For Adaptation.

It appears Whyte intends to postulate the peculiarities of the organization that instead of facilitating the individuals trammels their self-promotion, encumbers their all-round emancipation and confines them subsumed within its heart and soul. The individual is carried away by organization's fascination to such an extent that he gets divorced from himself and fails to realize himself fully spiritually, socially, physically and individually. Thus, work in organization settings becomes a sort of pursuit (though primarily economic) that is of the organisation, for and by the organisation. By the organisation in the sense that after joining it, the individual turns into an organization man, performs the tasks mechanically and no scope is left for himself as an individual. Evincing serious passion at a personal level, the author advocates that although the organizational man is aware of the pathology of his organization or his organizational life, ironically, he cannot find any escape from this consternation simply because of the fact that the rules, ethos and fascination of the organization have been deeply ingrained in his mind and consequently, he does not find any characterological difference between himself and his organization. Though he joins as a worker, gradually he develops a tendency of identifying himself with the organization. In the process of drawing an identity or equilibrium between him and his organization, he fails to understand and evaluate that his interest and that of the organization do not match very often. As he hesitates to be critical of the organisation he fails to see any conflict between the interests of the organization and his own. Thus, it ensures a complete 'surrender' of the man to the organization. But unlike Weber, Whyte concludes his treatise with a positive note envisaging an alternative to this surrender. To his mind, man has created the organization because of his dynamism and not vice versa. The existence of organizations is a human accomplishment. So, it is not impossible for man to explore and enjoy his freedom in organizational settings, ensure opportunity for self-realization, have a critical distinction and balance between his interest and that of the organization. The key to achieve this lies in the process of adaptation. To quote him,

Adaptation has become more than a necessity; in a life in which everything changes, it has become almost a constant... Organization of itself has no dynamic. The dynamic is in the individual and thus he must not only
question how The Organization interprets his interests, he must question how it interprets its own. 5

What is lucent in author's optimism is that the organization should be seen only as an economic enterprise. Work in the economic sphere should not shroud and hush up work in rest part of human affairs. The perspicuous message that emanates here is that while working in organisation, people should refrain from total involvement in it, perceive it only as a sphere of earning pursuit thereby leaving no scope for it of being deified or reified by its organisation men.

A perusal of Whyte's tome reveals that he is preoccupied with the idea of organisation and thus fails to see 'work' beyond and below it. Moreover, even in industrial or bureaucratic organizations, there are various job pursuits; but Whyte ignores to offer an all-encompassing analysis of them. Again, it needs to be acknowledged that there are many sites of work spheres and thus such organization is just one of them.

SECTION-III
RALPH DAHRENDORF
a. The Skill That Matters

Whereas the classical sociology's orientation to work is reflected in the analysis of labour, division of labour, industry and bureaucracy, that of Lockwood in the 'blackcoated worker' and of Whyte in the concept of 'organisation', Dahrendorf's idea relating to the said area revolves around the notion of 'skill'. Based on the notion of skill, he characterizes workers in terms of three categories: the unskilled, semi-skilled and the skilled. By skilled workers he means those highly specialized groups who acquire certain required expertise, aptitude and competencies by means of formal training. Semi-skilled worker is one who does not possess the formal training, but has acquired a high degree of experience needed for certain specializing tasks. Lastly, an unskilled worker is one who carries neither the skill nor the experience with him. Although Dahrendorf postulates this three-tier classification,

his leitmotif relates to the \textit{skilled} variety. To start with, he argues that the contemporary society is increasingly being characterized by a growing demand for highly skilled workers, designers, manufacturers and the like. There is a need for specialization and improvised expertise in order to cope with the increasing sophistication of working machines and apparatus. In other words, what would distinguish a modern worker are his specialized skill and the ever-effulging \textit{savoir-faire}, for which he is always in an unwavering state of cultivation in order to sharpen his metier. In his words,

Apart from the semi-skilled, there appeared, more recently, a new and ever-growing demand for highly skilled workers of the engineer type in industry... Increasingly complex machines require increasingly qualified designers, builders, maintenance and repairmen and even minders. Analysis of the industrial conditions suggests quite clearly that within the labour force of advanced industry we have to distinguish between at least three skill groups: a growing stratum of highly skilled workmen who increasingly merge with both engineers and white-collar employees, a relatively stable stratum of semi-skilled workers with a high degree of diffuse as well as specific industrial experience and a dwindling stratum of totally unskilled labourers who are characteristically either new-comers to industry or semi-unemployables.\footnote{Dahrendorf's theorization manifests a pragmatic analysis of the concept of skill in modern times. To schematize in line with his view, the advancement of modern society is inversely proportional to the preponderance of the unskilled variety. For a skillful explanation, refer, Ralph Dahrendorf, \textit{Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society.} (Routledge and Kegan Paul; London: 1959), pp. 49-50.}

\section*{b. Meritocracy for Role Allocation}

Dahrendorf envisages a kind of industrial society where each individual is assigned his role in accordance with his capability or competencies. In other words, in an industrial epoch people no longer get their work pursuit on the basis of their social or other ascriptive stamp; rather they are ranked in work sphere in terms of their merit. It is in this context that the educational system assumes its importance. In Dahrendorf's opinion, an industrial organization recruits members to labour and management sphere on the basis of their achieved merit. That is, 'achievement' constitutes the \textit{sine qua non} of the system of meritocracy in modern employment set up. This explains the magnificent role of educational system in accomplishing the
task of effective work-role allocation among the individuals on recognition of merit. He avers,

But since then a new pattern of role allocation has been institutionalized in industrial societies. Today, the allocation of social positions is increasingly the task of the educational system... Essentially the same holds for the value of achievement, i.e., the central place accorded to individual capacity, effort and success in industrial societies... An industrial enterprise cannot afford to rely on the social origin of its members in the sphere either of management or of labour; to carry on its tasks it needs above all capable, well-trained people... and for this reason also the educational institutions have grown in industrial societies, into the place of agents of role allocation.7

c. Work Defines Leisure

Under postmodern conditions, it is assumed that 'consumption' is given much focus than 'production'; manual/machine/manufacturing work get dominated by knowledge/professional work; people tend to seek more leisure in work than work itself. But Dahrendorf refuses to be swayed away by such categorization. For him, it would be over-simplistic to generalize that work in general, in today's epoch, offers much avenue for leisure and consumption trends. In other words, work, per se, has not been leisurely; more particularly not all sorts of work have equal leisure prospects; rather leisure varies according to the nature of work. Certain occupations provide much leisure, certain occupations offer more leisure whereas some occupations carry less leisure and some other occupations do not carry anything. For example, take the case of the schoolmaster and the laundryman. The schoolmaster is still required to work from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and there is no flexibility in his working hour and his assignment. Whereas modern washing machine and other improvised tools and washing practices have made the task of the laundry man much more simple, easier, relaxing; he can perform maximum tasks in a minimum period of time and thus there is ample leisure for him to realize his personal freedom. Thus, leisure is not a neutral category; it has to be discriminated, differentiated, deduced and defined according to the nature of occupations as it varies from case to case. In Dahrendorf's words,

7 In author's view, in an industrial society that allocates roles among individuals on the basis of their achieved merit, the agency of educational system in certifying the merit assumes its functional relevance. Ibid. pp. 59-69.
Many contemporary sociologists believe that we have left the age of work and production and entered an era of leisure and consumption. But to the present day the extent of a person's leisure as well as the level of his consumption, is entirely determined by his occupation and the rewards associated with it.8

d. Work Sphere: Authority-Centric?

For Dahrendorf, authority constitutes a major defining property of the nature of modern industrial enterprise. In every industrial organization, there are some who give orders and some others whose duty is to carry out. But this authority is rational-legal in that it confers the respective personnel the right to command and correspondingly ensure voluntary obedience to it from others. In his words,

In post capitalist as in capitalist industrial enterprises there are some whose task is to control the actions of others and issue commands, and others who have to allow themselves to be controlled and who have to obey... The authority exercised in both capitalist and post-capitalist society is of the same type; it is, in Weber's terms, 'rational authority' based on the belief in the legality of institutionalized norms and the rights of command on the part of those invested with authority by these norms.9

The paragraph gives rise to a number of issues on which the author seems to be taciturn. To begin with, do all organizations possess two types of workers - one who issue orders/commands and the other who pays obedience to it? How would Dahrendorf account for the following varieties viz., owners, elites, managing directors, superior personnel, white-collar employees, blackcoated employees and the manual workers? Does authority structure necessarily involve two classes? Is there only one division between order-givers and order-takers? If so, can we say that it is authority that unites people in an enterprise? Moreover, if we admit that this authority is rational-legal, we have to agree that the so-called order-commanders are not wholly or solely the absolute commanders; rather they also pay their obedience to something; that is, the bureaucratic rules, rational norms that underline the organizations and provide legitimacy to such authority. As is rightly stated by C. Wright Mills, the superordinates not only give orders to their subordinates, they are

---

8 Ibid. p. 70.
9 Ibid. p. 71.
also the ones who determine their own duty, follow the orders/norms of the rational bureaucracy.10

Like Whyte, Dahrendorf's primary focus has been the analysis of industrial organizations. As regards the orientation to the sociology of work, his conspectus of sociology posits only those things that are 'industrial' or 'organizational' and ignores all those that are non-industrial and non-organizational. For example, his classification and delineation of 'skills' ultroneously purports that his sociology of work would only talk about the 'skill' that is recognised, manufactured by educational/vocational institutions and the skill that is desired for the enhanced productivity of industrial organisations. Thus he ignores to explore other facets of work, other counterparts of skills and the skills that are not formalized by any public domain institution.

SECTION-IV
JOHN H. GOLDTHROPE

a. Economic Instrumentality in the Making of Affluence

A comprehension of John H. Goldthrope's writing tickles our memory and nudges us back to revisit the works of David Lockwood. In short, one needs to recall the contributions of Lockwood before approaching Goldthrope. Lockwood is talking about the 'blackcoated worker' and within it he draws a collation between the manual wageworker and the office clerk. His major argument is that the identical properties that underline these two varieties of workers are i.e., lack of mobility, identical economic position and identical social status. In contrast to Lockwood's depiction of a worker who is economically unprosperous, has no chances of mobility or has the lowest social status; Goldthrope delineates a new image of worker who is economically affluent, socio-economically and geographically mobile, enjoys an ever-growing social status, has an instrumental orientation to his work sphere and who is more inclined to be a consumer than a producer. Intrinsic to Goldthrope's

understanding is the idea that with the emerging trends of urban development, industrialization, geographical mobility, the manual workers no longer continue to be Marx's or Lockwood's 'blackcoated' variety; rather they achieve not only high income and maintain better living standards, but also they assume a way of life which is more characteristically 'middle class' and in the process they continually grow in the status hierarchy. More importantly, the modern worker is ignited by an urge to maximize his opportunity, refine his 'skill', search for better and newer jobs that offer high economic returns and carry increased social status. To Goldthrope's mind, the modern worker operates in a highly open and mobile society; he is not inclined to be static/fixed with one occupation; rather he has developed an instrumental orientation to his pursuit. He is in a constant search for better work that carries high compensation and prestige because he is induced by the 'demonstration effect'/hallow effect of the affluent others and by a spirit of 'consumerism' which stimulate his appetite for advancing affluence and producing a better tomorrow every next day.

