

White-Collar Collective Organisation

Anthony Thomson

1983

STRATIFICATION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS PERSPECTIVES

A. Introduction

Class distinctions, it was argued above, should be seen as hierarchised, with the most fundamental difference being between those who own or control the productive apparatus (as well as ancillary institutions) on the one hand, and those who are forced by circumstances to sell their labour as a commodity. Just as there are, in addition, distinctions within this latter grouping which reflect theoretically secondary differences in the relations of production which are expressed, through the labour market, as qualitative breaks in the occupational structure, so too are there differences in orientation to the labour contract. In the first instance, all contracts are between a specific individual and an employer or employing institution. This suggests the potential of individual strategies to improve both the terms and conditions of the sale of labour. But the existence of a hierarchy of particularisms, in addition to structured cleavages in the hierarchy, creates an intricate pattern of immediate sectional interests as well as relatively more general ones. It is on this complex basis that trade unionism arises as a collective response to the labour movement.

A consciousness of collectivity can develop among any group, the members of which have salient interests in common (Bliss, 1974). The organisational structure which these individuals would adopt would vary according to the interests pursued. Trade unionism is the most common form adopted by employees in the effort to influence the exchange value of labour power and exercise some control over the conditions of its appropriation by capital. The division of labour in industrial capitalism had developed a manual occupational structure with significant qualitative breaks which were associated with distinct life-chances, awareness and consciousness of collective interests. These cleavages in turn were associated with different types of collective organisation. The most important historical division has been between the unskilled, the semi-skilled and the skilled, these differences being institutionalised in North America into different labour movements with distinct principles of organisation.

The other important breaks in the employed occupational structure were those within the sphere of non-manual work. Capitalism, it was stressed above, is an especially dynamic social system and these broad divisions are constantly modified by the dual tendencies of differentiation and polarisation. The result has been the creation of several semi-proletarian strata and a diverse 'new middle class' which exists as an amorphous professional-managerial grouping. The question which arises is how these different strata, identified on the basis of the division of labour, express their economic interests. To the extent these interests are expressed through collectivity, it would be postulated that the

White-Collar Collective Organisation

cleavages in the non-manual workforce would be related to different forms of collective expression, from professional associations, through staff associations to trade unions.

Three distinct approaches to the question of the relationship between occupational strata and the varieties of collectivism can be distinguished. A stratification perspective has been proposed which began with the seminal work of Lockwood and has been extended by Stewart, Prandy and Blackburn. This approach claims that different social strata are linked systematically with distinct versions of trade unionism. An alternative, industrial relations perspective best represented by Bain, is concerned with the general social factors which explain union growth and denies any systematic connection between class position and ideology. Finally two versions of a Marxist approach can be identified, the first exemplified by Allen's neo-Marxist industrial relations perspective, and the second by Rosemary Crompton's class, as opposed to stratification, analysis.

These approaches will be discussed in the first half of this chapter, following which several issues which emerge from the critiques of the stratification approach will be discussed. These include the extent to which trade unionism is a class activity, the distinction between class and status consciousness, and the issue of union leadership. Finally, on the basis of the importance of the concept 'union character', the stratification notion of 'unionateness' will be discussed in more detail.

B. A Stratification Perspective

In The Blackcoated Worker, Lockwood was concerned to reassert the connection between the economic position of non-manual workers and their consciousness as indicated by their commitment to trade unionism. The intellectual context of his thesis was the argument, represented by Klingender (1935) that the clerical group had undergone a process of proletarianisation which had undermined its intermediate status and relative superiority, yet, the expectation that the response of clerical employees would become increasingly similar to that of manual workers was unfounded by the substantially lower degree of clerical unionisation. There appeared to be no necessary relationship between the economic situation and the actual behaviour or attitude of clerical workers. This discrepancy was attributed to the intervention of an ideology which continued to influence subjective awareness despite the erosion of the original conditions which had engendered the ideology. The failure of most clerks to unionise and to recognise their common interests with manual workers was consequently attributed to false consciousness, an ideological aberration contradicting current economic position. It was against this interpretation that Lockwood was concerned to reassert.

Lockwood shared with Klingender the proposition that the study of the class consciousness of clerical workers was a question of those "factors affecting [their] sense of identification with, or alienation from, the working class" of manual employees. The most

White-Collar Collective Organisation

important expression of this identification of alienation was the relationship of the clerk to trade unionism, "the main vehicle of working-class consciousness" (Lockwood, 1958:13). For Lockwood, the difference in the union response of clerical and manual workers was not attributable to an ideological construction independent of an economic foundation, but rather was associated directly with systematic differences in objective position. Sociologically the white-collar workers were not falsely conscious because the lower levels of trade union consciousness accurately reflected their class placement. The overall class position of a group of employees, Lockwood argued, included several factors in their market situation such as wages, hours of work, benefits and holidays. It also included factors in the employee's work situations, such as their place in the authority structure, bureaucratisation, and the division of labour. Klingender had concentrated his analysis only on certain factors in the market situation of clerical workers and had not taken into consideration these other issues which were related to their union response. Although Lockwood recognised, in principle, the independence of social status as a third dimension, this was not developed and status differences were implicitly seen as social expressions of complicated economic processes. By taking both market and work situations into account, Lockwood claimed, it was possible to account for variations in clerical unionism without resorting primarily to the independent affectivity of the status factor.

The question Lockwood set was the extent to which the trade union activity of clerical workers reflected class consciousness. He distinguished between "action in concert" among individuals who shared a specific occupation, deriving from recognition of certain common interests, and actions which express class consciousness. For Lockwood, concerted action confined to the organisation of a single occupational group may amount only to a pre-trade union consciousness of collectivity. Such action, expressed in the formation of employee associations, is distinct from trade unionism which "entails the further realisation that certain of these interests are also shared by other groups of employees". Trade unionism expresses the class consciousness which emerges when "the members of a clerical association realise, first, that their common interests are engendered by the conflict of interests between employer and employee" and second when they realise that their interests are not "fundamentally dissimilar" to those of manual workers. Since the trade union movement was overwhelmingly working class, the unionised clerical workers would have to come to terms "with its wider class character" (Lockwood, 1958:137).

Lockwood's empirical study traced the development and growth of clerical unionisation in Britain. He recognised that there was little connection between unionisation -- meaning the trade union organisation of clerks -- and economic position, if the latter was restricted to income and job security. In fact, the relationship was the

White-Collar Collective Organisation

opposite: well-paid secure clerks with high status tended to have greater degrees of trade union membership (1958:150). He also accepted the point that each union arose in particular circumstances and their unionisation would vary among groups of clerks for any number of "peculiar" reasons -- each union was *sui generis*. His concern, however, was to establish the general conditions which linked class position with "variations in the degree of clerical unionism" (:140).

He rejected the stereo-type that clerks would not organise by pointing to the high degree of membership in some industries. The Railway Clerks' Association, for example, contained a majority of eligible workers and demonstrated a "class consciousness" which surpassed many manual unions (1958:155-56). In industry, by contrast, barely five percent of eligible employees were unionised, while banking represented an intermediate situation (:145). These variations were not random; neither were they the result of an ideological "snobbishness". Rather, as Lockwood explained the main tenant of white-collar unionism, variations in unionisation -- and attitudes in general -- can be understood by systematic variations in the class position of the employees concerned (:198; see Blackburn and Prandy, 1965:116).

Lockwood made an important analytical distinction between the "degree of unionisation" (the percent of the total number of clerks who were organised in trade unions) (1958:138-139) and the "class consciousness" of clerical unionism. The latter could only be determined indirectly with reference to such factors as the use of the strike, affiliation to the Trade Union Congress, and so on. These gave an indication of the "character of blackcoated unionism" (:138). This distinction formed the core of the subsequent development of the stratification perspective by Blackburn and Prandy.

Lockwood had demonstrated the variations in clerical unionism as they related to the market situation of employees. His case studies, however, all tended to be similar on the indicators of "class consciousness" specified (with the exception of the National and Local Government Officers Association which had not at that time affiliated). They did not exhibit the same variations in character as they did in degree, although Lockwood attributed these to differences in work rather than market situations (1958:195). Blackburn argued that this was unsatisfactory. The situation was particularly complex in those industries that had more than one organisation, with differing characters, attempting to recruit members from the same class position. As Blackburn declared, if workers have the same class position, according to Lockwood "they cannot be represented by organisations with different characters (Blackburn, 1967:13).

Part of the clarification of this confusion involved the further elaboration of the definition of a trade union. Blackburn expanded Lockwood's narrow definition to include those organisations whose predominant activities are protective of employee interests (:14),

White-Collar Collective Organisation

which would include staff associations which represent employees in whatever forum is available to them (:28). Only company unions, which cannot represent their members independently, and "professional bodies" for which "union characteristics form a small proportion of total activities", are excluded (Blackburn and Prandy, 1965:114). There were, then, degrees of 'character' differences between types of unions, from prestige to protective occupational associations (Blackburn, 1967:21-29).

Blackburn argued that the significance of unionism could not be understood independently of union character (:10) and that differences in size relative to the total number of employees were most meaningful when character was held constant. To make this more precise, he specified that "unionateness", a measure of "the commitment of a body to the general principles and ideology of trade unionism" reflects an organisation's character (Blackburn and Prandy, 1965:112). This measure is different from "completeness", the proportion of potential members actually organised. Unionisation, then, is not a "simple measurable quantity" but a compound of completeness and unionateness, "the two being inversely related" (:118).

A further clarification of concepts was introduced on 1974, although foreshadowed earlier. Lockwood had drawn a distinction between a lower level of unionism and a wider identification with the trade union movement based, as a minimum, on the common interests of unions as defensive organisations (Lockwood, 1958; see Blackburn, 1967: 20). Prandy, *et al.* subsequently divided the measurement of unionateness into two components: enterprise unionateness referred to a specific employment situation and the conflict within it over the terms of the labour contract; society unionateness, concerned the relationship between the employee and issues reflecting the society-wide distribution of rewards (Prandy, *et al.*, 1974: 430). They demonstrated that these concepts can be used to measure the character of organisations as well as the attitudes of individuals (: 432).