Viewed through Goldthrope's prism, work, for the worker, does not represent an end in itself nor is it something of a commune bonum; rather it is to be visualized from the perspectives of Weberian 'rationality'. The modern worker looks at 'work' as a means to an end. He has an instrumental attitude to work - one that is suited to meet the priorities he holds, one that would offer collectively better economic/material/mundane gains in relation to other things. Hence work, for him, is just an economic pursuit, which he carries out in a relatively purposive and planned manner in order to maximize material returns and promote resources for the fulfillment of his self-planned, intrinsic and extrinsic interests. He notes,

In the conditions of modern British society, the tendency will increase for industrial workers, particularly unskilled or semi-skilled men, to define their work in a largely instrumental manner. The traditional modes of working class life are now steadily being eroded both by such factors as urban redevelopment and greater geographical mobility and also... by the 'demonstration effect' of those workers and their families who have already become affluent. One may then expect that as their pressure continues, the presence on the mass of manual workers to increase their consumer power will intensify... There will be mounting inducements to relegate work to the
level of merely instrumental activity and to seek employment, which offers a high economic return... The worker's occupational life is likely to be narrowed down to one of a largely economic kind. Workers... are likely... to give priority in their employment to maximizing economic returns; that is, to define their work as a means of gaining resources for the pursuit of extrinsic - largely familial - ends... Workers pursue new goals/standards in a relatively purposively and planned fashion. 11

From this paragraph, it is conspicuous that work, in Goldthrope's sketch, has been approached from the point of view of economic instrumentalism. Work is construed as an economic, instrumental and material foray pursued by the individual in order to fortify his power as a consumer and construct a seely mundane destiny for his affluent living.

b. Education, Competition and Industrial Work: The Making of Mobile Men and Mobile Society

Goldthrope shares certain similarity with Emile Durkheim in the sense that the former, as like the latter, also enunciates the presence of meritocracy in role allocation. Of direct relevance to the proposition is the argument that as society experiences the phases of rapid industrial development, urbanization, and technological innovations, it signals a simultaneous shift in the character and composition of the labour force. For example, tasks are no more allocated arbitrarily, rather there is an open competition for recruitment among individuals and what is ultimately rewarded is the educational and technical superiority. Thus, modern work not only demands higher standards of education and training but also it bestows an ever-growing status, ever-rising income, thriving chances of mobility and an expanding sphere of consumption, and increased network of communication upon the individuals. 'Achievement' constitutes the hallmark of modern work sphere and thus there is always a growing competition among individuals to prove their savoir-faire and to keep up their lamp of mobility - both personal and societal - burnishing. Goldthrope postulates,

11 In Goldthrope's vision, individual's approach to work under conditions of modernity is one of instrumentality, purposivity and calculability. Work is viewed merely as an economic pursuit to maximize one's economic prosperity and remain perpetually affluent. For an intellectually affluent analysis see, John H. Goldthrope, The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour (Cambridge University Press; London: 1968), pp. 174-76.
Industrial development based on technological advance requires an increasingly differentiated labour force and one with progressively higher standards of education and training. Thus the proportion of the economically active population enjoying a relatively high level of occupational status and income steadily grows. Moreover, this expansion of higher-grade employment, together with increased provision of education, greatly enlarges individuals' chances of social mobility; and the 'openness' of industrial society is further enhanced in that economic and technical rationality impose criteria of social selection, which emphasize 'achieved' rather than ascribed characteristics... All forms of subculture particularism - those based on region, ethnicity etc. as well as those based on class are broken down, on the one hand, by the need for greater geographical as well as social mobility within the labour force and, on the other hand, by the growing influence of consumption and mass communication.  

Like Durkheim and Drahrendorf, Goldthrope's treatises primarily focus on industrial set up. His sociology of work would essentially revolve round the industrial-public enterprise. It may be true that owing to technological advancements, society is increasingly becoming mobile and open; competition becomes free and each individual competes to get a job on the basis of his talent and achievement. But it remains to be explored as to what happens to those individuals whose talents remain nipped in bud owing to their lack of economic or other essential resources. It means society also comprises of certain deprived individuals (largely economically) who simply cannot aspire to be affluent, elite or bureaucrat, as it would simply amount to nothing but a delusion for them. Thus, Goldthrope's vision of 'open', 'mobile' society is not as 'open' and mobile for some people as it is for some others. Like Dahrendorf, Goldthrope's understanding of work can be conceptualized as a career pursuit: that is largely located in industry or industry-like enterprises; an activity that necessitates certain amount of education and training; an activity that is bestowed upon an individual having the necessary formal and standardized qualification/skill and an activity that is propended to obtain higher and further higher specialization.

---

Like William H. Whyte, Parsons initiates his discourse with the analysis of organisations. But one notices a fundamental distinction. For Whyte, organisation is something that pervades all of individual's life/living; something, which dominates/determines individuals' everyday ethnomethodology, and something to which such individuals begin to deify. But Parsons's approach takes a different route. In his view, organization represents an embodiment of certain societal necessity and it holds an important position in people's life. In short, there is a functional need for it. It arises owing to the corresponding ramifications of the enormity of the division of labour. An organization persists because it serves certain desirable goals/interests; be it economic, integrative, pattern-maintenance, governance, implementive or whatever. Organizations vary according to the nature of goal, interest or function they serve/fulfill. Their existence hinges on their functions for the larger collectivity. It is precisely for such service or fulfillment that they are considered to be a sub-system of a more comprehensive, larger social system. Accordingly, business organizations exist and operate because they serve certain economic functions. A business enterprise is one where an individual is engaged in economic production and it is administered by the norms of economic rationality. That is, individuals assemble to accomplish maximum production in a minimum time/cost with reasonable effort. Parsons enounces that with the pervasion of such goal-oriented economic rationality, business/industrial organizations are getting increasingly bureaucratized. In work sphere, not only there is a need for functional specialization, differentiation of tasks, but also incumbents are recruited on the basis of their technical competence and achieved merit. Implicit in the assumption is the idea that each individual is allocated work according to his merit and is paid in accordance with the task he performs. Thus Parsons envisages economic enterprise from a goal-oriented perspective. As he mentions,

Organizations have occupied important place in modern societies... The existence of organizations as the concept here set forth is a consequence of the division of labour in society... An organization is always a sub-system of a more comprehensive social system... The value system of the organization must imply basic acceptance of the more generalized values of
the superordinate system - unless it is a deviant organization not integrated into the superordinate system.... Thus the value system of a business firm in our society is a version of 'economic rationality', which legitimizes the goal of economic production... Organizations can be classified in terms of the type of goal/function about which they are organized. Thus we may speak of adaptive goal, implementive goals, integrative goals or pattern-maintenance goals. The reference is always to function in the society as a system... Business firm is governed by the values of economic rationality; the maximization of production with minimal cost in the economic sense. It is production, which is the institutionalized goal of the firm... The employee is expected to be paid what his services are worth on a competitive market.13 ... Above all, industry and government... in the operative sectors they have both become bureaucratized. That is, functions are performed overwhelmingly in occupational roles... arranged in a hierarchy of executive authority and differentiated in function on the basis of technical competence, with selection by appointment, often involving tests of competence.14

b. The Preponderance of Professions

Unlike many scholars discussed earlier, Parsons addresses more the question of the 'professional' rather than the proletariat, professionalization than embourgeoisement, an era of professions rather than an epoch of capitalism. Professionals are neither capitalists nor workers; they are the ones who have got certain specialized knowledge or skill and are said to possess a service orientation towards the society. In Parsonian vision, three major professions, i.e., the academics, law and medicine, are gradually dominating the contemporary as well as the coming era. The discourse on these three constitutes the leitmotif in the conspectus of Parsonian professionalism. Apart from this, Parsons admits that with the passage of time, a new set of professionals is on the rise that mainly centres on the complex business organizations; they are the management/business professionals. In his opinion, these middle sector management professionals would constitute an indispensable part in modern organizations, structures and societies. To him, the modern societies and the enterprises will increasingly be 'suffused' by abundant management professionals. And this suffusion will blur and bewilder the boundary

13 Parsons shares a sort of congruity with Durkheim and Weber. In line with Durkheim he states that organization is an upshot of the increasing division of labour. In line with Weber he posits that both government and industry are gradually getting bureaucratized. Most clearly, the value that guides the functioning of such organizations is economic rationality. For a rational review, see, Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. (The Free Press; New York: 1967) pp. 17-49.