There are no absolute distinctions to be drawn between protective organisations of manual and non-manual workers, and the similarities are greater than the differences (Prandy, 1965: 145; Blackburn and Prandy, 1965: 120). Among manual unions there are equally significant differences. However, for any employment situation the degree of unionisation is determined by the factors which tend to be common for manual and non-manual workers alike, although white-collar workers, in general, have not been affected to the same degree as manual workers. Employee attitudes are "related to . . . objective factors of the work situation". Of these, one of the most important is the attitude of the employer (Blackburn and Prandy, 1965: 116). More "basic factors" included the growth of bureaucracy (: 117), size, complexity of organisation and reduction in promotion prospects, a lack of autonomy at work (: 118) as well as the structure of the industry in question, the status of the employees, and historical developments (Blackburn, 1967:

White-Collar Collective Organisation

268-69). The level of unionisation is determined by the social situation, but if this level is held constant the completeness and unionateness would vary inversely (:267) and prestige associations would predictably be low in unionateness, the unionisation of clerical workers would tend to be "intermediate": organisations which scored high in union character would tend to be low in completeness, and vice versa. White-and blue-collar unions differ, then, because they fall at different points along the unionateness continuum. The character of unionisation in a particular field would be a "function of the characters of the various unions in that field" (Blackburn, 1967: 18).

In short, the stratification perspective held that white-collar unionisation is systematically associated with class position. In its simplest formulation, the hypothesis asserts that different employment situations generate class or status ideologies which are reflected in collective organisation by trade unions or professional associations (Prandy, 1965: 42-7). Within the terms of completeness and unionateness, wide variations could be expected between different white-collar unions. In the aggregate, however, significant differences would be expected between the union responses of manual and non-manual employees. Although factors such as the concentration of employment and the attitude of employers were importantly related to unionism, overall manual and non-manual unions would tend to differ in character as measured by a unionateness scale, a scale which, moreover, could be understood as a measure of the class consciousness of the employees organised.

C. The Industrial Relations Critique

The principal issues in the stratification approach, then, are the importance of understanding the character of a union as an element of unionisation, and the existence of systematic differences between groups of workers at different levels of the employment structure. The importance of character has not met with unreserved acceptance. Lumley (1973) accepted that a measure of the character or nature of unionism is theoretically desirable (: 24) and a "specific research need" (: 122), but argued further that aims were difficult to measure and there was no acceptable method to weight the factors in Blackburn's unionateness scale. Although in the end he abandons the idea and concentrates on completeness (or "density"), concluding that "any attempt to find a quantifiable relationship between nature and membership is an unwarranted sophistication", he does utilise the ad hoc division between unions, staff associations and professional organisations, and he does recognise that the differences in their respective natures correlate with the social status of the occupations organised (Lumley, 1973: 23-24). Generally in the industrial relations approach, however, the desirability of indicating the character of a union is not acknowledged (Bain, Coates and Ellis, 1973: 68-70). Unionisation is understood as a unitary phenomenon and membership statistics are sufficient primary

White-Collar Collective Organisation

data for the analysis of unionism.

In its analysis the industrial relations approach concentrates on the environmental factors which are associated with the occupational and industrial variations in white-collar unionism. Certain differences are found to be insignificant; for example, coming from a manual or non-manual background (Bain, 1970: 43-46); or having a low or high social status (: 49-50; see Lockwood, 1958: 150-51). In other cases the relationship is found to be the reverse of that predicted by the stratification model (in its unsophisticated form): some groups, such as male laboratory technicians, have suffered a decline in earnings but are "poorly organised" while bank clerks have had very little reduction in income but are "highly organised" (Bain, 1970: 54); civil servants and bank employees are not in close proximity to manual workers but have a high degree of completeness, while white-collar workers in manufacturing industry, in close proximity to manual workers, have a low completeness level (: 86).

Positively, other factors are significantly related to union completeness. The strongest links are between unionisation and employment concentration (Bain, 1970: 72-3; Sturmthal, 1966: 336; May 1979: 105), the attitude of the employer (Lumley, 1973: 56-65; Bain, 1970: 122-26), and the industrial relations climate promoted by the government (: 124-25; May, 1979: 107; Blum, 1971: 15). To these may be added economic trends, the effect of the business cycle (Price and Bain, 1976), and especially the effects of inflation (Allen, 1971: 95). In Canada, Bain argued, government policy had failed to undermine management's opposition to unionism and, with this crucial pre-determining factor absent, white-collar unions were weak and could not grow easily in the private sector (Bain, 1969).

Having enumerated the associated factors, the industrial relations approach is completed without attempting to integrate them into any general theory. Many of these factors were discussed by Blackburn (1967), but his intention was to locate a systematic connection between unionisation and class position. This theory is still being elaborated.

The critique which attempts to undermine the stratification approach directly is associated with Bain and his co-writers (Bain, Coates and Ellis, 1973). Although they raise many fundamental questions about the connection between class position and class consciousness, the authors' treatment of them is not satisfactory. Bain *et al.* argue that there is "no simple relationship between a union's character and the social position of the membership" (1973: 70; see Allen, 1971: 56). Furthermore they assert that these different positions do not sustain separate types of organisations. Distinguishing between trade unions, white-collar staff associations and professional associations, they maintain that the differences between separate organisations within each type are at least as great as the difference between types. Character was not as important as effectiveness (Lumley, 1973: 23). In the insurance industry, for example, the unrecognised trade union was seen as

White-Collar Collective Organisation

ineffectual compared with the staff association which was successful in negotiating such provisions as early retirement, leading to the growth of these less unionate bodies despite some relative proletarianisation (Heritage, 1980: 289).

Bain *et al.* claim that, since unions are recruited from a wide range of social positions, the character of a union conceptualised as a unidimensional continuum cannot reflect "the social position of its membership" (1973). To demonstrate this they ask: "if union characters are determined by their members' social positions, then how can the former change while the latter remains the same?" Unions choose to affiliate with central labour bodies, for example, at specific times with "no significant changes in the social position of the members" (: 70). Heritage (1980: 288) was more open to the possibility that the creation of a white-collar proletariat was a necessary condition for unionisation, but added that the other factors adduced by the industrial relations school must be present for sufficient conditions to exist. Allen argued in different terms. The range of factors were deemed "necessary conditions" in addition to which are a number of unspecified "sufficient conditions" which are particular to the environment and determine "the timing of the emergence of trade unionism, the forms it takes and the rate at which it develops" (1971: 43). These did not include the manual or non-manual nature of work, given the complex division of labour, since the economic differences between these groupings had been erased. The question became why workers in some occupations were less organised than those in others (: 440. Many non-manuals, as May pointed out, do not see themselves as middle class and therefore unionism is more normal and accepted (1979: 105).

Blackburn had emphasised the importance of an organisation's independence from the employer in his definition of a trade union. In reply, Bain *et al.* argue that collective bargaining is a relationship of recognised dependency and that only unilateral demands on the part of the employees express independence (1973: 86-88). Nor can the character of a union be taken as an indication of class consciousness. Since white-collar unionism often follows a change in the attitude of the employer, it need not imply a change in the attitude of the employee in the fundamental sense that it expresses a new conflict with management (May, 1979: 108). Bain *et al.* move from the point that, for Lockwood, "trade unionism is necessarily a class activity" to the assertion that "the character of the union may thus be taken as an index of the class consciousness of its membership" (1973: 59). They regard class consciousness to be a "form of behaviour which is solely, or at least primarily, motivated by a consciousness of class ties", from which it follows that on the separate aspects of unionateness listed, class consciousness was a significant factor only to the extent to which individuals were motivated in their unionism by solidarity with the manual working class rather than by narrow sectional ends (: 79-82). The authors have little difficulty in disposing of this argument. As a final disagreement with the stratification

White-Collar Collective Organisation

school, they dispute the existence of a relationship between coherent class and status world views and types of unionisation. This last point will be discussed in more detail below.

In short, the industrial relations critique holds that white-collar workers "do not possess any intrinsic qualities which make them less receptive to trade unionism than manual workers" (1973: 50). They may think of themselves as socially superior but this does not prevent their unionisation any more than a falling status encourages it (: 49). Any aggregate differences can be accounted for by the variables of employer attitude and concentration of work. As May argues, the "strong version" of the stratification thesis, that white-collar workers restrict the aims of their organisations and eschew the use of the strike and industrial militancy, must be rejected. Even in its "weak version" the evidence refutes any difference. Most middle class unions have resorted to the full range of sanctions, including national strikes, which are used by many working class unions; and there are examples of the latter which have hardly, if ever, resorted to the use of strike action. This obviously undermines any broad characterisation of non- manual and manual unions in terms of different strategies and tactics (May, 1979: 110).

Part of the discussion of this critique must question whether "examples" are sufficient to demonstrate the existence or otherwise of "broad trends". Bain *et al.* rest much of their case on the demonstration that no simple relationship exists between members' social positions and union character. Their evidence, which amounts to the marshalling of deviant cases, may indicate that the simple range of union responses varies considerably within each category of organisational type. This formulation, however, fails to deal directly with the level of sophistication of the argument which acknowledges wide variations but associates them with differing combinations of character and completeness. The critique addresses neither Blackburn's hypothesis not the question at an aggregate level. One essential point of the thesis -- different from both the weak and strong versions specified -- was that membership was insufficiently meaningful in the absence of a discussion of character. Bank workers and railway workers may be both "highly organised", but this obscures the nature of the union they prefer, and both give some indication of the consciousness of the members. No relationship would be predicted between class position and either completeness or unionateness if these are considered separately, the main point that Blackburn made in 1967. Insofar as the prediction remains that there will be different levels of unionisation between the three types of collective organisations, it remains possible that, despite equally great ranges, the distribution of responses could be skewed in significantly different ways among them. To conclude that, in the aggregate, the relationship did not hold, it would be necessary to carry out an analysis at that level of measurement. The discovery of militant white-collar unions, then, does not refute the stratification hypothesis. Troublesome deviant cases would consist of

White-Collar Collective Organisation

two bodies of workers in the same class position with significantly different levels of unionisation as defined by character times completeness, or workers in very different economic positions with identical degrees of unionisation. Such deviant cases occur theoretically and may occur empirically, especially if the analysis is made between regions or nations. Assuming an aggregate relationship, as the level of analysis becomes less abstract the degree of unionisation of concrete groupings will be affected by the "particular conditions" Allen mentioned as well as by the objective factors acknowledged by both the industrial relations and the stratification schools.

The question of whether character is less important than effectiveness is more complex. It is possible to envision a situation in which a change in the market and work conditions elicits a new set of demands from employees. The content of their bargaining or consultation with management may change, but should their association be effective in achieving its goals (or convince the membership that they are unachievable), then the means used to obtain them -- and hence the aims of the organisation and its character -- will not change. At best, unionisation may increase in its completeness component since, as it achieves the new goals, more employees will be convinced that membership is desirable. It is when the new goals cannot be achieved within the old framework that new aims emerge which induce members to join more militant bodies or alter the character of the existing associations. The limiting point remains valid, however. No motive to increase unionateness will follow when effectiveness is not diminished; and it is possible for employees to adjust to the new circumstances and not respond by increasing their unionisation.