14 Ibid. p. 113.
between government sector and the private sector; the local/national company and the multinational ones. These professionals will dominate the management of business organizations by virtue of their specialization, that is, the distinction of their professional expertise. The author envisages that the process of professionalisation would form the fundamental desideratum of the structure and processes of modern societies and their organizations. To recall his words,

The core of the professional system now lies in two areas: the institutionalization of the intellectual disciplines in the societal structures and the practical application of these disciplines. The first is the profession of learning itself. The second is represented by two fields, law and medicine. However the modern list of applied professions includes a much wider range of fields the boundaries of which are somewhat uncertain... Law and medicine then have constituted the frame within which a more elaborate system of applied professions has begun to proliferate... In the middle sector of this range lies another complex of emerging professions that are broadly concerned with the management of complex organizations... This complex has crossed the line between private and governmental sectors of social organization - a development that is expressed in the phrase 'business and public administration'... It is in my view that the professional complex, though obviously still incomplete in the development, has already become the most important single component in the structure of modern societies... I suggest, however, that the professional complex has already not only come into prominence but has even begun to dominate the contemporary scene in such a way as to render obsolescent the primacy of the issues of political authoritarianism and capitalistic exploitation.\(^\text{15}\)

The prevision proponed by Parsons, \textit{per se}, entails encomium for its noteworthy relevance in our times. Parsons's prescience presumes that the organizations of society will be dominated and managed by professionals; subsequently many new professions would also come into play day by day. This proposition has come potentially true in our everyday reality. We have already started rediscovering a society which signals an 'accrescent' rise and preponderance of new and ever new professions - be they engineers, software executives, technocrats and the like - and in addition, information technology is rapidly permeating all sectors of our society. It is in this process of \textit{accrescenc}e that the Parsonian prodrome presumes its prominence.

c. Occupation: A Quid-Quo Contract

Parsons spells the definition of occupation in a quid-quo schema. 'Quid' refers to the work-performance accomplished by an individual in his capacity as an employee of an organization. The organization reckons its individual employee's occupational orientation through his commitment to the specialized job he pursues. 'Quo' denotes the amount of economic compensation or the salary that is due to his job or commitment. In other words, it signifies the 'expectation' of the individual from the organisation that derives from his occupational performance. Thus 'quo' is the quantified monetary amount that an individual receives as a result of his real occupational performance. To put it simply, 'quo' is something that an individual gets as a reward in proportion to his job adhering performance at his work place. The task of the organisation is to ensure that a meaningful harmony is established between the commitment and expectation (performance and wage/income). In this context, Parsons constates there lies a contractual relationship between one's commitment and salary or between the individual and the organisation. However, Parsonian notion of contract is different from that of Spencer in that for Parsons, contract is an institutional framework for the regulation of individual activities or organizational processes; it is the socially prescribed and sanctioned rule that controls, checks and subjects all 'individual' interests, fraud, coercion etc. 16 As regards competition, he opines that it is absolutely guided by the market rules. Individuals have to compete according to the norms and conditions of the market. Moreover, these conditions cannot be changed deliberately by individual's whimsical desires. Thus each individual wants to satisfy his own wants under given set of market and production conditions, which he is unable to alter deliberately. 17

The Parsonian vision of work, among other things, recognizes the 'payment' aspect as an important one that underlines the very expectation of the individual from his occupational pursuit. In addition, work in Parsonian convo can be construed as a sort of goal-oriented, calculative, occupational-cum-contractual, economic pursuit performed by the individual in society within an institutional framework of norms of contract, or within organizational conditions serving as the guards of surveillance to maintain a balance between the individual performer and the

organization, between his commitment and his expectation, between his contribution and his payment, between his interests and the institutional regulations or between his 'self' and his society. To recall his words,

An occupational role is the role of an individual within an organisation in so far as it commits him to productive functions on behalf of the organization through personal performance and in so far as the commitment is established and/or maintained by an explicit or implicit contract with the organisation... The occupational role is thus a type of contractual relationship between an organisation and an individual usually acting in a representative role as member of a household or possibly some other collectivity. The prime 'quid' is his commitment to continuing performance as a member of the organisation in capacity defined in the contract employment. The primary but not exclusive 'quo' is money income - wages, in the economic sense paid by the organisation for satisfactory performance... The balancing of two expectation-commitment component - the commitment to performance and the expectation of wage income - is the primary direct function of the contractual settlement... Occupational performance is the primary output to the organisation and money income is the primary output to the household.\(^{18}\)

d. Perusing Parsons

Any sincere scholar who goes through the Parsonian sociology of work and then approaches the social order of our contemporary times, he may be confronted with a number of conundrums that arouse passion for their detailed exposition. To begin with, Parsons opines that once professions begin to dominate contemporary social structure, they will render obsolescent the primacy of old issues of political authoritarianism and capitalistic exploitation. Let's examine the issue of political authoritarianism. Does/can the preponderance of professions really lead to the obsolescence of political authoritarianism? Then, what happens to the Ministries of Information Technology, Disinvestment, Broadcasting, Home, External Affairs and the others? Who makes the major decisions in our country? For instance, who controls the business houses in the country within which professionals work? Do professionals fall outside the purview of Indian Legislature? Who prepares the ground rules for medical entrance seat limit and for the recruitment of doctors? Are doctors beyond the control of Health Ministry? It is not surprising to see management professionals being purchased and arbitrarily dismissed by business

houses according to the tunes of the market. Raising such questions is not to reject but an attempt to rethink Parsonian assumption that political authoritarianism will be obsolescent with the proliferation of professionals.

Let's examine the issue of capitalistic exploitation. Parsons proclaims that in the same way capitalistic exploitation will be obsolescent. It may be true that the Marx's variety of exploitation gets eroded, but it does not suffice to the view that no one will be deprived, victimized or marginalized. Take for example, the legal profession. Do the poor have equal reach to the courts of law? Have the courts been always impartial when there is a case between the powerful and powerless? There have been instances where legal courts have favoured the rich/powerful and victimized the poor/powerless. Second is the medicine. How many (good) doctors in India are really interested to be posted in rural/underdeveloped areas? Is there really no need for 'specialists' in primary health centres in rural areas? It appears as if rural people do not get affected by any fatal, dreaded, furious, high sounding, unheard, sophisticated diseases and thus there is no need for specialists and sophisticated/hi-tech medical facilities in primary health centres. How do doctors at AIIMS respond to these two varieties of patients: one elite patient who is a high-positioned/powerful one or has visited with a reference/recommendation from a big boss and the other who is a common man? Third is the IT education or the software technology. Is an access to IT education a simple affair? Unlike general education, software education needs a huge investment. How many people in India have the resources to train their children in IT education? Thus it is puerile to argue that exploitation has been obsolescent en masse. It still continues in some vesture or the other. All such points discussed above should not be construed as a move to abnegate the author's idea holus bolus; rather this is an attempt to interrogate Parsonian assumption with a sense of skepticism and criticality and to examine its foison through the prism of our everyday peculiarities.
SECTION-VI
S.M. LIPSET AND R. BENDIX

a. The Shaping of Career Pursuits and The Role of Socio-Economic Conditions

With little disceptation, it appears that Lipset and Bendix's approach to the notion of work is more tantamount to the actual ethnomethodology of our everyday living. The central topos of their argument is that the work/job that an individual pursues, or the career that one chooses or for that matter, the job that one aspires for, is completely influenced and almost determined by one's family's socio-economic location. Intrinsic to the argument is the idea that for a poor child, work becomes a compulsion and not a choice. Good or higher education is an illusion. His family situation compels him to search for any available job with whatever educational qualification he has. Abject poverty, inability to go for the desired level of education, lack of an appropriate career planning, insufficient resources, disability to develop and manipulate personal 'contacts', inability to explore relevant information/career guidance limit the ambitions of a poor boy to avail the desired platform in order to prove his talent and compel him to go for a manual wage work or similar equivalent pursuit. Thus, the cycle of endless poverty gets routinized for subsequent generations. It is not to suggest that he does not have high ambitions, but that he is unable to desiderate for higher-grade occupations owing to his objective, structural, existential compulsions. A poor man's child fails to sustain his appetite for prestigious/high-earning jobs simply because he knows that it would amount to a delusion of grandeur. In the long run the status of being a working class continues from one generation to the next. On the other hand, for the child of an affluent family, job is a choice and not a compulsion. Not only has he the resources needed for his career advancement, but also he can go for the best possible education of his choice, can exploit the advantage of the available job opportunities and manipulate his 'contacts' to secure the maximum. Children from the affluent class do not join the job that comes to them; rather they take up the job that suits or enhances their family status. Thus Lipset and Bendix conclude that one's education and occupation are mostly determined by one's parents' socio-economic status. The thesis that the authors intromit is that both occupation and social status are self-perpetuating. The authors point out,
If an individual comes from a working-class family, he will typically receive little education or vocational advice; while he attends schools his job plans for the future will be vague and when he leaves school he is likely to take the first available job, which he can find. Thus the poverty, lack of education, absence of personal 'contacts', lack of planning, and failure to explore fully the available job opportunities that characterize the working-class family are handed down from generation to generation... The social status of parents and the education of their children is, therefore, closely related both to the nature of the latter's first jobs and to the pattern of their later careers... Occupation and social status are to an important extent, self-perpetuating. They are associated with many factors, which make it difficult for individuals to modify their status. Position in the social structure is usually associated with a certain level of income, education, family structure, community reputation, and so forth... Those in the lower socio-economic groups tend to take 'the only job they know about' at the time they enter the labour market. This choice of the first job is made with more deliberation by individuals with more education and a family higher up the occupational ladder.19

The explanation given by the authors in support of their argument looks quite apodictic for a number of reasons. To begin with, there are many people who cannot afford quality education because of their poor financial condition and finally, their talent remains nipped in bud. How many children of well-to-do families are seen to be working as manual labourer or fourth-class employees in private enterprises? Why does a poor labourer induce his son to follow his footprints instead of sending him for higher education? Why is it that despite being talented, a working-class child does not ween to become a software professional? Conversely, why is it often observed that children of esteemed/elite families hesitate to pursue certain jobs (it might degrade their family status) and prefer only to take up certain specific jobs? It is also observed that sometimes there is a competition among the guardians in matters of providing better education to their offsprings. In a sense, Marx's formulation of 'economic determinism' holds true in this context.

But there are also exceptions to the arguments of Lipset and Bendix. It is true that for a working class child, it is quite difficult to try for better jobs. But our Indian

19 The authors contend that one's family background greatly impinges upon the kind of job that one takes up. A person hailing from a very poor background can't afford to choose one job from among many. He is compelled to pursue whichever pursuit he finds at first. Choice always stays a rich man's prerogative. For an enriched explication see, S.M. Lipset & R. Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, (University of California Press; Berkeley & Los Angeles: 1959/1967), pp.197-98.
scenario presents an interesting note. With the provision of Protective Discrimination at the governmental level in the form of stipends, special assistance, educational allowance and reservation of seats/posts, people from the deprived sections of the society are getting increasingly inspired to compete for quality education and enter the so-called elite jobs. Hence, the proposition forwarded by the authors is neither absolute nor unquestionable. Thus, to conclude, in line with Lipset and Bendix’s postulates, work can be viewed as an economic pursuit resorted to by people as an existential necessity (be it a choice or a compulsion), which to a large extent is related to, has the bearing on and conditioned by individual’s respective family socio-economic position.

SECTION-VII
RAYMOND ARON

a. Housework: Questioning Its Invisibility

A sceptis that was traditionally left untouched, has generally been neglected in academic discourse, has now evoked a plethora of debates in current sociology and still continually haunts our imagination is: can woman's domestic work be regarded as work? Or, why is there a habit of ignoring the work of homemaker while formulating the notion called 'work'? It is evident that all the scholars discussed earlier - both classical and modern - have exuded their scholarly 'nonchalance' over this polemical issue. It is because of this marked nonchalance, the enigma of domestic work in particular or for that matter, 'work' in general has increasingly posited a serious debate in contemporary academics. It is in the context of this debate that the insights proffered by Raymond Aron enounce their significance.