The third argument was that since unions recruit from a wide range of social positions, their characters cannot reflect the position of the membership. Just as unionisation in a given field is seen as a function of the union characters of the organisations comprising the field, so too an industrial-type union may be seen as expressing the average character of its membership groupings. It will be argued below, however, that this pluralism may not exist and the definition of the character of the union may be disproportionately influenced by superordinate subsets within it. A similar response can be made to the question of individual "dual membership" in organisations with different characters, although in this instance it may be more appropriate to seek, in class terms, a more ambiguous situation of interests rather than some sense of a mean interest located between the dual organisations.

Fourth it is argued that union characters may change while the members' social positions remain constant. If we use the majority decision to affiliate as the indication of a change of character measured by a dichotomous variable, there is no reason to assume that the social conditions had suddenly materialised and less that there would be an immediate

White-Collar Collective Organisation

transformation in cognition. This is a definite problem in the measurement of the concept rather than a question of the general theory itself. If character is regarded as a variable which can exist in degrees, then the point at which the question of affiliation arises, as well as the amount and source of fluctuations in support may be related to changes in economic position, employer response, and so on (see Thomson, 1977b). The other relevant point is that other factors operate, as both the stratification and industrial relations school recognise, so that character may change and then have an effect on completeness, or vice versa (Blackburn, 1967).

On a second issue of the consciousness question, Bain *et al.* make the point that a high level of class consciousness might lead to an ideological rejection of unions as not revolutionary. This does not necessarily follow however. In France, for example, there are "revolutionary unions" which dispute the legitimacy of management authority and educate their members to the exploitative nature of capitalism (Gallie, 19xx). The International Workers of the World in North America adopted a similar syndicalist position. In the present the empirical existence of such a high level of class consciousness is extremely rare in Canada, though the theoretical point remains valid. Syndicalism may represent, furthermore, a higher degree of independence when contrasted with collective bargaining which occurs in a situation of mutually accepted dependency confined to the instance of selling labour power. This dependency is a product of the market for labour and expresses a narrowly defined mutuality of interests. These interests, which are specific to a given enterprise, may form the foundation for an ideology of labour-management co-operation, a common feature of many employment situations. The advent of collective bargaining, however, while usually occurring within this framework of mutually recognised pragmatic interests, expresses the class distinction, at a micro-level, between employer and employee; it is a recognition that the interests of the buyer and the seller of labour are not identical and presupposes the formation of a conception of separate interests within a more general commonality which assumes that they can be reconciled to the relative satisfaction of both parties. The further argument that collective bargaining was granted to workers by employers who were conscious of its capacity for enhancing social control of workers expresses, in part, confusion between the types of interests within an enterprise and is in part a misinterpretation of history. The adoption of a favourable attitude towards trade unionism on the part of employers may express a recognition that their interests are served in rationalising the labour market, especially in large employment situations. But it is not entirely legitimate to argue, from this fact that since employers have adopted trade union methods for their employees in their own interests that they must represent the interests of the dominant class rather than be an expression of working class consciousness.

Unions are more often won than granted gratis, and where they are granted, it is

White-Collar Collective Organisation

often to forestall a drive by a more militant union. Since they are institutions to bargain over the sale of labour power they express the mutual interests expressed in this contract and simultaneously represent the conflict of interest inherent in the selling of labour power from the point of view of the workers. If class interests are restricted to the market relation then trade unionism is a full expression of working class consciousness vis-à-vis an employer. To the extent that the exercise of unionism confines workers to immediate interests then they may simultaneously express the longer range interests of the employers who want an orderly process to negotiate the terms of the labour contract, and the shorter range interests of the workers confined to these terms. From the wider perspective that the interests of workers go beyond the specific terms of exchange for labour power, then trade unionism is not a full expression of class consciousness. However, it is at least implicitly a class activity because it is concerned not only with the terms of sale of the commodity, but more importantly of the conditions of its appropriation in the context of the subordination of labour to capital.

Bain, Coates and Ellis move from the point that, for Lockwood, "trade unionism is necessarily a class activity" to the assertion that "the character of the union may thus be taken as an index of the class consciousness of its membership" (1973: 59). They regard class consciousness to be "a form of behaviour which is solely, or at least primarily, motivated by a consciousness of class ties", from which it followed that, on the separate aspects of unionateness listed, class consciousness was a significant factor only to the extent to which individuals were motivated in their union activity by solidarity with the manual working class rather than narrow sectional ends (:79-82).

Two conceptually separate questions are raised here. The first concerns the connection between class consciousness and trade union response, not only as a conceptual question but as a cognitive process among employees. The second question is the extent to which the character of an organization can be considered to be the creation of the conscious expression of the interests of its membership.

Clarke and Clements distinguish between unions which act "merely to represent the sectional economic interests of particular occupational groups" and those which act "to advance the general interests of the working class in combating capitalism" (1977:10-11). The former is too narrow to express the consciousness associated with trade unionism which also includes those interests common to all employees, as such, in the labour market. The latter may be too wide to express a consciousness associated directly with trade unions and assimilates a revolutionary perspective in which the general interests entail the overthrow of the commodity status of labour. While leaving aside the issue of the development of a revolutionary perspective, Lockwood had drawn a more useful distinction between a lower level of unionism, concerned with a specific employment

White-Collar Collective Organisation

situation, and the conflict within it over the terms of the labour contract, and a wider identification or alliance with the trade union movement based, as a minimum, on the common interests of unions as defensive organizations.

The essential point about the nature of trade unions is that they reflect a basically defensive reaction designed to secure the benefits of its members, in a given situation, as employees. They are devices for sectional ends. Employees in certain positions, particularly those in which individual means of advance are limited, come to perceive that they can best pursue their interests collectively. This conception of interests need not only involve collective opposition to an employer, but unionism can become, for example in some craft situations, a strategy of closure aimed to reduce competition in the labour market (Perlman, 1928). Furthermore, consciousness of collectivity is not confined to employees but can be generalized to the whole realm of social movements. It has been argued above, however, that these sectional ends, while forming the basis of trade unionism, contain an intrinsic class element. This class element is not necessarily perceived in class terms and there exists an important disjunction between trade unionism as a class activity and as an expression of class consciousness. On the contrary, the conditions of the labour market structure both interests and consciousness to express particularisms.

Theoretical approaches to the study of class consciousness have specified a progression of increasingly explicit stages of class consciousness, from lower to higher degrees (Hobsbawm, 1971; Ollman, 1972; Wolpe, 1969). In Michael Mann's classification, class consciousness among employees involves a series of steps with regard to their employment which recognize a common identity, a common opposition, a "class" definition of the situation fully articulated rather than being merely implicit, and a conception of an alternative society (1973: 69). There is a more or less spontaneous tendency which drives employees towards some form of protective organization, assuming a sufficient scale, but there is both a logical and empirical gulf between this level of articulation of consciousness and the movement to embrace the higher levels which involve an explicit rather than implicit conceptualisation of class (71-72). The second, higher level, the class definition and alternative society, is not simply a quantitative increase above the recognition of common interests and antagonists, but rather is a qualitative break. The two levels are conceptually distinct and independent of each other (Meszaros, 1971).

One of the central ambiguities in the use of the term "class consciousness" is that social actors generally do have a vision of the social structure which takes two forms. One is a micro- perspective of gradations in prestige status or skill rankings. In addition to these generally recognized differences in occupational status, terms such as "middle class", "upper middle class", or "working class", for example, are part of their conceptual apparatus. In this sense actors are aware of general distinctions labelled "classes" and will

White-Collar Collective Organisation

often place themselves in specific categories. The question of class consciousness is more than the predicted self-placement of individuals within a perceived hierarchy but rather entails the recognition of the conflict of interests inherent in the relationship between asymmetric class categories. Both conceptions are "theory impregnated", the latter in a more visible way since it relates to structural processes which underlie the occupational division of the commodity labour power.

Giddens specified two levels of class consciousness prior to the adoption of a revolutionary perspective. The first is a "conception of class identity and therefore of class differentiation", which is class awareness. In Giddens' approach, classes exist only insofar as they become social realities "manifest in the formation of common patterns of behaviour and attitude" (1973: 111) and a common awareness of these which is linked to a given life-style. Class awareness is often only implicit and is not necessarily perceived in class terms (: 115). It is analogous to other forms of group awareness, such as national, racial or ethnic consciousness.

The second level is apparent when "perception of class unity is linked to recognition of opposition of interest with another class or classes" (: 112). This awareness of conflicting group interests gives rise to a "conflict consciousness". Again, a conflict perspective could emerge on the basis of any salient group difference of interest, whether racial, ethnic, and so on. Conflict consciousness is not necessarily a lower form of class consciousness, but conflict consciousness oriented to antagonisms founded in class difference is such a form. There is, then, an implicit class awareness and an explicit class conflict consciousness, both of which are independent of and conceptually prior to a revolutionary consciousness. The new middle class, Giddens argues, is class aware rather than being class conscious. They are conscious of having a distinct life style, attitudes and beliefs but do not perceive their situation as involving a conflict of interests with another group in class terms. On the contrary, one element of their common ideology or class awareness tends to "take the form of a denial of the existence or the reality of classes" (: 115, emphasized in original). The conditions of existence of the new middle class make the coalescence of a specific middle class consciousness problematic.

From this perspective, trade unions are an institutionalized form of class-orientated conflict consciousness, while pre-union associations, at best, express group awareness. Even among trade union, members, as individuals, need not have a conflict consciousness. Those who do have such a consciousness may tend to confine its applicability to the immediate employment situation and not see this conflict in its broader, class perspective. It was argued above that unionism was implicitly a class activity. A notion of an implicit class consciousness, however, is a contradiction in terms. It is better, therefore, to speak of the development of "trade union consciousness", recognizing its implicit class meaning,

White-Collar Collective Organisation

while leaving as a conceptually distinct question the extent to which trade union consciousness entails an explicitly class frame of reference.

The concept of union character, then, measures different levels of trade union consciousness among those who are instrumental in shaping this character, while bracketing the question of the extent to which those who embrace given levels of trade union ideology see this activity in class terms. Trade union ideology may be significantly related to class consciousness, but it is not necessarily a lower degree of such consciousness.

D. Class and Status Ideologies

Having distinguished between class and union consciousness, the question of the link between trade unionism and class position remains. Since trade unions are organized expressions of the interests of groups in the selling of labour power, systematic differences would be expected between occupational categories. If it is asserted that there is a new middle class, or that there are one or more significant fractures along the multi-dimensional gradation of class positions, then the content of trade union consciousness would predictably vary on either side of the theorized cleavages. If there are two major groupings and two types of consciousness, then there would also be two types of employee organizations. The collective orientations more common among non-manual workers (the formation of associations, preference for arbitration, reiteration of distinct character vis-à-vis manual unions) become not merely less "class conscious", in Lockwood's terms, but may express the class awareness of a separate class.

Non-manual workers, according to Allen, have always been distinguished by their "striving for prestige", Lacking the social bases of prestige, such as birth-right, power or authority, the non-manual workers sought prestige by a policy of segregating the less worthy manual workers who bore "the stigma attached to dirty work". This "social insularity" was based on privileged treatment from employers and a caste-like segregation of manual from non-manual employees (1971: 93-94). This real difference was exaggerated into a "great social pretence" as non-manual workers "saw themselves as individuals, superior to manual workers and able to progress through society unaided" (: 94). They were isolated from trade unionism because of this special treatment and their social imagery which emphasized "middle class values" (Allen, 1971: 43; Crompton and Gubbay, 1977: 195). White-collar workers resist unions "because they consider them organizations appropriate for lower status, blue-collar workers and beneath the dignity of the white collar employee", a situation which reflects tradition and the work environment more than their income or skill (Kruger, 1971: 106- 107). Management has played a part in fostering this view of the antithesis of unionism and higher status employment (Strauss, 1954: 74).

In her analysis of class discussed in Section I, Rosemary Crompton had argued that

White-Collar Collective Organisation

most white-collar employees were in a different class relationship compared with manual workers. Consequently, rather than seeing differences in union ideology as a quantitative question, more or less unionate, in Blackburn's terms, it should be recognized that these alternative strategies express class differences. The approaches to industrial relations common to staff associations, which are based on a conception of the harmonious nature of the employer-employee relationship, "represent, and are certainly perceived by their members as, a very different approach to collective bargaining than that of trade unions" (Crompton, 1976: 422)¹.

The stratification approach, as Bain, Coates and Ellis point out (1973: 9-11), maintains that the social structure generates two sets of images, a dichotomous, power-based model which emphasizes class differentials, and an hierarchical, prestige-based model which is associated with individual careerism (Runciman, 1966; Goldthorpe and Lockwood, 1963). Dahrendorf suggested that these images reflect class differences: workers would see society as a dichotomy whereas the white-collar man would see society as a hierarchy which includes a "'top' that is above him, and a 'bottom' that is below him." By placing himself in the middle, he would develop "a remarkably acute sense of distinction and social gradations" (Dahrendorf, 1959: 283-284). A "status ideology", as outlined by Kenneth Prandy, accepts the hierarchy and its legitimations and accepts advancement through individual mobility as the norm, while a "class ideology" emphasizes the conflict of interests and the differentials in power (1965: 37). While these ideologies represent ideal types and as such would not be encountered in exactly the pure, theorized form, manual workers and professional workers would tend to adopt class and status ideologies respectively.

The thesis asserts that a perspective which arises from an individual relationship with an employer would tend to see society as a series of gradations, a continuous hierarchy of positions. Advance would be seen as individually working up to positions of higher prestige and rewards. According to Giddens, the middle class would tend to "perceive the social order in terms of individualistic notions of 'personal achievement' and 'initiative', etc." (1973: 115). This orientation would be consistent with the terms of their labour contract, for in a situation where the contract may appear to be more individualistic than collective, there is a more substantial basis for an ideology that emphasizes personal achievement. Such a perspective would be inimical to trade unionism, initially, because collective action would be regarded as unnecessary.

Non-manual employees, who retain a sense of their individual status as employees but who nevertheless require a more collective approach to negotiations, will be in an ambiguous position relative to these two contrasting perspectives. To the extent that these employees retain a status perspective, they will tend to eschew trade unionism, particularly

White-Collar Collective Organisation

its conflictual aspects, in favour of less militant bodies. Status ideologies, in the context of a co-ordinated employment situation, would more often be institutionalized into staff associations. Prandy argues that, in contrast to trade unions which are class bodies, these associations would be more concerned with maintaining prestige than with bargaining with employers, and hence would be primarily status bodies (1965: 44).

Class and status perspectives are, in principle, independent. As defined by Weber, status means "an effective claim to social prestige" and is founded on life style, education and hereditary or occupational prestige. Status is not solely determined by class position (Weber, 1968: 306) and may itself "influence, if not completely determine a class position without being identical with it." The relationship between class positions and status is complex and problematic: "class distinctions are linked in the most varied ways with status distinctions" (: 187). This is so in general.

Consciousness of status and a sense of social gradations are not restricted to one particular occupational category, such as non-manual workers, but rather pervade the entire structure. Prestige scales arise from the evaluations of positions relative to each other. All employees perceive a hierarchy and place themselves within it, although they are most sensitive to those positions nearest their own. Furthermore it is generally recognized that staff associations and unions not only recognize the occupational hierarchy but often explicitly contribute to its maintenance by balancing differentials. In this sense they are both "status bodies".

Occupational groups, for Weber, are also status groups and in capitalist society the class situation is the major factor by which status groups are formed "for of course the possibility of a style of life expected for members of a status group is usually conditioned economically" (1968: 190). In periods of "technical and economic transformations" the class position is pushed to the fore and the form of status stratification threatened; when the "shifting of economic stratification" slows down, stratification by status becomes more prominent (: 194).

Status differentials are under girded by quantitatively higher or lower economic rewards which accrue to occupations, providing the incumbents with the means to make appropriate prestige claims. According to Weber there is an historical link between class positions -- the hierarchy of rewards determined by market situations -- and the status hierarchy. Since the basis of separate prestige claims is market relations, a decline in the latter would seem to result in a decline in the former. Hence actions to restore prestige would be based on strategies to increase market returns. Since status distinctions depended on unequal access to the symbols of prestige (Allen, 1971:95), economic processes which have narrowed the gap between white-collar and blue-collar workers have "injected realism" into their lives and revealed that their images were false (:63),

White-Collar Collective Organisation

resulting in a loss of status and prestige. In this situation, white-collar workers have increasingly turned to trade-union methods "because they know they are losing their status and recognise that the causes are institutional ones" (:96; Sturmthal, 1966). In this respect, trade unionism could be regarded as a means for obtaining the substantial differentials upon which their claim to a higher prestige rested, an alternative means to achieve traditional goals (Mills, 1956:308-309; Strauss, 1954:81).

This instrumental connection between ends (appropriate rewards) and means (individual or collective) is affected by several factors. Because the two dimensions of stratification are independent, and because the weight of legitimate historical claims to prestige would survive the decline, there is no inevitable connection between a loss of economic benefits and an immediate loss of effective claims to prestige. Lockwood had argued that clerical workers, who suffered some loss of economic returns, remained in an ambiguous status position because of the maintenance of many salient differentials, particularly those relating to the work situation of the employees, which continued to reflect some measure of relatively high status.

Mills suggested that the white-collar grouping would continue pressing claims to prestige based on the hollow residues of a higher status even after the economic basis had been completely dissolved (1956).

The relatively favourable employment conditions of the past, which represented a privileged position for white-collar workers, were also associated with a social image or standing which involved identification with the employer in the one hand and a status separation from manual workers. Over time the objective differentials which had separated the manual and non-manual workers were eroded, and the isolation from the employing class increased, undermining the basis of the ideology of social superiority. However, since the image, once created, obtains a partially autonomous existence, then it would be possible for white-collar workers to continue to hold the vestiges of their privileged status irrespective of the disappearance of its economic foundation and as a consequence they would continue to reject trade unionism and association with the working class. It was not uncommon for lower status groups to maintain identification with status superiors in order to emphasize their own relative superiority over a lower status group (Merton, 1958).

This independent survival of a status dimension (which, as indicated above, continues to have a material presence -- it is not merely an "illusory advantage") is used to explain the failure of the declining market and work situations to be accompanied by a concomitant rise in unionisation. Consequently, only a minority of white-collar workers belong to unions (Rinehart, 1975:96).

From a Weberian perspective, while there is a hierarchy of market situations, some

White-Collar Collective Organisation

distinctions are more fundamental than others. All employees possess some "property" to bring to the market encounter, in terms of different skills, but the main differential among these conventionally propertyless is their possession of labouring or intellectual skills (Weber, 1986:302- 305). While labouring skills were more often organized in larger employment situations, which necessitated a collective response, intellectual specialities continued to bargain within an individual relationship with an employer. While prestige may ultimately be based on the returns available from the stronger bargaining power of individuals, it amounts to more than the amount or nature of the rewards and embraces the means used to obtain them. One consequence of this ambiguity was the perception of a contradictory relationship between status and economic returns such that a loss of prestige was entailed in the selection of collective and abandonment of individual means to obtain those resources upon which the claim to prestige was based. Since violation of the means deemed legitimate jeopardized prestige, non-manual workers in relatively privileged situations tended to adopt, at first, less unionate forms of collective action which did not imply a conflictual relationship with management. Since their social prestige rested on a separation from manual workers, it included a disdain for aggressive means of pursuing apparently selfish interests, with the white-collar workers tended to cling to a service mentality. Consequently, militant action is difficult to reconcile with their social image (Allen, 1971:97). Having denigrated industrial action in the past, they are concerned that their reputation will be damaged if they eschew more neutral dispute resolution mechanisms such as arbitration in favour of more aggressive actions which may be less "socially permissible" (:64).

Finally, even if status perspectives arose historically and are perpetuated by the reproduction of certain differentials at work, they are reinforced by social practices. The conditions of employment of white-collar work have been sufficiently distinct to engender different forms of collective response and different employer attitudes. In turn, white-collar unions are seen by the trade union movement as being distinct. In addition to a more conciliatory attitude towards, and a reluctance to attack, management, the union approach used different terms which evoke different responses: rather than workers organized in locals, having shop stewards, white-collar people are employees, organized in divisions, with representatives. They form associations, alliances or institutes rather than unions. (Blum, 1971:30-32). In their organizing drives some unions emphasize psychological differences between manual and non-manual workers and may make invidious comparisons between them (:39).

The stratification approach had asserted that there was a systematic link between the class position of manual and non- manual workers and, respectively, class and status ideologies. Although status consciousness is not specific to non- manual workers, the link

White-Collar Collective Organisation

between class position and unionism was reinforced by systematic differences produced by the labour market. In this respect the main difference is in the means of negotiating the labour contract. Non-manual workers more often negotiate the conditions of their employment individually and perceive their skills more directly as property, an individualistic notion which defines success as personal career advancement. Manual workers more often find themselves in a situation of more collective employment which is more conducive to a less individualistic consciousness (though not necessarily a less particularistic one). To the extent that these different conditions prevail, then ideological differences would be predicted between manual and non-manual workers.