Aron advocates quite explicitly that the so-called analysis of 'work' has generally evaded the recognition of 'housework' in its formulation. The work performed by a woman in domestic sphere is not something inferior to or insignificant as compared to that performed in public sphere. In his view, a fundamental reason as to why a housewife’s work is not reckoned, evaluated or even noticed is that it is not paid in monetary terms. But this image of 'non-payment' should not mean that housework is of less utility for the family, community or the
Chapter Two

State at large as compared to the paid jobs in market. Rather, it needs to be comprehended that the economic value of unpaid domestic work has the potential to surpass the paid jobs if one begins to enumerate its monetary worth. As he states:

Many services, which are rendered by the State, are difficult to evaluate. Finally, there is all the work done for nothing, which provides the work done by housewives in their families. The work done by women in their home is not counted in the national product because it is unpaid. But if by a stroke of a wand the system as it is were changed, so that all the women worked in factories and house-keeping was carried on only by paid workers, there would at once be a considerable increase in the gross national product because work would have been made subject to payment which up till now then was not. 20

b. Industrial Societies And the Preponderance of Technical Occupations

Like Weber, Raymond Aron envisages modern society in terms of increasing bureaucratization and civilizational progress. But he is one step ahead of the former. Weber perceives modern industrial work sphere in terms of incrementing bureaucratization and rationalization. Inclusive of this, Aron theorizes work sphere in the light of growing preponderance of technical and intellectual occupations. 21 In his imagination, the services or the occupations that would be important in industrial societies are those of the supervisors, engineers, academic professionals, technical experts, professionals/specialists in the spheres of mass media, communication and the like. The author insinuates the growing predominance of service sector in contemporary times. Without being verbose, he hints at the emergence of post-industrial society, which is marked by a shift from ‘manufacturing’ to ‘service’ oriented professions. In Aron's words,

The proportion of intellectual or semi-intellectual occupations inevitably increases in industrial society. More and more supervisors, engineers and people with technical qualifications are needed... Thus the two of the occupational categories become larger and larger, the technical intelligentsia or those whose technical qualifications are mainly literary; the specialists in media of communication, who write for the press, radio and

television and exercise a considerable influence over the mass of population.\textsuperscript{22}

The scholastic tenor of sociologist Raymond Aron's writings laced heavily with a humanist/feminist passion comes in sharp contrast to the dominant sociological literature discussed so far. Particularly the general message he has sought to convey is almost invisible in the literature gleaned so far. To a layman, Aron's enumeration of women's 'domestic work' might appear as a 'heresy', as he spells out something in contradistinction to the dominant sociological discourse. But to a critical learner, Aron appears heretic in a constructive and creative sense: constructive in the sense that he challenges and deconstructs the conventional style of looking at work and gives a new twist with his heretic insights for an alternative reconstruction of the notion of work; creative in the sense that his 'heresy' enriches the gamut of discourse on 'work' and opens up, urges and formulates new directions of further inquiry and more so, it creates an inciting space for re-imagining the phenomenology of work beyond 'employment'. While expatiating on the topos of 'work', Aron signals the coming of 'post industrial' society in the vizard of emerging 'intellectual-technical' occupations in society,

SECTION-VIII
H.L. WILENSKY
a. Organizational Work in the Making of Calculating Men

Wilensky's ideas primarily focus on the industrial organizational work sphere. But unlike Durkheim, Marx, Parsons or Lipset, he is concerned more with the characterological 'effect' of such industrial work rather than the phenomenon of work itself. In other words, the author highlights how certain attributes of work (industrial work behaviour) guide, determine and shape individual's all-round behaviour and his/her personality dispositions. In particular, his focus is on the middle class employees such as the manager, white-collar employees, technicians and so on. At work, the individual propends to be instrumental, calculative, objective, self-oriented and at the same time, safe, secure, friendly, impressive and bureaucratic. Wilensky propones that these learned attributes continue to dominate

\textsuperscript{22} Aron's delineation of the importance of technical, intellectual and semi-intellectual professions in contemporary times can be seen as a foundation of post-modern discourse, which has formally been pioneered by Daniel Bell (in his book The Coming of Post-Industrial Society). Ibid. pp. 233-34.
the overall life and living of individuals to a great deal. In the process of getting
instrumental and calculative in their orientation, they begin to deal with their
neighbours/friends as commodities in the market. *They interact with those who carry
some 'use value' and avoid those who do not.* Individuals develop and discard their
association with neighbours/friends the way the sell and/or purchase cars and
clothes. This behaviour, in Wilensky's terminology, is known as 'expedient
conformity'. That implies, in both the work and non-work sphere (club,
neighbourhood, community), individuals intend to act in a way that is profiting, that
suits their interests or that would resolve some sort of personal worry. To quote him,

Certain attributes of a class of large, complex organisations and of one type
of career shape the work behaviour and life style of middle manager and
technicians. At work, these men play it safe, seek security, and cultivate
smooth human relations. In the community... they pick up and drop
friends the way they buy and trade cars and homes - speeding up the
obsolescence of both. This is a life style, which is active, group-centred,
conforming and fluid - a pseudo-conformity pattern unguided by stable
values. Behaviour both at work and office-work is characterized by
expedient conformity (If I do not do this, I'll get into trouble) and by other
direction, or conformity as a way of life whatever the content of values and
norms conformed to... 23

b. Wilensky: A Critique

The proposition posited by Wilensky is not something acarpous. Rather it
casts its innumbrations on our times too. To begin with, who appears to be more
calculative, self-oriented or rational: an employed woman or a full-time female
homemaker? Why does a man tend to present an impressive self (of him) before
others? Erving Goffman's text *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Anchor;
Gordon City/New York: 1959) rightly explains this query. It will not be improper to
aver that the modern man is inclined to be more calculative, instrumental and
purposive. In a sense this relates to the Weberian variety of 'goal-oriented rational
action'. But it ought not to be generalized that this value of instrumentality or

23 Wilensky's core concern revolves around the elements of instrumentality and calculability, which
have pervaded mankind. Modern man is inclined to remain engaged in that relation which is
profiting, satisfying and gratifying. As Wilensky puts it, 'expedient conformity' has emerged to
be the hallmark of people's behaviour both at work and community. The author's utilitarian
perspective to peruse the phenomenon of expedient conformity is sociologically worth learning.
The hedonial tendency of a majority of individuals to value others in terms their use value can be
best understood through the scholarly contributions of Wilensky. For a rational explanation see,
Article by H. L. Wilensky, "Work, Careers and Social Integration" in *Industrial Man*, by Tom
calculability is the omnipotent one that shapes the overall behaviour of all individuals at all times. Moreover this penchant for 'becoming instrumental' can be found in any individual i.e., child, adult, man or the old and thus, it is not class specific or job-specific. Factors other than one's employment sphere can also lead an individual to develop such calculative-purposive approach.

SECTION-IX
ROBERT T. DUBIN

a. Work is Not One's 'Central Life Interest'

Dubin's reflection on industrial workers spells out quite a distinctive message that is almost invisible in the work of other scholars pertaining to the issue - be it Marx, Dahrendorf, Whyte or Wilensky. In the case of Whyte, Wilensky or Weber, the eloquent attempt has been to delineate how the organizational (or industrial/bureaucratic) work 'dominates' or 'conquers' all aspects of the workers' lives. But a thorough analysis of the contours of Dubin's contribution would inevitably spur oneself to realize that his framework has a different dimension altogether, which casts a new focus that has been ignored by many scholars. The scholar explains his paradigm with his conceptual-cum-methodological tool, the 'central life interest' (CLI). Dubin proposes that a person employed in an industrial or a bureaucratic enterprise is not completely obsessed by, submerged in, conquered by or occupied by his 'work' or work sphere. The reason is that an individual worker is a human being at first, then a worker in some enterprise. Thus, he has his own diverse/multiple worlds of reality/life other than that of work sphere i.e., his family, social ties, personal spheres of entertainment, get together, happiness and the like. These other aspects of one's life are also important and at times superior to one's employment aspect. Thus work sphere is one of the spheres and it does not constitute his 'central life interest' because the worker has got other equally important 'commitments' to perform. His status of a 'working' individual is just confined to the work sphere only and the very act of pursuing employment is an endeavour to serve only his economic interest. While in work sphere, he performs with sincere commitment; attributes prime importance to his work/workplace. But just after the working hour is over, he is a completely relaxed individual having the utmost freedom to enjoy, explore and re-discover his 'personal life' according to his volition; there is no control on him directly or indirectly. In other words,
work/occupation is one of the 'life interests' of the individual but not the 'central life interest'. Moreover, even though he is an industrial worker, he has a well-devised routine of attachments - that is, each task should be done with the requisite commitment needed for it; there are diverse forms of attachments and that no attachment should interfere with or dominate upon the rest and work is just one of such attachments. He avers:

To the workers work is not a 'central life interest' in the sense that the family and community are.... Our research shows that for almost three out of every four industrial workers studied, work and the work place are not 'central life interest' for a vast majority.... Industrial man seems to perceive his life history as having its center outside of work for his intimate human relationships and for his feelings of enjoyment, happiness and worth. On the other hand, for his experiences with the technological aspects of his life space and for his participation in formal organisations, he clearly recognizes the primacy of the work place. In short, he has a well-developed sense of attachment to his work and work place without a corresponding sense of total commitment to it.  

b. Critiquing Dubin

The insight inseminated by Dubin into the discourse of work appears quite burnishing. He is one of the rare scholars who have set forth an unambiguous distinction between 'work' and other attachments and more so, a distinction between the importance of 'economic' interest and other multiple interests in one's life. His compendium sends out a clear signal that one's earning pursuit is an important priority but, not the central or the most important 'life interest'. Moreover, this 'work' does not constitute the whole of one's life or conquers/pervades his other aspects of life. Rather what is often more important in terms of one's 'central life interest' is one's family or community. But this sort of generalization puts the learner in a quandary. For example, it is true that one's family or similar social attachment is equally (or more) important as one's occupation is. But it becomes difficult and eristic to generalize that one's earning profession does not /shall not in any way interfere with one's other spheres of life. One's occupation may have the potential to impede, enhance, restrict or devastate one's familial commitments. Secondly, it is not always possible for the individual to draw a sharp, stark dividing line between

---

his 'earning work' attachment and 'other' attachments so as to avoid interference of 
some sort. Moreover, sometimes, it also happens that one's 'work' becomes one's 
'central life interest'. The point that we intend to articulate here is that there are also  
people who attach central value to their job/job status than their family or similar 
bond/attachment; for them work constitutes the 'central life interest' and other 
attachments or spheres of life are simply subsumed under it. It is true that family is 
an important attachment. It may be the central life interest for many individuals in 
society. Yet, it is also important to acknowledge the fact that not all workers in 
public domain are married. There are also workers who continue to be life-long 
spinsters/bachelors and who pursue their career without any familial attachment.