Processes intrinsic to the capitalist division of labour which have affected the non-manual workforce have broken down the connection between individualistic employment and non-manual work in many cases. Secondly, the link between such cooperative employment and collective consciousness -- specifically trade unionism -- has been challenged by a reiteration of a "false consciousness" thesis which argued that, since class and status were in principle independent, claims to prestige could be sustained despite an erosion of the basis of superiority. This did not imply, however, the absence of any differentials since identical situations are not conducive to systematic differences in status. Given the tendency of the labour market to reproduce numerous distinctions, claims to prestige could still be based on objective differences. However, statistical connections do not in themselves provide an answer to the question of the extent to which the association reflects a self-legitimation of a perceived superior position. Finally, status is perceived within an ideological context which includes the interests of the employer and the organized expression of ideology promoted by employee organizations. Neither of these necessarily articulates a class perspective, and the latter need not support a conflict consciousness.

E. Work Structure and Sectionalism

The second issue raised above in the discussion concerning the relationship between union character and the consciousness of the membership was the extent to which the former was a reflection of the interests of the members as they perceived them. There may be a considerable discrepancy between what an organization proclaims and what many of its members may be prepared to do. This question raises several issues: the importance of leadership, the development of union staff positions, the degree of heterogeneity of the membership, and the relationship between ideological practices and social positions.

The first two issues concern organizational structure and internal union politics. The ideal situation would be a fully informed membership directing the affairs of the union themselves in a manner congruent with their perceived best interests. In this situation it is more reasonable to expect the union character to represent the consciousness of the

White-Collar Collective Organisation

membership, although there may be a discrepancy between actual and desired goals since unions are constrained by both legislation and employer response. To the extent that desired goals are not incorporated in union policy, for example a situation in which membership seeks the right to strike but no such right exists in legislation and no resolution to the effect has been devised within the union, then there would be a discrepancy between union character and the consciousness of the members.

The second qualification, in an employee situation of a substantial size, is the need to delegate leadership with the authority to bargain over the sale of labour power and direct union business on a day-to-day basis. To the extent that this leadership attains an autonomous role in shaping the policy and proclaimed interests of the membership, then there is created a new particular interest based on authority relations within the organization (Michels, 1962:283-284). Efforts to restrict this particularism, to compel the leadership to pursue interests congruent with those of the membership are usually institutionalized in union structures. Such devices as regular meetings, referendums, leadership reviews, policy conventions, and so on are essentially means to realize a modicum of internal democracy.

Formal leadership, however, is in a powerful position to define members' interests, both formally and actually. They disseminate information and knowledge, and shape the discourse within which evaluations are made and in terms of which objectives are specified and means planned. The autonomy of leadership is enhanced by the potential quiescence of the membership. Union structures can dissuade membership from active involvement and centralize initiative in relatively few hands. This condition of membership indifference may develop in any union, despite a successful, militant beginning, but when a union is largely a creation of management -- and this is the case for many white-collar associations -- membership disinterest may be the original condition of its existence.

The tendency for leadership to separate itself from the membership is further developed by the requirement, in the context of increasingly sophisticated collective bargaining, for technically competent staff versed in legal procedures and capable of conducting negotiations in an increasingly rarefied and specialized situation. This expansion of the organization is associated with potential goal displacement, the development of institutional needs which are different from those of the membership (Hyman and Fryer, 1975). The issue of difference, however, is separate from that of contradiction and the latter does not necessarily arise automatically from the former. The goals of the union, such as unity, financial solvency (Hyman and Fryer, 1975). The issue of difference, however, is separate from that of contradiction and the latter does not necessarily arise automatically from the former. The goals of the union, such as unity, financial solvency and administrative efficiency are not necessarily in opposition to the

White-Collar Collective Organisation

interests of the membership. The leadership is charged with the long-range perception of interests and usually justifies any short-term sacrifices in these terms. A question of interpretation arises, for example, in the decision to insure dues check-off at the expense of a compromise which strengthens the position of employers during strikes. The issue of longer-term interests becomes entangled with the particular interests of the staff whose security of employment may depend on financial solvency.

Given a more spontaneous tendency for enterprise-specific awareness to predominate the union consciousness of employees, it could be argued that, despite the separation of leadership from membership, the former could be meeting the interests of the latter, as the members perceive them. Seen in these terms, successful leadership may be representative of the membership even if it is isolated. The failure of the leadership to deliver an acceptable contract can lead to the rejection of their legitimacy. Depending on the viability of the structures which permit membership input into union policy, alternative leadership could be developed more congruent with members' interests. This tendency for the development of particular interests and processes to restrict the relative autonomy of leadership prevents the character of the union from varying beyond certain limits from the consciousness of the members only to the extent that the means are effective. An alternative response to a failure of the union is disillusionment, or acceptance of the situation. The more demonstrative individuals are in expressing their interests the more confident an observer can be that policies advanced reflect members' perceptions.

The membership, however, is not an homogenous grouping. While non-manual workers more often work in conditions which tend to make unionisation a more problematic process, manual workers, even those in mass industries, do not consistently adopt a conflict perspective. First, the social situation is seldom a matter of a simple relationship between an employer and a unified body of homogeneous employees. There may be important structural reasons in the workplace itself which prevents manual workers from developing a "traditional proletarian" perspective (Lockwood, 1966). Second, evaluations are not entirely given by structural determinants.

The structurally-based differences are especially significant in the mass unions which organize industry-wide and contain members from diverse classifications, occupations and work settings. They will contain numerous particularisms in addition to common or mutual interests reflecting the diversity in social relationships. At both the workplace and community levels "specific loyalties to particular groups within the larger whole" can develop and become the focal point of social interests and interested social action. Since social situations need not form separate wholes but can overlap and be inconsistent, the diversity of social perspectives is enhanced (Brown and Brannen, 1970:207).

White-Collar Collective Organisation

In this situation of heterogeneity, leadership positions may be dominated by specific interests who represent a dominant subset within the structure and are instrumental in shaping the common aims. Particularly in white-collar organizations, the higher classifications may be initially most active in the organization and come to hold a disproportionate share of the executive positions. The probability of such leadership may be one factor in management's decision to recognize a staff association. Such a situation introduces a bias into the organization, for the dominant group may define interests more congruent with its own than with those in other positions. For example, they may prefer percentage rather than across-the-board wage increases because they maintain economic differentials. The position of the leadership grouping is also important because of its preponderant influence in shaping the philosophy of the organization as well as its relationship to the employer, the labour movement and the society as a whole. In this situation of relatively unequal influence and power, the link between the character of the union and the class position of its membership becomes increasingly hard to specify. A conception of an "average interest" may be inappropriate and internal politics may be more important in determining the character of the organization. Nevertheless, given this analysis, it is still maintained that this character is a function of membership, although this is qualified to the extent that it is necessary to identify a dominant subset within the union which shapes the character according to its particular interests and its definition of the general interests.

Cousins and Davis, in rejecting the argument that the incorporation of the working class in contemporary capitalism is an ideological phenomenon, assert that this results from more than the lack of structural homogeneity (1974:277). The social division of labour in its commodity form implies specialization into occupations and industries "with competing claims over tasks and rewards, and as different labour movements" (:285). A dualistic consciousness among workers does not arise directly from sectionalism, which cannot yield enduring and internally coherent ideologies, but rather from the social division of labour determined by commodity production. Given this context they conclude that: "Subordination, 'hermetic' privatisation of working class culture, incorporation, are thus not cultural or political products. They are a necessary and logical feature of the system of commodity production. But so is the potential for their opposite" (:285). Alienation takes several logical forms: first, individual mobility to more independent, less subordinate positions, thereby emphasizing the commodity nature of labour; second, isolation of private aspects of life from the commodity market; and third, a notion of replacing "co-ordination by the capitalist or the market by planning and social control", that is, by rejecting the commodity status of labour (:284-285).

In only a small minority of cases does privatization take the form of a return to

White-Collar Collective Organisation

subsistence living, and thereby indicate a withdrawal from the market economy. Back-to-the-land farmers and young artisans performing hand crafts more often seek a less dependent position vis-à-vis the commodity market. For most employees, privatization involves an emphasis on leisure activities. These, however, are being increasingly commodified and this in turn emphasizes the commodity status of work through the need to secure greater resources to support the needs of private consumption. That is, it supports an instrumental orientation to work. Although MacKinnon (1980) found that work instrumentalism, rather than arising as an orientation external and prior to the work, was strongly affected by work conditions and was a "component of work alienation", the two aspects extrinsic and intrinsic to the work situation, may both tend to reinforce instrumentalism.

In addition, the establishment of the basis for competing ideologies in one structure -- the commodity market for labour -- must not obscure the field of ideology and politics. It is one thing to assert that the selling of labour power will inevitably generate both individualistic and collective ideologies, and a second thing to isolate sociological factors which are related to the specific reproduction, among concrete groupings, of the various ideologies. The analysis must go further than merely to assert the logical range of responses in order to understand the modes of ideological reproduction and transformation.

Under capitalist conditions, Marxists have argued, the seemingly free wage contract and the recognition that workers are paid the full market price for their labour power, combine to mystify the process by which a surplus is pumped out of the direct producers. The wealth which has been created is legally appropriated as the converse of the wages paid and the illusion of a transfer of equivalents affected. In this sense there is a basis in reality for acknowledging the legitimacy of the wage contract. This provides one reason for recognizing the relatively spontaneous adoption of an ideology which confines itself to the terms of sale of labour power while distinguishing this from a class perspective which, in its more developed expression, attempts to delegitimize private appropriation.

It follows from the concept of the collective labourer that the workers are dependent in a very concrete sense on management. The modern factory represents a highly developed form of social production and this helps to explain the finding that the workers tend to view the firm as a "team". The use of this image has important ideological implications. The team image is consciously promoted by management and the media, which can bring substantial resources to its dissemination. At least in North America the image of the unity of the interests between labour and capital has frequently been promoted by unions. Furthermore the concept itself does not imply the absence of internal differences. The interests of the two principals are never identical in all respects and this

White-Collar Collective Organisation

latent antagonism is at least implicit in the responses, although in a specific conjuncture relations may appear harmonious. There is room for the co-existence of relatively contradictory perceptions and consequently social attitudes are not fixed but are emphasized or deemphasized depending on the context.

Which aspect of the complex of relationships is the primary determining factor, while being conditioned by structural processes, is not a simple matter because organizational form and discourse intervene in the determination of action. Commenting on a study of Durham miners, Richard Scase stressed the point that workers even in a traditional community had to be "converted" to the proletarian, dichotomous outlook, and he emphasized the role of ideology in shaping social situational definitions. As Frank Parkin suggests, "although there is a factual and material basis to class inequality, there is more than one way in which it can be interpreted. Facts alone do not provide meanings, and the way a person makes sense of his social world will be influenced by the nature of the meaning-systems he draws upon" (Parkin, 1971). With regard to the new middle stratum in Germany, Geiger held that they corresponded objectively to the Marxist definition of the proletariat but their feelings of being déclassé made for a conscious separation from the working class. While they developed a collective consciousness, as "the joke of history" and the fullest expression of the failure of "Scientific Marxism", it was manifest by their recruitment into fascist parties (1969:94-95). Besides the "'objective' patterns of structural relationships", images of society are shaped by normative influences and "interpretations generated by wider social processes" (Scase, 1974:171).