SECTION-X  
C. WRIGHT MILLS  

a. Work: A Modus Vivendi; A Poem in Action

Mills's topos of work purports a peculiar conceptualization that is not only 
unique to his way of understanding but also almost invisible in the literature of other 
scholars discussed so far. His insight on 'work' is largely gleaned from his concept of 
'craftsmanship'. He criticizes the tendency of the modern individual to frame a 
deliberate chasm between work and leisure or between production and consumption. 
To his mind, it is because of this concocted chasm, that the very meaning and ethos 
of the 'activity' called work get blurred.

Unlike Dubin, Mills constates that work not only constitutes the central life 
interest in one's life, but also it is an integral, inseparable and inherent part of the 
individual. In his opinion, the very purpose of work does not involve any ulterior 
motive; rather the fundamental nisus that propels the individual to engage him in 
'work' is to create, to accomplish and to thrive. It is success in such creation, 
accomplishment and thriving that offers a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment to the 
individual actor. Not solely that, it also ascribes meaning to his life and thus keeps 
his foray of 'productive life' continually active. The idea is that unlike Dubin, Whyte 
or Lockwood, Mills does not approach the study of 'work' solely through an 
economic prism. He suggests that the very endeavour of 'work', per se, contains 
certain exclusive properties. To begin with, work is an autonomous and creative 
activity. The person performing such activity is also autonomous and both the
design and performance of this activity belong to him only. Second, work is a rational sphere of independent action. Third, it is an arena where the individual performs the art of production with devotion, sincerity and punctuality. Moreover, such devoted commitment to the work sphere enables and confers on him the space to express, realize and develop himself. As the individual runs his work-commitment with utmost honesty, not only does he continue to thrive as an individual actor but also his 'skill' gets increasingly refined. Thus, work is not merely an economic pursuit. Rather, it is a way of life; a venture to produce one's life-world; a medium for the individual to translate his dreams into reality, image into object and poem into action. In epitome, work refers to the expression of one's 'self' and his savoir-faire. Mills maintains that there is no separation between and/or split of work and leisure. Leisure is not something outside there, it is inside the sphere of work itself which can only be realized/discovered by those who enjoy their work, who grow and thrive successfully in their sphere of 'striving'. The man lives, discovers and actualizes his 'self' in and through his work. Of equal note is the idea that it is only through work, his creative agency resides in a constant state of instauration and accrescence. Mills mentions,

The most fundamental split in contemporary life occurs because of the break up of the old unity of design, production and enjoyment. Between the image and object, between the design and the work, between production and consumption, between work and leisure, there is a great cultural vacuum and it is this vacuum that the mass distributor, and his artistic intellectual satrap have filled up with frenzy and trash and fraud. In one sentence what has been lost is the fact and the ethos of man as craftsman... By craftsmanship I refer to a style of work and a way of life having the following characteristics. In craftsmanship, there are no ulterior motives for work other than the product being made and the process of its creation... The satisfaction he has in the results infuses the means of achieving it. In craftsmanship, plan and performance are united, and in both, the craftsman is master of the activity and of himself in the process. Work is a rational sphere of independent action. Since he works freely...his work is thus a means of developing himself as a man as well as developing his skill. This self-development is ... a cumulative result of devotion to and practice of his craft... He lives in and through his work... For him there is no split of work and play, of work and culture. His work is the mainstream of his life; he does not flee from work into a separate sphere of leisure; he brings to his non-working hours the values and qualities developed in his working time.
He expresses himself in the very act of creating economic value; he is at work and at play in the same act; his work is a poem in action.25


Mills expunges the uncritical, unreasonable, conventional separation between work and leisure. Leisure is generally perceived as a freedom from work, an escape or a relief from work; it is a no-work recreation. Although leisure and work presuppose each other, at the same time, they mutually exclude each other. They 'presuppose' each other in the sense that there has been a tendency to define leisure only with reference to and/or in contradistinction to the phenomenon of work. Oppugning this uncritical and arbitrary separation (of work and leisure), Mills advocates that the modern individual is increasing being propended to do less work, entertain more in hobbies, resort more to funs, party-time/ recreation and indulge excessively in such unserious pastime. Thus the penchant for pastimes foments an increasing thirst for, demand for, dependence on, indulgence in and search for leisure, that is, generally viewed as a period to enjoy, indulge, fun, forget, release, recreate, and relax. Quite optimistically, Mills propones that the reason as to why people tend to separate work from leisure is that there has been a devall and dwindlement in the 'spirit' and 'ethos' of 'work' or to use his terminology, a craftsman-like style of life in people's mind. But the unification of work and leisure still can be possible only by restoring and inculcating such true spirit of work, the craftsman-like style in our thinking and developing an approach towards work sphere as a space for self-cultivation where both work and play can be discovered. Leisure can be phenomenised through the ethos and the endeavour of work. Work and leisure should be seen as companions complementary and supplementary to each to other rather than as diametrical opposites. Thus the blossoming new formulations of work and leisure cannot, should not and must not be formulated/ founded on their arbitrary separation; but on their mutual, harmonious and adhering presupposition, complementary coalescence and companionship. He points out,

For if our work allows to express our true interests and to facilitate their more skillful expression, then our leisure is not escape, or recuperation, or

---

25 Work is a creative engagement on the part of an actor that contributes to his self-realization, self-expression, self-development and self-actualization. It is the source of joy and zeal, play and prosperity. Leisure is integral to its domain. For an insightful understanding see, C. Wright Mills, *Power, Politics and People*, (Oxford University Press; London: 1969) pp. 384-85.
that tired frenzy by which we strive for the animated glee we call fun...
Today many people have to trivialize their true interest into 'hobbies',
which are socially considered as unserious pastimes rather than the center
of their real existence. But only by a craftsman-like style of life can the split
domains of work and leisure become unified; and only by such self-
cultivation can the everyday life become a medium for genuine cultivation.
The deeper problem of leisure and of the cultural content of leisure time can
be solved only when leisure and work are easy companions rather than
tense opposites.26

At a philosophical level the topos of Mills's contribution appears quite
panoptic. But viewing from the point of our hodiernal reality, it remains catalectic
and controverted. To begin with, work is no longer seen in the way that Mills does.
Work is increasingly being calculated by its instrumental and monetary value and
all other values are subsumed under it. Secondly, work is mostly viewed as a pursuit
to meet the economic interests in life. Thus for many people, it is not something
through which they come to develop their self or "live" in and through work. It is
more often treated as just another assignment in everyday routine. Rather there has
been a growing proclivity for doing 'part-time jobs' instead of those of full-time
ones. This explains the kind of value that people attach to their 'employment' sphere.
More than the ethos of creativity and self-cultivation, men are increasingly impelled
by properties of calculability, purposiveness, instrumentality and economic
rationality. In fact, there are many individuals in society whose approach to work is
just one of quid pro quo, rather than that of self-development or self-actualization.
But irrespective of people's actual approach to work, Mills's conceptualization of
craftsmanship certainly bears the potential to serve as a viable ideal type to
contemporary realities. However, Mills's explanation of the contours of work-
leisure integration proves apodictic to an enormous extent. He vividly depicts the
individual's inclination for viewing 'leisure' as a freedom/escape from work or a
space to indulge in his unserious pastimes a la the appetite of contemporary
individual for greater leisure to engage in such unserious pastimes.

26 Ibid. pp. 348-49
SECTION-XI
HERBERT MARCUSE

Barring certain minor variations, Marcuse's conspectus of work is suffused with almost same ideas as envisaged by Max Weber. The leitmotif of Marcuse's analysis is the idea that modern industrial (or organizational) work domain has primarily been dominated by the preponderance of machines. To use Marcuse's terminology, it is increasingly getting machinized. These machines have extenuated both the quantity and intensity of physical energy/labour that was traditionally expended by men. This extenuation is quite visible in industrial work force also. With the dominance of machine over men, the tempo of manual labour diminishes and it leads to the dwindlement of blue-collar workers and proliferation of white-collar ones. In other words, to borrow Marcuse's terminology, the number of 'non-production' workers grows very fast. The entire organisation turns to be a 'corporate machine' and workers in it are structured in accordance with the norms of bureaucracy and thus there exists no hard-task owner to exploit the worker. But what is appalling is that such machine not only dominates the work sphere in organisations but it also tends to subjugate the individual's life altogether. Not only does the work sphere get machinized, but also the corporate machine begins to conquer individual worker's life-world. Consequently, man gets obsessed with an unhindered spirit of materialism to create more luxuries and sophistication so as to live always in a state of abundant comfort and plenty. But ironically, there is no limit to this urge. In the process of striving for the accomplishment of corporeal comforts, the worker fails to realize himself as a human being. The modern, technological, sophisticated work set up has cast in his mind constant unfreedom (fascination for materialistic affluence) of being engaged in an endless endeavour to excel better and better in his materialistic journey. Hence, the modern man has turned out to be one-dimensional. The modern industrial work sphere on the one hand inculcates a spirit of materialism, sets a constant, intemperate obsession for materialistic goals, promotes a materialistic outlook among individuals to draw recognition of themselves from their material accomplishments and products/commodities; on the other hand, it reduces the individual to a puppet of materialism (corporate machine),
freezes his freedom as a human being, leaves no scope for him to make a sense of his inner freedom and his humanly peculiarities and instills in him a nimious brame for material progress.