The trade union movement itself is one such force. Blum points to the need for a white-collar organizing drive to "serve as a catalyst to create the sense of class consciousness" (1971:24). The potential for a working class orientation for such a drive would be an important factor in the long historical process which he indicated would be necessary for white-collar employees to change their identification from the middle class to manual workers. It follows that the view which sees trade union consciousness as the result of an entirely spontaneous process determined by objective factors, in contrast to class consciousness which arises on the basis of direct ideological and political intervention is, in this absolute formulation, a false dichotomy.

Mills argued that individuals could be both unconscious of their interests and falsely conscious of them. He drew a sharp distinction between on the one hand, "economic and social facts" and, on the other hand, "psychological feelings", asserting that there was not necessarily a close association between them (1956:294). At best, subjective attributes must be "stated as probabilities on the basis of objectively defined situations" and associated with various strata within which several sociological dimensions intersect, including class, occupation, status and so on. This disjunction between economic facts and conscious

White-Collar Collective Organisation

representations is a further limitation on the supposed link between the character of a union and the consciousness of its members. As Mills stressed, the link can only be ascertained in the aggregate, on a probability basis.

The industrial relations approach sensitizes the researcher to the wider context of class action, the importance of the class struggle which comprises more than one agent, the business cycle, the facilitative role of the state, the structure of industry, the nature of competing organizations. It raises questions about the differences in the composition of membership, the role of leadership and the potentials for a discrepancy to exist between the policy of an organization, the consciousness of its members and their varied responses. The wider sociology of trade unionism does not necessarily refute the thesis of the stratification school that there is, in general, a connection between the class position of an employee and his union consciousness and response. However, by specifying a number of mediating influences and intervening variables, this approach indicates some of the sources of systematic variation from the predicted ideal types, whether of a structural, ideological or political nature.

Notes

¹ This conceptual difference is articulated most forcefully by those committed in principle to trade unionism and Crompton's conclusions were drawn from her interviews with union activists. In response, Heritage has claimed that employees, in general, do not recognize the ideological differences between these types of organizations (1980:283). Nevertheless, many do draw an important distinction between them while confining this to a relatively narrow sphere primarily concerning militancy.

OCCUPATION AND UNION CHARACTER

Blackburn's conception of "unionateness" denotes the understanding that trade union consciousness can be present to varying degrees. Consistent with the view that trade unionism is at least implicitly a class activity since it is concerned with the terms of exchange in the labour market, unionateness involves two distinct levels. First it is an expression of common interests in an employment situation, that is, the specific relationship of one group of workers with one employer. This relationship can be regarded as one in which mutual interests are of overriding importance or one in which the conflict of interests are most crucial. In turn one set of these immediate interests form the basis of an acceptance of a wider commonality of interests among employees in different work situations.

These orientations were defined by Lockwood as being immediate and instrumental respectively, although the difference is difficult to specify in these terms. General interests among groups of commonly situated workers can be equally as immediate as those that arise within one specific labour contract. This difference between interests which were specific to a given situation and those which were more common over a wider spectrum of employment

White-Collar Collective Organisation

situations was expressed in Lockwood's list of elements which denoted the "class" consciousness of a union. The level of trade union consciousness could be indicated by several factors:

1. the name of the organization, or a change in its title (e.g. from association to union);
2. the purpose or change in purpose of the organization (e.g. whether it embraces collective bargaining mechanisms)
3. advocating and using certain sanctions (e.g. the strike)
4. "by the affiliation of the association to the wider trade union movement"
5. identification of the organization with the political wing of the labour movement
6. sympathetic behaviour in critical class situations
7. "the general social and political outlook of the membership and leaders of the association" (Lockwood, 1958:137-138).

Some of these elements, such as the purpose of the union or methods adopted, were specific to the given employment situation. Others such as the name or title of the association reflected both its internal role and possibly a conceptualisation of the organization's place among similar bodies. The last two measures more directly reflected a "class" perspective and can be distinguished from the narrower conception of trade union consciousness specified earlier. Affiliation or political alignment referred to the wider context of general interests. Finally, the outlook of the members and leaders would permeate all of the elements listed. In addition, this listing included such diverse issues as attitude, adoption of sanctions in principle, and actual behaviour. The latter tends to predominate and it is largely what the members of an organization do, expressed in part by the type of association they create, which gives an indication of their "class" consciousness.

While Blackburn was similarly concerned to measure class consciousness, he confined his defining elements more closely to trade unionism excluding the wider issues of class outlook or behaviour. "Class" consciousness was associated particularly with the character of the union to which the employees belonged. The same distinction between levels of interests appeared in the elements he specified to measure unionateness:

1. the main function of the organization was collective bargaining and protection of members' interests as employees;
2. the organization was independent of the employers for the purpose of negotiations;
3. it was prepared to be militant, using all forms of industrial action including the strike;
4. it declared itself to be a trade union;
5. it was registered as a trade union;
6. it was affiliated to the T.U.C.;
7. it was affiliated to the Labour Party.

In line with Lockwood's conceptualization, unionateness combined two distinct series of

White-Collar Collective Organisation

elements relating to the level of the formation of a defensive organization to protect employee interests and to the progressively greater identification of the union with the trade union movement as a whole. The first three of his elements referred to "the behaviour and function of the organization itself" while the last four measured the level of identification (or alliance) with the labour movement (Blackburn, 1967:20-21).

Several difficulties with the application of this measure were obvious to Blackburn. It included elements of both stated purpose and observable action although the former need not be expressed in the latter. The indices differed on the level of measurement involved, some being continuous and others dichotomous. The sense given is that the list approaches a scale, although Blackburn does not make this claim. He argued that there is "a tendency for them all to vary together", but they were not all equivalent such that one could represent the others. Some of the items were declared to be "more fundamental" than others, such as declaring an organization to be a trade union (:42). This was seen as problematic, however, since there were always "good reasons" for not changing a name. Finally, it was possible to adopt the elements selectively. Affiliation to the T.U.C., for example, would not necessarily have implied registration as a trade union or a public declaration of union status (:38).

As Blackburn noted (1967:20), there were two distinct subsets in the concept "unionateness" concerned with employees' immediate employment interests and with their relationship with the wider union movement. This distinction was subsequently drawn out farther and was conceptualized as a distinction between "enterprise" and "society" unionateness: Enterprise unionateness involves the idea of a progression of activities vis-à-vis an employer; an increasing assertion of the differences of interest between employer and employee and of the independence of the representative association, as well as the threat of increasingly severe sanctions to backup claims (Prandy, Stewart and Blackburn, 1976:431). The emphasis was placed less on behaviour and more on the "willingness to countenance various activities". The authors argue, for example that use of the strike is dependent on circumstances, while acceptance of the strike in principle would be "related more to a wider range of experiences" (:431).

"Society unionateness" involved "a recognition by the organization of the similarity of its interests to those of other organizations and a willingness to ally itself with them" (:431). The concept was concerned with the interests defensive associations had in common, consistent with Lockwood notion of a similarity of instrumental interests. The principal measure of this recognition of wider interests is the participation in the labour movement and the political wing of this movement (in Britain, affiliation to the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party).

Although the authors recognized that there were numerous cases in which the two aspects of "unionateness" varied independently (:430), they argued that they were logically

White-Collar Collective Organisation

connected. First, those pursuing their interest in affecting the distribution of rewards in society "are likely to extend their activities into the political or societal sphere" (:432). Second, an organization which exists in a particular setting to negotiate with an employer operates in a context of industrial relations policies which affect all such bodies and produce common interests vis-à-vis the state.

There is a second very important distinction drawn by the authors between union character as measured by the positions of an organization and union attitudes among the membership. In one sense, union character is indicated by the explicit purposes and declared intentions of the organization. This formal character is determined by the constitution and by decisions of the governing bodies. The problem of membership input into union policy has been raised above. Despite formal procedures to maximize the representativeness of the executive of the convention delegates, there may be considerable differences between the understanding of the membership and their representatives. The less immediately accountable a representative is, the more room there is for a particularistic definition of interests. Besides being charged with the longer- range interests of the organization, the representatives are subject to information and pressures which their members are not. Accountability often takes the form of explaining the positions adopted, that is, the formal union character, to the membership. Again, consciousness is a product of articulation as well as position.

For many reasons, then, there exists a considerable discrepancy between what members wish and what representatives procure; between what members believe and are prepared to do and the formal character of their union. There may be a limit to this cleavage, and membership revolts against union leaders are not uncommon although an alternative response would be disillusion and disinterest in union affairs. In short, union character may not be a completely reliable guide to the consciousness of the employees themselves. In addition to measuring the formal character of the union, the concept of "unionateness" was used by Blackburn to assess the level of trade union consciousness among members directly. This may be a more reliable method for ascertaining differences in response among various categories of employees, particularly when they belong to an industrial-type union in which, at best, the formal character represents only a notion of a mean interest of the constituent parts, and for testing the relationship between unionism and occupational position.

Enterprise unionateness

(i) Need for Collective Organisation

It was argued above that the nature of the employment situation is, fundamentally, an individual relationship with an employer. From the point of view of the employee it is his specific job and he can be laid-off individually or fired from his position, or find a better situation. However, it was further argued that employees in more autonomous work

White-Collar Collective Organisation

situations would be in a position in which this individual, careerist orientation would predominate and any negotiation over the terms of sale of labour power would be a more individualistic affair. While those in relatively homogeneous, more concentrated and less personal employment situations are more likely to seek collective means to defend their interests, the more autonomous employee may be more likely to emphasize his peculiar market opportunities and see collective representation as unnecessary and perhaps harmful to his interests since his own particular demands may be submerged in the overall bargaining. Should these relatively autonomous or privilege positions change to a degree, there may develop a felt need for some type of association despite a preference that there be none.

According to Prandy, *et al.*, the largest single empirical gap is between feeling no need for an association of any sort and coming to accept the need for collective representation. The belief in an individualistic career advance could be seen as an alternative to organisation. Those doing collective work who, nevertheless, believe themselves to be on a career escalator, would react ambivalently in terms of their assessment of short- term gains and long-term losses. But with the general spread of unionism to relatively privileged groups, adopting collective means may be more acceptable and more probable.