As in Weberian industrial bureaucracy where the individual ends up as a 'cog in the machine', so also in Marcuse's vision, he is shrouded by an inescapable unfreedom, where he gets increasingly controlled, subjugated and dictated by his productive apparatus and by his insatiated urge to enhance his material prosperity. Being inveigled by the fascination of material accomplishments, he turns out to be an inveterate worshipper of his own 'product' - the object of reification. As Marcuse meaningfully mentions,

The brute fact that machine's physical (only physical?) power surpasses that of the individual, and of any particular group of individuals, makes the machine the most effective political instrument in any society whose basic organisation is that of the machine process... The people recognize themselves in their commodities, they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-level home, kitchen equipment. The very mechanism, which ties the individual to his society, has changed, and social control is anchored in the new needs, which it has produced... The idea of inner freedom here has its reality: it designates the private space in which man may become and remain 'himself'. Today this private sphere has been invaded and whittled down by technological reality... Machinization is increasingly reducing the quantity and intensity of physical energy expended in labour... The assimilating trend shows forth in the occupational stratification. In the key industrial establishments the 'blue-collar' work force declines in relation to the 'white-collar' element; the number of capitalist bosses and owners are losing their identity... They are assuming the function of bureaucrats in a corporate machine... With the technical progress as its instrument, unfreedom in the sense of man's subjugation to his productive apparatus – is perpetuated and intensified in the form of many liberties and comforts... The slaves of the developed industrial civilization are sublimated slaves, but they are slaves, for slavery is determined.27

---

27 Herbert Marcuse's treatise carries a great deal of hermeneutic as well as heuristic value. While remaining engaged with the discourse of modernity, progress and development, he never loses his criticality to examine the pathology of development. To him, development results in mixed consequences. On the one hand, it implies technological advancement and material prosperity; on the other it also leads to the subjection of individual to his organization, subjugation of the producer to his productive apparatus and failure on the part of the individual to realize his inner joy/space/peace that individualizes him. In fact, Marcuse is one of the few development theorists who have forcefully put forth the critical aspects of development in candid terms. For a deeply appealing analysis see, Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man, (Beacon Press; Boston: 1972) pp. 3-33.
b. Marcuse: A Critical Overview

A systematic recension of the above discussion would inevitably urge any learner to assume that like Weber, Whyte, Dahrendorf or Goldthrope, Marcuse explores the 'skill' and 'productive ability' of men in organizational work sphere. Like others, Marcuse also explains the emergence of white-collar employees and a sharp decline in the proportion of blue-collar ones. It goes without saying that the author depicts how the industrial work sphere is structured around bureaucratic norms and how the values of instrumentality, rationality and calculability guide workers' orientation to their pursuits.

A fundamental methodological congruity that Marcuse shares with Whyte and Weber is his distinctive style of approaching something (modern industrial/organization work sphere) with a sense of skepticism and criticality. Like these scholars, he also highlights the dominance of industry over individuals (workers, for instance), organization over organizational men, work over worker, product over the producer, productive apparatus over the producing men, consumption over production, consumerism over consumer, object over subject, abstract rules (bureaucratic) over living individuals, machine over men, and of unfreedom over freedom. This dominance casts its shadow upon the individual and colonizes him completely. He remains deluged in corporeal abundance and fails to discover his inner freedom. Realization of the non-material facets of human existence remains alien to him. Thus, his 'freedom' as an individual over himself sinks topsy-turvily. The contemporary trend of consumerism can also be comprehended with the help of Marcuse's treatise.

SECTION-XII
JURGEN HABERMAS

a. Work: A Purposive-Rational Endeavour

Habermas puts forward a very precise contribution to the analysis of work. Despite being very precise, it appears quite convincing and focused. The message of his tone is quite loud and clear. To him, work is an instrumental, calculative and
purposive foray. It is a purposive rational action. He makes a conceptual distinction between instrumental and rational. Instrumental in the sense that it is always contrived and carried away by certain technical rules having empirical validity. It is rational in the sense that the actor approaches this action-sphere with a judicious sense of calculability, strategic analysis, means-ends appropriateness and his choice or volition. Thus in the sketch of Habermas, work is an instrumental, purposive, rational pursuit that is based on the learning of certain requisite skills and qualifications, guided largely by technical rules and moreover, it leads to the growth of productive forces, greater control of technical knowledge and emancipation of the individuals. To him,

By work or purposive-rational action I understand either instrumental action or rational choice or their conjunction. Instrumental action is governed by technical rules based empirical knowledge... The conduct of rational choice is governed by deductions from preference rules (value systems) and decisions procedures; these propositions are either correctly or incorrectly deduced. Purposive-rational action realizes defined goals under given conditions. But while instrumental action organizes means that are appropriate or in appropriate according to criteria of an effective control of reality, strategic action depends only on the correct evaluation of possible alternative choices, which results from calculation supplemented by values and maxims.28

There appears to be a great deal of commonality between Habermas and Max Weber especially in the methodological and conceptual planes. Like Weber, Habermas is also a strong votary of human agency and its productive potential. Throughout his analysis, he sends out an unambiguous insignia of the preponderance of 'industrial-organizational-bureaucratic' work sphere, superiority of technical knowledge over other and a continual demand for technical 'skill' for modern organisations. But the inadequacy of his analysis rests on the fact that he is concerned with the sort of work that requires certain formal skills or technical expertise and ignores to explain all those that fall outside it.

28 Habermas does not delineate anything directly on the issue of work. The analysis can be viewed as a deductive attempt on the part of the researcher to infer from his literature concerning the issue. For details see, Jurgen Habermas, Towards a Rational Society. (Heinemann Educational Books; London: 1971), pp. 91-93.
SECTION-XIII
ANTHONY GIDDENS

a. Work Sphere: A Profit-Making, Management-Intensive And Organized Enterprise

The design of Giddens's characterization or 'work sphere' spells out marked similarity of understanding between his approach and that of Max Weber, Dahrendorf and W. H. Whyte. Reasonably, his writings nudge us back to reflect their contributions in order to understand him better. Insights gleaned from his sociology ingeminate into the discourse of work the idea that work is a rational, instrumental and profit-making behaviour. True, Giddens is locating the arena of work pursuit in modern industrial enterprises. To him, work force in such enterprise is no more labour-intensive or abundantly manual in nature; rather it is increasingly getting vocationalized, bureaucratized, specialized, organized and professionalized. There is no denying the fact that men are engaged in certain productive activities but what has undergone a tremendous transformation is the fact that there has been a shift in the nature of these activities and the structure of such organizations wherein these activities are carried on. For example, within the organization, the tasks get specialized and skill based; the workers remain accountable to the management and thus there is no unilateral control of any single capitalist. Apart from this, the traditional composition of work force has been altered toppsy-turvily; there has been a greater demand for and growth of specialized, vocational, management oriented, professional occupations.

The gamut of Giddens's analysis broaches two distinctive features that underline modern work enterprises. One of them is the profit-motive. To Giddens's mind, the prime propeller that operates behind the individual worker is the profit-making motive not only for his personal plenty but also for the mutual coalescence of himself and his organization. The second feature highlighted by Giddens is the process of routinization. Giddens proposes that not only the work sphere is segregated from the household but the very duration/assignment of work schedule also gets routinized. In other words, work is increasingly getting divorced from its (manual) labour-centredness and is becoming more and more knowledge-centred, technology-centred, 'skill'-centred, and management-centred. This sort of marked
transition has sparked a remarkable ramification in an important aspect, that is, the duration of office time or the duration of work. Giddens opines that there has been a strict formalization of working hour of individuals in their respective work places. Work is no longer a full-day assignment; it now requires only a part of the whole day to perform certain specific tasks. The implication is, people spend a few hours of the day in the struggle for economic gain and consume the remaining time for other purposes. Giddens aptly puts it:

Industrialism refers to more than mechanized technology alone... The 'factory', a locale in which direct productive activity is carried on through manual labour, is too narrow a notion to capture the organizational changes that occur with the advent of industrialism. Rather, it is better to speak of the 'industrial work place'; a locale in which vocationally organized labour is carried on separately from the home... Capitalistic enterprise involves the pursuit of profit through the production of commodities for sale on a market: the perceived need to achieve profits sufficient to guarantee an adequate return on investment generates a chronic impetus towards economic transformation and expansion... The drive to maintain profit, or to enhance profitability where this is consistent with the perceived investment needs of firms, is associated with an intrinsic propensity to technological innovation via mechanized manufacture... Quite fundamental is the commodification of labour power... Labour force falls under the immediate sway of the entrepreneur or of 'management'. At the same time, the commodification of labour power, not only permits but demands its consolidation as 'abstract labour', malleable to the organizational directives of the employer.\textsuperscript{29} Characteristic of the work-place setting of the business firm or of the school and most other modern organizations, is that the individual only spends part of the day within their walls; and that during that segment of the day the application of disciplinary power is more diffuse than in 'total institution'... But I would suggest that the locale in which struggles over economic rights are focused is the work place, the surveillance in question being that of 'management' over a labour force.\textsuperscript{30}

b. Examining Anthony Giddens

The above paragraph shares a great deal of resemblance with the ideas of Weber and Whyte. But Giddens maintains a conceivable difference. That is, in the cases of Whyte or Weber, the organization completely exercises its domination over its employees, subjects them to bureaucratic regimentation and indoctrination

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid. pp. 186-206.
thereby rendering them as puppets in bureaucratic set-up. But in Giddens's envisagement, the worker is not subjected to that strict regimentation, discipline or indoctrination as is done in the case of inmates in jail. Rather Giddens states, although the worker is working in an organization, he enjoys a sort of relative freedom and there exists no hard-task rigorous control or authority to engulf him in totality.

It is true that work is no more a whole day engagement and it requires a part of the day to involve oneself in the forays of economic pursuit. But, this 'working duration;' is not found uniformly in all jobs. The point that we wish to make is that in some jobs this 'working hour' is quite 'fluid' and in certain other jobs, it is absolutely rigid. 'Fluid' here conveys two connotations. First, in certain jobs, the employee can have the advantage where he can come and leave on his own; in operational terms, there is no 10 a.m. to 5 p. m. rigid schedules. The employee enjoys the freedom of going to his work place according to his individual convenience. Secondly, with the spread of information technology in almost all spheres of the government departments, certain jobs have increasingly become not only space-less or site-less, but also time-less. Even one can pursue a salaried job even while being at his home. On the other hand, certain jobs are strictly followed by an adherence to a rigid working hour. The elementary schoolteacher is a case in point. Although Giddens has rightly envisaged the routinizaiton of working-hour; but he does not go into its nitty-gritties.

Giddens's insight in relation to work per se has its own merit. But after making an intensive understanding of Durkheim, Weber, Whyte, Dahrendorf or Aron, his contribution appears almost tame and bland, in the sense that for the learner, it does not represent something new or intellectually stimulating. That is, Giddens does not speak anything new and whatever he propones, has already been, more or less, discussed by the said scholars.