(ii) Labour-Management Committees

The employment situation, however, is not only a matter of negotiating terms and setting the limits to the direct control of management over the manner of carrying on work. There is also the work itself, both in the narrow sense of the employee's own speciality and of the overall goals of the enterprise. Different job situations are relatively more alienating as well as more or less rewarding. Some, especially those areas which involve defined responsibility for segments of the operation, will tend to be associated with an orientation which emphasises the good of the larger whole, always tempered with the good of their particular unit within it. In this situation a labour-management committee may be seen as a possible forum for joint discussion of matters of mutual interest: the better management of the enterprise.

Defined in this way, the general is assumed to take precedence over the particular and the labour-management committee would be a poor device for securing sectional ends, or the ends of employees with respect to management. In general, however, such committees are not organised to express the common goal. They often arise as a result of the employees' desire to have some effect in determining their conditions of work. The formation of a "labour-management" committee, in these precise terms, is at least implicitly recognition of the distinct interests of the two parties and although the formal definition of the committee may be to maximise common goals, labour may use it as a representative instrument to press its own claims. Questions about the terms of reference of the committee, its sphere of

White-Collar Collective Organisation

competence, its methods of reaching a decision, its status as a consultative or advisory or managing body, the means of implementing decisions, as well as such internal issues as electing a chairman, the voting procedure, even the daily agenda -- all of these become political matters and potentially items of conflict which clarify the different interests within the enterprise.

If the expressed need for collective representation is the most general statement of the dissatisfaction with the effects of individual bargaining, the labour-management committee may be regarded as one of the least conflictual forms of association, in its conceptualisation as a consultation body operating as an arm of management for enlightened decision making. It can be seen as an alternative to 'trade unions' which embody the spirit of conflict of interests, of sectional ends seen as contradicting common goals. The term 'labour-management' denotes mutuality and harmony.

But even in the case of more autonomous and privileged workers, there are differences between employer and employee and the practice of the committee, as described above, makes a degree of conflict probable. Although it is an intricate combination of particular and general ends, the latter predominate. Trade unions may also take into consideration the goals of the enterprise, but the labour-management committee is explicitly structured for this purpose. In this sense it is often seen as an alternative to other forms of more overtly conflictual forms of organisation, as Crompton claims (1976). Nevertheless some form of collective consciousness is required for the expression of a need or preference for such a committee. In general, those in positions of authority or with clear prospects for career advance would most likely, at least initially, limit their collective consciousness to less conflictual forms.

(iii) Collective bargaining

If the Labour-Management committee emphasises collective goals and the ultimate authority of management, collective bargaining is a further statement of the independence of the two parties in the employment relationship. While collective consciousness is expressed in a labour-management forum in a form which recognises the rights of management to make final decisions (at least as this practice is institutionalised in North America), collective bargaining is a process which operates at the level of the formal and legal equality of the two parties for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of employment acceptable to both parties. It presupposes a sense of collectivity among the employees, a recognition that they have common interests *vis-à-vis* management and that their ends can best be met in a representative organisation. There is conflict among the employees between goals they have in common and possible sectional variations from these, and the decision to adopt collective bargaining will depend on the extent to which sectional and common ends can be met relative to any sacrifices which have to be made to accommodate the sectional interests of

White-Collar Collective Organisation

other parties in the alliance. The more concentrated and homogeneous the employment situation the more likely is it that the employees will seek to maximise their advantages through collective pressure. Groups will resist such organization to the extent that they can meet their sectional ends in other ways, or their position in the larger unit is undermined by the interests of more powerful parties. This resistance may be reinforced by management practices which extend concessions granted other, often unionised, workers to those who are not organised, either gratuitously or through independent committee structures.

However, as a form of enterprise specific unionism, the term 'collective bargaining' itself has wider connotations and is associated with manual trade unionism, with the pursuit of sectional ends contradicting the best interests of the enterprise, with an ideology. The terms within which the negotiations are couched reflects the wider social context and are implicitly evaluations of it. With respect to enterprise unionateness, the basic difference lies in the specifics of negotiating. Collective bargaining is enforced by the state; it involves written agreements binding on the parties and specifies remedies. It is a considerable step beyond a labour-management committee, as commonly practiced, sense it institutionalises an adversarial system emphasising the separation of the interests of the parties rather than their mutual enterprise-goal interests. It underlines the inequalities of power and the need to gain bargaining power through some collective action and to have the terms carefully specified rather than trusting in the good-will of management. The problem often arises, however, that the compromises reached through negotiations reflect this power position. Without some remedy for a potential break-down on irreconcilable differences, collective bargaining may be a "blank cartridge".

(iv) Compulsory Arbitration

If for some the acceptance of collective bargaining was the sine qua non of trade unionism, of an attitude to labour- management relations which emphasised conflict, for others the chief distinction between the two forms was not a question of negotiations, which could be carried on in an adversarial or a 'gentlemanly' manner, but of the sanctions which could be imposed on recalcitrant parties and the meaning of such sanctions. The most generous assumption was that good will would prevail and negotiation would be concluded in a general agreement based on the facts and reasoned arguments presented.

If this reasonable approach to negotiations is found to fail, then compulsory arbitration may be regarded as a suitable instrument which would be fair to both parties and allow for the adjudication of a dispute without the necessity for a display of force by either party. Acceptance of arbitration implied a realisation that interested parties could sometimes fail to agree, a belief in the effectiveness of neutral mechanisms and a belief that bargaining need not imply a conflict over power.

There are many objections to the use of arbitration procedures. Among them would

White-Collar Collective Organisation

be the claim that a neutral body would be unable to judge the merits of a specific case and consequently would be prone to mistaken interpretations and unjust awards. It made considerable difference who was appointed to the Board and to the Chairmanship. A Board might be more prone to define the award in terms of broad economic factors, a situation labour representatives regard as accepting management's definition of the situation. In addition, Boards often operate largely on precedent and this makes the arbitration route less innovative with respect to workers' demands for new concessions, not only in salary negotiations but especially in the area of working conditions and management prerogatives.

In general, arbitration will be regarded as an acceptable alternative to more militant remedies by those more privileged employment situations. More importantly, however, arbitration may be a route preferred by those who feel that they do not have the appropriate power-base with which to compel employers to accept their terms. Or it may reflect an ideological preference for a non-adversarial relationship with the employer. In the former case, arbitration may be preferred by blue-collar workers who lack the economic strength to force compliance with their terms; white-collar workers, especially those in more autonomous situations will be in a similar position. Those with connections to authority, whether immediately or potentially, will more like respond in terms of the latter case. Again, although the difference will not be exclusively along a manual/non-manual line, more non-manual workers have traditionally been in less collective situations and will therefore adopt less unionate forms. As with the difference between labour-management committees and collective bargaining, the distinction between arbitration and the strike is not simply more or less unionate but can be regarded as alternatives. This would make the scalability of the items problematic.

(v) Industrial Action

The sanctioning of relatively 'mild' forms of collective industrial action is a further stage in the recognition of the independence of the interests separating management and employees. It involves a belief that the interests are not merely different but that some actual use of power is required to induce acceptance of union demands. There is logically a considerable gap between the potential for reasonable negotiations and the use of force, but the perception of the failure of arbitration often leads to acceptance of more conflictual approaches, the type depending largely on the possibilities inherent in the situation.

On-the-job action has the useful effect that it permits a continuation of employment and hence earnings. At the same time, essential work is done as the employees strive to meet at least a modicum of the common interests in the enterprise. However, it may be more difficult, because more personal, to remain at work and consistently work-to-rule, especially in smaller employment situations. Industrial action often involves direct conflict with the supervisor on the first line of authority who in many cases is an object of special enmity.

White-Collar Collective Organisation

Depending on the exclusions policy of the collective agreement, many lower-level supervisors may also be union members, placing them in a precarious position. For many, the options of on-the-job action may be less palatable than an actual strike. Here again, the choice of tactics raises issues beyond a desire not to antagonise management or disrupt services. Workers in weak bargaining positions may prefer on-the-job action where their effectiveness will have a greater potential, although they face the possibility of a lock-out. On the other hand, weak units in which there is little collective support for industrial action will tend to eschew such tactics.

(vi) The Strike

The strike is the highest sanction discussed under enterprise unionateness. More radical measures could be included on the scale such as plant occupations. Blackburn's unionateness scale, however, emphasises only those legal means which may be considered part of the normal run of collective bargaining. In addition there are also numerous intermediate sanctions which could be imposed: collecting signatures on a petition, organising an information picket, holding a protest demonstration or march and so on, many of which could be undertaken in lieu of a strike or during such industrial action. The strike remains the ultimate legal sanction and is an explicit rejection of the immediate goals of the enterprise, in the short run. It is a statement that the conflict of interests can only be settled by a demonstration of power.

It is this overt statement of conflict which strikes directly at the attitude of employee loyalty and employer paternalism. Yet there is more to the strike weapon than a statement of irreconcilable differences and more reasons for rejecting the option than identification with management, or the belief in the goals of the enterprise. It is a visibly public act which is usually accompanied by picketing, strike pay normally being dependent on active participation. For a group relatively new to industrial militancy, the immediately personal experience of being demonstrably on strike, confronting the public, attempting to bar strike-breakers, seeing supervisors going through the lines, is accompanied by considerable hardship and groups require some self-assurance to willingly participate.

There is also the factor of material hardship. In straight financial terms strikers often lose more than they gain, although advantages gained in working conditions are less easily specified in monetary terms. At a minimum family consumption is limited for the duration. In some cases, particularly in government employment (although 'wild-cat' strikes can occur in any jurisdiction), the strike may not be a legitimate sanction. In this case the question of union consciousness involves less the actualisation of a strike and more the expression of the need to have the legal right to withdraw services. In fairly extreme circumstances employees will resort to illegal strikes or, especially in semi-professional employment, to mass resignations. The effectiveness of the resignation is partly dependent upon the market

White-Collar Collective Organisation

situation and on the moral justification for taking the action. In certain service situations, whereas the strike is seen as the abandonment of responsibility, the resignation may be seen as putting principle first, as sacrificing personal interest. While resignations may be regarded as the logical extension of an individualistic employment situation, it is seldom used because of the insecurity and the inevitable threat that the job may be lost permanently.

The strike has the strongest overtones of employer/employee conflict and the acceptance of the strike would vary with position in the productive system. Again, however, this broadly includes such factors as relative autonomy, authority function, degree of collectivity, bargaining strength, career prospects, and so on. The issue of the right to strike in government service raises other important questions. These will be discussed in more detail below.