SECTION-XIV
J. E. GOLDTHROPE
a. Phenomenizing Work in Home Economics

The dichotomies that cut across the enigma of work cannot be better explained than through the wide differences marked out between the 'market-centred
paid work' and the 'unpaid-housework' linkage. This has been aptly emphasized and reckoned with by J. E. Goldthcrope. His writing tickles our memory and nudges us back to the earlier discussion by Raymond Aron pertaining to the issue. A perusal of Goldthcrope's contribution makes us believe that he is the next scholar after Aron to formally and forcefully underline 'housework', unearth its esoteric and neglected meaning, explain its isolation from market economics and draw a comparison between the two different attributions of work: the paid-work and the unpaid housework. In Goldthcrope's classification, these two varieties relate to two different spheres: the first relates to the paid-work in market-cash-economy and the second to the homemaker's (of a woman) activity in household sphere that goes on unpaid and de-recognized. Golthrope propones, although the homemaker's work is unpaid, to dub it non-economic (or a work having no economic value) would be starkly malapropos. In fact, he divides the nation's economy in line with the same dualism, that is, the modern cash economy sector versus the unpaid-household subsistence sector. Further, he discepts the recurring tendency of our scholars to neglect and bypass the entire gamut of home-craft (domestic work) while attempting at a theorization and exploration of 'work' in contemporary discourse. The fundamental telos of the author's conspectus has been to recognize, reckon, phenomenize and underline the apodictic importance of household work, deconstruct the conventional/colloquial formulation of 'work' and finally, to reconstruct the phenomenological meaning of work that takes into account the market and the household dimensions in conjunction. The following paragraph is quite convincing.

The economy of our country may usually be regarded as composed of two sectors, variously termed the 'cash,' 'monetary', or 'modern' sector, and 'non-monetary, 'household', 'traditional' or 'subsistence' sector. In the first, goods are produced and services rendered for money, cash transactions prevail, and money values are placed in everything. In the second, goods are produced and services rendered without money payment (though money may be used in gifts), and things are valued in more personal terms of reciprocity, family ties, honour or neighbourliness. Pretty universally, it may be guessed, men are more involved in the first sector and women in the second... Because the second sector is non-monetary, it largely escapes statistical notice. To some extent, indeed, it represents a hidden economy... The goods produced and services rendered in the second sector do not figure in the official national income accounts at all, or are underestimated, often grossly so... In general, the more developed the economy the larger is the modern cash sector in relation the subsistence, traditional or non-cash
household sector. The latter, however, continues to operate, and its importance continues to be overlooked and underestimated, especially in relation to the unpaid work of housework in the home; it would be a mistake to regard it as vestigial... And to imply that women who are not in paid employment are not working is both inaccurate and insulting.\footnote{J. E. Goldthope, The Sociology of The Third World. (Cambridge University Press; Cambridge: 1984) pp. 80-82.}

No doubt, the argument proponed by Goldthope is profoundly promising and a path-breaking one; but like Raymond Aron, he does not elaborate much on it. In other words, comparatively speaking, like August Comte (who coined/introduced the idea of 'sociology'), he (like Aron) inseminated/demonstrated the value of women's household work, put forward his argument in its recognition, regretted its hitherto invisibility in our discourse; but unlike Durkheim and Weber, he could not build up its subject matter both extensively and intensively. Nevertheless, Goldthope's address to the issue is very terse, sharply epitomized and intellectually inciting. However, his contribution should be hailed as a new milestone in the phenomenization of 'work' in social science epistemology.

SECTION-XV

DANIEL BELL

a. From Terotechnology to Information Technology: Growth of Organizations And Professional Services.

Bell evinces an altogether different picturization of work pursuit the insignia of which has already been hinted at by Talcott Parsons in his essay on 'professions'. Like Parsons, Bell's essay envisages an accrescent prominence of professionals or so to say, professional work pursuits in our contemporary society. In his view, an industrial society is 'a game against fabricated nature' that centres on human-machine relationships and applies energy to the transformation of natural into a technical environment. Here economic activities focus on the manufacturing and processing of tangible goods. Work in industrial age is located mainly in the secondary sector, i.e., the semi-skilled factory worker, the engineer and the like. On the contrary, work in a post-industrial society is based on information or information technology that blossoms alongside machine-technology. A post-industrial society is
a game between persons as there is a persistent competition to augment one's efficiency so as to exhibit better service for the organization. As Lyotard views it, technology is therefore a game pertaining not to the true, the just or the beautiful, etc, but to efficiency: a technical 'move' is 'good' when it does better and/or expends less energy than another.\footnote{Lyotard is regarded as the expounder of the idea of post-modernism in social science discourse. For details see, Jean Francois Lyotard, The Post-Modern Condition: A Report on Knowledge. (Manchester University Press; Manchester: 1984), p. 44.} In Bell's opinion, a postindustrial society comprises mainly of professional and technical occupations. Society is organized around 'knowledge' and accordingly there is a proliferation of knowledge workers recruited on the basis of their efficiency over intellectual technology. Not only does 'information' become the central power but also society experiences a growth of new organizations (such as research institutes, multiple forms of governmental agencies, firms, service spheres like hotels, hospitals, schools etc.) that necessitate and furthers the demand for professions in society. Moreover, the very 'intellectual work' gets specialized and the hierophants of the new society - the scientists, engineers and the technocrats - assume notable importance, as 'professionalism' begins to underline the spirit of work itself.\footnote{Bell's idea of post-modernism can be inferred from his conceptualization of post-industrialism, which revolves around knowledge economy. Knowledge society, according to him, is indicative of two things. One is the predominance of information. The other is the growth of service sector accompanied by a cumulative demand for service professionals. For a post-industrial understanding see, Daniel Bell, The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. (Arnold Heinemann Publishers; New Delhi: 1974), p. 13.} There is a shift in the kind of work people do. The very nature of 'work' undergoes a historic transformation owing to the preponderance of 'knowledge' and 'knowledge workers' thereby leading to a fall in the number of manual and manufacturing jobs. At the same time, the growth of service sector is represented as a repository of 'non-manual' work that involves at least some degree of creativity, technicality and sociability. Instead of working upon 'things', people work with other people to deliver a service that is much more professional or technical in nature. Work experiences a structural change as manual jobs give way to white-collar and technical occupations. Old skills requiring strength and physical dexterity give way to new forms of 'think' work and this heralds the growth and preponderence of professions and 'knowledge'-based occupations in social structure. But this is not to be construed that the 'knowledge', 'technology' or 'professional' occupations emerge as a succedaneum to the manual and manufacturing jobs. The professionals, no doubt, become preponent in post-industrial work sphere; but there
is no complete disappearance of the older occupations though their importance both in term of 'quantity' and 'quality' gets subsumed under the influence of these emerging professions.

Bell’s conspectus spells out that knowledge and information constitute the key resources in contemporary times; occupations that are knowledge-centred and information-centred assume high prepollence and prestige; the process of professionalization has started growing at a faster speed and there has been a trend toward bureaucratization of 'think' work, or so to say, towards a greater specialization of 'intellectual' work. Correspondingly, this trend keeps on inculcating in the mind of individuals a need - that is, intrinsic, extrinsic, competitive and existential - to excel better in professional, technical, or informational courses/education so as to be a member of the larger 'credential society'. To put it in his own words,

The expansion of the service economy, with its emphasis on office work, education and government, has naturally brought about a shift to white-collar occupations... Industrial society is the coordination of machines and man for the production of goods. Post-industrial society is organized around knowledge, for the purpose of social control and the directing of innovation and changes; and this in tum gives rise to new social relationships...34 Industrial societies are goods producing societies. Life is a game against fabricated nature... The machine predominates, and the rhythms of life are mechanically paced... Energy has replaced raw muscle... Energy and machines transform the nature of work... A post-industrial society is based on services. Hence, it is a game between persons. What counts is not raw muscle power, or energy, but information. The central person is the professional, for he is equipped, by his education and training, to provide the kinds of skill which are increasingly demanded in the post-industrial society... Information becomes a central resource, and within organization a source of power. Professionalism grows... The central occupational category in the society today is the professional and technical...35 Surely this is an 'organizational society' in that the organization rather than the small town is the locus of one's life... New form of small professional firms, research institute, diverse kinds of governmental agencies, plus schools and hospitals, which are subject to professional and community control, become the locus of life for more and more persons in the society...36 Technology has created a new class, hitherto unknown in society of the engineer and the

34 Ibid. pp. 17-20.
36 Ibid. p. 162.
technician, men who are divorced from the site of work but who constitute a 'planning staff for the operations of the work process... Technology is one of the axis of the post-industrial society; the other axis is knowledge as a fundamental resource. Knowledge and technology are embodied in social institutions and represented by persons. In short, we can talk of knowledge society... In the professional class, teachers make up the single largest groups... Engineering is the second largest professional occupation... Allied to the engineer is the engineering and science technician... The most crucial group in the knowledge society, of course, is scientist... All this growth goes, hand in hand with a democratization of higher education on a scale that the world has never seen before... The chief resource of the postindustrial society is its scientific personnel. The manual and unskilled worker class is shrinking in the society, while at the other end of the continuum the class of knowledge workers is becoming predominant... If the dominant figures of the past hundred years have been the entrepreneur, the businessman, and the industrial executive, the new men are the scientists, the mathematicians, the economists, and the engineers of the new intellectual technology... There is the technical skill as the basis of power and position, with education as the necessary route of access to skill. A meritocratic society is a 'credential society' in which certification of achievement – through the college degree, the professional examination and the license – becomes a condition of higher employment. Education thus becomes defensive necessity.

Unlike many other scholars who would term 'work' mostly as industry-centric, manufacturing or machine-centric, skill-, organization- or for that matter bureaucracy-centric; Bell moves one step ahead and categorizes it knowledge-centric, information-, technology- and/or profession-centric or service-centric. His methodology of 'work sphere' goes beyond and transcends the 'spatial' dimension of work. The professional need not spend the whole working-hour within the four-wall boundary of his work site; rather work far from being site-centric, is increasingly becoming knowledge- or technology-centric. The recent trend of professionalization in particular and of increasing preponderance of service sector in general can largely be understood and explained through Bell's prism of 'work'. True, in our times, knowledge-workers are earnestly desiderated by every nation and it is in this context that Bell's explanation appears quite apodictic. However, like many scholars, his

37 Ibid. p. 189.
39 Ibid. pp. 343-61.
40 Ibid. p. 414.
focus on work is concerned with the public sphere and within it, he addresses the service sector only. Thus, he has not paid a heed to all those activities performed in private/household spheres.

SECTION-XVI
MANUEL CASTELLS

a. Information-Oriented Work Force: A Trend Towards Professionalisation

Castells's idea stands contiguous to that of Bell, but there is a sort of conceptual dissonance between the two at the level of emphasis. To begin with, Bell is operating in a triangular framework i.e., pre-industrial, industrial and the post-industrial whereby one economy is successively superseded by the other. He is contextualizing the range of technical or knowledge work force within the broader framework of post-industrial economy. But on the contrary, Castells brands the economy per se as 'informational'. He explains that the economic enterprise itself is informational and not post-industrial as argued by Bell. 'Informational' in the sense that, information (knowledge) intervenes upon information and thus both the input and output are also the information itself. In other words, in an informational mode of development, knowledge mobilizes the creation, re-creation and renovation of new knowledge for higher productivity. As John Allen would put it, the work force, which is increasingly preponderating in these days, consists of professional and technical/knowledge workers associated with the production, processing and distribution of information. Hence he would prefer to call today's society as the information society.41 Bearing significant commonality to this proposition, the leitmotif in Castells's essay evinces that the work pursuits that appear prepotent in such 'informational' mode are primarily professional and informational in nature, for example, those of scientists, engineers, technocrats and the like. Like Bell, Castells constates that this is not to abnegate the presence and possibility of non-professional, unskilled, semi-skilled or skilled manual workers in contemporary work sphere. Rather he simply spells out the fact that the preponderance and primacy of these workers continue to decline with emergence of the informational mode. In particular, Castells has picked up one phenomenon that is not explicit in Bells' topos of work. He propones that two of the major information technologies that have

revolutionized the work sphere, transcended the spatial or site-centred notion of work, made the work-firms entirely foot loose, expedited and accelerated the density and speed of transportation and networking, led to the greater demand for and proliferation of professionals and technical occupations are computerization of information processing and the multidimensional exercitation of telecommunications to information exchange. Castells advocates that the work force that becomes dominant is one that is information-oriented and thus the work that is pursued is information work. Castells opines,

However what is specific to the informational mode of development is that here knowledge intervenes upon knowledge itself in order to generate higher productivity. In other words, while in the pre-industrial mode of development knowledge is used to organize the mobilization of greater qualities of labour and means of production and in the industrial mode of development knowledge is called upon to provide new sources of energy and to reorganize production, accordingly, in the informational mode of development knowledge mobilizes the generation of new knowledge as the key source of productivity through its impact on the other elements of the production process and on their relationships... However, what differentiates the current process of technological change is that its raw material itself is information and so is its output... The internal differentiation results in a distantly polarized occupational structure, with a high proportion of engineers, scientists and technicians, a sizable proportion of unskilled workers, and a relatively small number of skilled manual workers, in opposition to the pyramidal structure of occupations in traditional manufacturing... It is this information-oriented work force which constitutes the qualitative and quantitative basis of advanced economies... Our economies are to be categorized not as 'post-industrial' but, as I argued in the first chapter of the book, informational, that is to say, the production of surplus derives mainly from the generation of knowledge and from the processing of necessary information... Two major streams of new information technologies are converging to revolutionize office work and corporate organizations: the computerization of information processing and the multifaceted application of telecommunications to information

---


43 Castells argues that in advanced economies, information is power. It is both the means and the output. The mode of production, hence, is called informational mode. Thus, the economy can be viewed as information economy. Therefore, information constitutes the foundation of modern economies. It is information that calls the shots. The capitalists of the economies are the information capitalists. Instead of manual workers, there is a growing demand for information workers. This is not to asseverate that manual workers disappear completely. What the author insinuates is that their proportion declines gradually. It is the information workers who take the rostrum. They begin to conquer modern organizations, corporations, bureaucracies and economies. Ibid. p. 76.
There has been a considerable degree of resemblance between Castells's approach and that of Daniel Bell. Particularly the analysis of these two scholars evinces a remarkable shift in the nature of 'work', that is, from manual/machine and manufacturing to the one which is technology or knowledge-based or so to say, informational. Castells's delineation of 'work' focuses on those that are primarily informational. Of course, implicit to it is the fact that he is speaking of those occupations that are paid in cash economy. But within this public sphere cash economy, he talks primarily about knowledge work and has eschewed other varieties of occupations that come under it. Moreover, like many outstanding scholars, Castells eschews many significant and sensitive facets of 'work' that are performed, still not recognized, in private spheres of life including those of household activities. This nonchalance is perhaps, because of his excessive pre-occupation with the information age.

Some Compendious Comments

While proceeding forward to cumulatively evolve an understanding of the phenomenon called 'work', it becomes both epistemologically and methodologically important that the scholastic works of our academic intellectuals and their propositions be seriously scrutinized. This sort of exercise equips the learner with the required conceptual and analytical tools and puts him in a comfortable position not only to utilize these tools in furthering the discourse on the subject but also re-examine the insights of the earlier scholars in the discipline on the score. It also confers a moment for rethinking/reconceptualizing the notion of work.

After making a recension of the contributions of modern sociological thinkers to the perpetuating issue, it brings the learner to realize that it is quite difficult at this stage to construct a complete theorization of work, by taking into consideration the ideas of all the thinkers gleaned here. The reasons are obvious. To begin with, there is no direct 'discourse' of work as such (under the rubric of 'work') in the true sense of the term. What is culled from the scholars' dominant discourses

---

can be said as references, indirect or peripheral discussions in relation to 'work'.
Their approach to work, if there really exists any, suffers from methodological cum-conceptual inadequacy. Academicians have mostly talked about paid jobs in public, industrial or informational mode. Nobody has tried to conceptualize 'work' as a notion that would encompass its multiple facets and not simply the paid/public dimension. In a sense, Mills has been an exception in that he offers certain qualities of work, but again that he translates in the language of 'craftsmanship' and not in terms of the notion of 'work'. His attempt has been to skim over 'craftsmanship' without any detailed explication of work. But he deserves a special credit for his artistic way of looking at 'leisure' through the prism of work. He visualizes both the conjunction and distinction of work-leisure linkage within the framework of work.

It appears, modern sociology has developed a tendency to evade the methodological imperative of considering non-paid, non-public facets of work or work carried on private spheres of life, while working on the arena of work. In short, its range is not only restricted but also partisan in that it cannot see work beyond employment or below it. Most of the scholars do not even pay a heed to the household dimensions of work. The reason is genuine. They are not at all engaged in a discourse of 'work' in general and whatever idea is culled from their writing, (though it concerns paid jobs) its reference is indirect and unsystematic.

Of course, Raymond Aron and J.E. Goldthope have been exceptions. They have explicitly identified the work of a homemaker in household sphere and attributed it the image of 'work' in unconditional terms, making it no inferior to those paid works in market. But they did not elaborate the issue within the broader framework of work. Although their point is a potential and challenging one, they left it remain as it is. No doubt, they do delve into domestic work, but they tend to skate over the polemics of work without thrashing out its divergent manifestations. The reason is simple. They are not consciously engaged in a 'sociology of work' and thus could not imagine, explore, create and sustain their criticality and inquisitiveness to fit their idea in its proper place. In other words, they could not 'build up' a comprehensive formulation of 'work' that could have offered a dynamic paradigm to the field of sociology of work. But it has to be admitted honestly that the points raised by these two scholars are quite protreptic.
In general, 'sociology of work' as a branch of study continues to be neglected in the discourse of sociology. Within this, whatever ideas are explained, hardly touch upon the unpaid, invisible and the household dimension of work. It is not enough to say that the approach of modern sociological thinkers is uncritical, unsystematic, gender-insensitive, non-holistic, partial or lackadaisical; but what is more noteworthy is the explanation that nobody (among the dominant theorists) has ever directly tried to make a sense of, construct an all-encompassing conceptualization of 'work' or for that matter, build up a 'sociology of work' consciously. There has been little attempt to explore the meaning of 'work' as an important aspect of people's life. In other words, no sociologist has directly/deliberately deliberated upon the philosophical or phenomenological 'enigma' of work. To put it simply, there has not been any planned and substantial endeavour to develop a discourse of work in particular and build up a field of sociology of work in general. Whatever insights we are now able to discover, are primarily the culled and gleaned ideas from the dominant writings of our earlier scholars. Thus to blame these scholars for not talking about the 'household' work would be largely inappropriate. The reason is that they are not operating their discourse within a schematic paradigm of 'work'. They have only analyzed certain aspects of industrial-organizational-work sphere in some context or the other except the notion of work.

No doubt, modern sociological thinkers have neglected the analysis of private sphere and its associated work activities in their writings. Of course, the work of a homemaker (woman) in private sphere is unpaid, unrecognized and assumed to be insignificant. But that does not mean that a homemaker's work is worthless, unimportant, of less value or inferior to that performed by men in public sphere. To recognize paid-public sphere work as the only form of work and to ignore house work while attempting at a conceptualization of work, would be an attempt to garble the very notion and essence of 'work' itself. It would be like recognizing, recommending or certifying all the Miss-Worlds, Miss-Universes, Bollywood/Hollywood heroines and other visible, glamorous, gorgeous medi-centric models (and similar women) as the only beautiful women and branding other women as being bereft of beauty.

The range and duration of work performed by a woman is no less than that performed by men in market. But the irony is that whenever and wherever there is
any attempt by scholars to discuss work of any sort, it has essentially been cash-centric, market-centric, and qualification-/recognition-centric. One must not be so naïve and one should understand the fact that work has many facets and dimensions and 'paid-work' is just one of them. But the paradox is that while the 'possibility' of varieties (of many facets) exists, our construction of 'work' has hitherto been non-accommodative of such possibilities. It is because of such non-accommodation, that feminist scholars have increasingly become critical of the so-called notion of work. They have challenged the one-sided understanding of work and work sphere and urged the intelligentsia that there is a need to rethink the apathy of this discipline to the gender-dimension of work. In fact the very discipline of sociology in general and the field of 'sociology of work' in particular have increasingly been challenged by feminist understanding of the concept of work. It is because of the emergence of such a feminist discourse that the discipline is now confronted with a number of questions that need serious contemplation and re-examination for their holistic resolution. For example, why does a homemakers work go unnoticed? Is cash an integral/inseparable defining property of work? Why is there a persistent stigma on homemakers work? What prevents us from categorizing it as a form of work? Thus there is a need to comprehend these household dimensions of a homemakers work in order to construct an integrated formulation of the notion of work in sociology. It is in this context, the next chapter assumes its importance. The next chapter will be an endeavour to understand the feminist critiques of the hitherto attempted formulations of 'work', explore their insights pertaining to the issue and find out the possible alternative definition of work, if any, that is hinted at by feminist scholars. In other words, the third chapter seeks to evolve an answer to the following core question: how does feminist scholarship, as a branch of social science, respond to the question of work?