(i) Scope of organisation

The most general form of established trade unionism involves the relationship between one employer and a body of employees. If this situation was characteristic of the labour market as a whole, then it would be reasonable to envisage one trade union, one set of negotiations and one complex contract. Given the division of labour into distinct occupation and the division of the workforce between distinct enterprises, the formation of trade unions would reflect this divisiveness.

The conditions of the labour market imply, for employees, a position of relative co-operation with the employer and competition between peers. For manual and non-manual workers as well as sub-sets within each category such as skilled craftsmen or professionals, the degree of recognition of common interests could stop at specific socially defined barriers. The restriction of the realisation of common interests to one employment situation could be expanded by broadening the definition of interests to include a wider scope of similar employment situations. In principle, members of an occupational category with a specific labour skill could sell their labour to any employer requiring that quality of labour and are free to change employers. There exists, then, a wider nexus of common interests vis-à-vis the body of employers and a wider conception of unionism would reflect this condition by establishing common terms and help to eliminate competition among themselves. A broader scope of organisational membership, then, expresses recognition of a wider set of common interests. This scope is articulated through a claimed jurisdiction which may be a positive inclusion of similarly situated employees or a negative exclusion of others.

Secondly, the scope may be increased by including a wider diversity of occupations in the single enterprise, or in combination with the first type, in several enterprises. Again, this is expressed with respect to the limits of the claimed jurisdiction of the organisation. There are no necessary limits to the membership of a union and all employees could be similarly organised. In Canada the One Big Union was the most significant attempt this century to

White-Collar Collective Organisation

construct such an alliance of working people. The point here is that the larger the scope of the organisation, or its anticipated jurisdiction, the wider the recognition of common interests.

Despite this element of commonality, the development of industrial unions, embracing many occupations and employment situations, there is a need to recognize sectional ends. A union with such an enlarged membership will normally devise a structure which will permit institutional expression of sectional interests. However, these will be limited by the definition of common interests and conflict will result when the two sets come into contradiction. In The Canadian civil service prior to the creation of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, two types of organizations competed for membership. One of these endorsed the principle of an amalgamated union in which all occupations would be integrated into a common structure. The alternative organization endorsed a federation approach of separate structured associations based on departmental occupational divisions. Under the federation principle the central directing body -- the representatives of the broader interests of the whole and responsible for balancing the sectional interests -- had less power and each separate grouping retained considerable autonomy. Both principles recognized the existence of common interests, hence the perceived need for a larger alliance. But the federation approach allowed for a wider expression of sectional interests. Although the optimal size of an organization is limited by perceptions of common interests, a relatively more autonomous structure permits a wider definition of jurisdiction, or scope of membership situations.

If pressures of competition may, in some circumstances, dictate an exclusive policy with regard to scope of membership, there are also some advantages to an expanded jurisdiction. Centralisation permits more resources for the common use of all units and permits more strength in bargaining, for example, by reducing the inter-provincial differential for given occupations. Since such a union is in a potential position of greater financial strength, there may be perceived an unfortunate trade-off: strength versus sectional interests. Those with more independent bargaining strength, or with the most developed sectional interests, will be less likely to choose an organisation with a broad scope, whereas those in relatively weak positions may prefer a larger union for its potential power. Not surprisingly, when the Public Service alliance was formed in the federal civil service, the professionals, who feared that their special needs and interests would not be met in the larger structure, decided to remain separate.

(ii) Name of the Organisation

As the discussion of enterprise unionism argued, various sanctions would be regarded as legitimate depending on the conception of the nature of the organisation -- the two being intricately tied together. Within the terms of collective bargaining, a distinction can be drawn

White-Collar Collective Organisation

between an 'association' and a 'union'. In practice, little definite content can be assigned the former, although there is a tendency to avoid the strike, and various activities may be characterised as appropriate only for a union.

Along with this conception of the appropriate stance of the organisation vis-à-vis management and the enterprise as a whole, would correspond different names connoting a more or less unionate position. For example, in the federal civil service the militant postal workers changed the title of their organisation to 'union' from 'association' when they reorganised in the early 1960s to seek collective bargaining and the right to strike. Within the broad Public Service Alliance, a wide range of names and semi-autonomous bodies continue to exist. The professionals, following the practice in England, named their organisation an "Institute".

The name, then, may symbolise the orientation of the organisation to the tenants of trade unionism. Or it may express the claimed jurisdiction of the organisation. The initial naming of the association may reflect its position vis-à-vis trade unionism quite consciously. Further changes in jurisdiction may be indicated by an evolution of the name, for example, from 'civil servants' to 'government employees' to 'public employees'. Nevertheless, the typology of the name does not necessarily reflect the evolution of character. While a decision to change this typology is important is the sense that it indicates the self-characterisation of the organisation and potentially indicates the consciousness of the membership, the absence of a formal change does not indicate the absence of an evolutionary process altering the character of the organisation. Similarly, internal debates on the appropriate name may be significant indicators of this evolution or only of the relative strength of various forces internal to the union. Historically, the nature and timing of these debates are symbolic of other tendencies towards or away from trade unionism.

Because of the complicated question of what is involved in determining a typology, the question of the name may be subject to wide variations. The desire to change the name from 'association' to 'union' may be indicative of a more unionate consciousness, but the decision to leave it unchanged need not imply the opposite conclusion since there are often pragmatic reasons for doing so (Blackburn, 1967).

The question of the name of an organisation has implications for both enterprise and society unionateness. The choice of a typology is partly a reflection of the status of the labour- management relationship within the enterprise and the experiences at the micro-level. The abandonment of a Labour-Management committee for collective bargaining might occasion a name change. But both the new form desired and any possible name change which could symbolise the new perception of the employment relationship, have reference to wider spheres of influence and ideology, including society-wide factors. While the relationship remains local, the symbol connotes a class of similar bodies and indicates a

White-Collar Collective Organisation

specific image. Trade unionism implies a relatively permanent conflict of interests and those who aspire to top positions may be more comfortable, while pursuing collective bargaining aims in the short-run, to belong to less perpetually antagonistic bodies.

(iii) Trade Union Act

Whether an organisation comes under the provisions of the trade union act is similarly a question of both micro-and macro-level unionism. Labour-management committees, existing in numerous North American enterprises, operate external to the provisions of the trade Union Act which is the legislation which formalises the process of collective bargaining for most private sector employees.

Certain groups of workers -- particularly public employees, but also small producers -- have frequently been denied the right to come under the provisions of the Trade Union Act. Where this is the case, a demand for collective bargaining could be met in one of two ways. Either the government could remove the restrictions, or it could enact special legislation. The differences between the trade Union Act and such a Collective Bargaining Act concerns such issues as a defined jurisdiction, a range of exclusions, and a limitation on legal sanctions. A common provision is to make strike action illegal and substitute compulsory arbitration.

The act which is applicable to a given group of employees regulates the relationship with management at the local level. A desire to come under the Trade Union Act is connected with management at the local level. A desire to come under the Trade Union Act is connected with this micro-level bargaining and reflects a new conception of the best means to secure enterprise- specific ends. To reject the trade union act, then, does not imply a rejection of the principle of collective bargaining. While less common, it also does not necessarily mean abandonment of the right to strike, since such a clause may be provided in special legislation (although where this is the case, it is ham- strung by a list of 'designated employees') which limits its effectiveness.

In addition, however, the Trade Union Act regulates the employment practices of the great majority of employees and the desire to come under the act may express a degree of identification with the larger union movement and the manual working class, for whom the act was originally intended. It means giving up the claim to special status and provides an indication of society unionateness.

(iv) Affiliation to the Central Labour Body

Lockwood (1958) distinguished between an instrumental and an ideological reason for joining a central labour body. The former concerned those aspects of trade unionism which are common to all such organisations such as general rights for all workers and the legal framework of the collective bargaining process. The latter referred more directly to identification with manual workers. For many public employees, who lack many trade union rights, joining a central labour body creates an alliance with a powerful group of employees

White-Collar Collective Organisation

in order to receive their support in securing these rights shared by other workers. The most pertinent example in Canada is the right to strike and the trade Union Act. However, the labour movement normally defines its concerns more widely than these employment-specific concerns. Native rights, Quebec's right to self-determination, regional disparity, and many other national interests are advocated by the Canadian Labour congress and the Congress supported the right to strike for public workers before such legislation was provided in the country. Ideologically, then, joining the C.L.C. implies a host of economic and political positions which many members may not be prepared to condone.

The micro-level consideration concerns the question of benefits received as opposed to the costs of affiliation. Dues are deducted directly from a pay cheque while support to obtain trade union rights or mutual identification with the wider goals of the labour movement is more abstract and nebulous. The debate for and against affiliation is couched, on both sides, on instrumental and ideological grounds, and delegates to conventions can be persuaded to accept C.L.C. membership despite membership directions to reject affiliation on ideological grounds.

In general, the acceptance of membership in the wider trade union movement is not purely instrumental and organisations must come to terms with the broader view taken. It is, *de facto*, recognition of common objectives. It should be noted, however, that the existence of a single central labour body is not common to all societies. In some Western nations, notably West Germany and Sweden, there are separate labour centrals for manual and non-manual workers. This is significant for the question of the class consciousness of members and trade unionism as an indication of this consciousness, since it provides two clearly defined class poles. In Canada the question is to join or not join the Labour Congress. Non-manual workers who feel the need for a wider alliance and collective action do not have the option of confining the scope of their affiliation solely to organisations representing employees in similar horizontal classifications but must contemplate an alliance with manual workers.

(v) Affiliation with a Labour Party

The last ideological/instrumental response in Blackburn's model of society unionateness is for employees to express their general collective interests in the wider social context through a political party or movement. In many countries, such as Britain, there is an organisational and ideological link between the central labour body and a labour party, the latter representing the more general interests of the working class. In Canada such a party is the New Democratic Party. There are, however, difficulties in using support for this party as an indication of class consciousness. In the first place the supposed link between the interests of the unionists, or wage- and-salary groupings in general, and the policies of the political party, may be wide. The point of departure of a political party is society as a whole rather than only the point of view of organised workers. There may be a discrepancy between the

White-Collar Collective Organisation

short-term perceptions of employees' interests and the policies pursued by the labour party.

Second, in principle, high class consciousness may be indicated by the rejection of the labour party as not sufficiently committed to the interests of workers. In Canada, furthermore, there is a weak (although positive) correlation between class and voting patterns, a connection which reflects the complications of the political party system. However, this connection is strongest for the New Democratic Party. It was partly the creation of the Canadian Labour Congress and receives unqualified support from the National labour body, although it has not yet been able to influence the voting of a majority of trade unionists. In some provinces, the labour central (Provincial Federations of Labour) have withdrawn their support from the N.D.P. after its terms in office. However, the origins of the party and the degree of positive correlation with the working class vote, justifies its inclusion in a society unionateness scale.