# מכון הג'וינט **לגרונטולוגיה והתפתחות אדם וחברה בישראל** על עום ברוקדייל

GERONTOLOGY AND ADULT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN ISRAEL American Joint Distribution Committee

# **DISCUSSION PAPER**

PATTERNS OF OCCUPATIONAL AUTHORITY AND CONTROL OF RESOURCES

by

GILA NOAM



No. D-33-78

ירועלים, הבנות-רם, ת.ד. Jerusalem, Givat-Ram, P.O.B.13087.

#### THE INSTITUTE

is a national center devoted to research, experimentation and education in gerontology and adult human development. It was founded and is funded by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (AJDC) with the assistance of the Brookdale Foundation and the support of the Government of the State of Israel. Its research is policy- and program-oriented, multidisciplinary and, primarily, of an applied nature.

The Institute tries to identify socially relevant problems and to recommend alternative solutions to problems of the health, and social services and policies. It attempts to bring together academic and governmental experts, and other public officials and citizens in order to link research findings with their implementation.

#### **DISCUSSION PAPERS**

are produced by members of the Institute for distribution to students of the social and behavioral sciences, professionals and elected or appointed officials who make decisions affecting social policies and programs.

Their purpose is to direct attention to issues of national importance in order to promote informed public debate for the development of sound policies and programs.

The findings and conclusions presented in such papers are those of the author or authors and do not purport to represent the views of the Institute, and of other persons or groups associated with it. BR-D-33-78

Patterns of occupational authority and c



PATTERNS OF OCCUPATIONAL AUTHORITY AND CONTROL OF RESOURCES

by

Gila Noam

This paper was written under the guidance of Professor J. Matras to whom sincerest thanks are due, and thanks to Vera Eden who was responsible for the typing of this Material.

August 1978

D-33-78

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Definition of Job Power	3
Investigation of Job Power	4
PART I: Source of Data	7
PART II: Measuring Job Power	8
Control of Resources	8
PART III: Measuring Access to Job Power	26
Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Controllers of Resources	26
PART IV: Returns to Job Power: Rewards and Payoffs of Resource Control	37
PART V: A Path Model of Access and Returns to Job Power	44
PART VI: Summary of Main Results	52
PART VII: Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research	58
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	66

#### INTRODUCTION

The general purpose of this paper is to describe a preliminary investigation of power and influence in the work situation of respondents in a small, urban Israeli sample. The underlying assumption of this investigation is that power on the job has significant implications for the individual status profile and may in addition be an axis for the development and crystallization of social groupings.

The significance and utility of occupation as an indicator of the individual's social standing has been clearly established (see Blau and Duncan, p. 6, and the discussion in Simha, pp. 10-14), but until now interest has focused on occupations primarily in terms of the education and income components of socio-economic status (SES) or the prestige accruing to them. Much less attention has been accorded to the relevance of other aspects of occupations (the power and control they imply, among them) to the analysis of social inequality and stratification (see Kluegel, 1975).

Power and control, on the other hand, have often been focused on in the context of the extensive literature on the authority structures of industrial organizations, autonomy on the job, and chains of command in various types of organizational and bureaucratic structures (see, for example, Presthus, 1962; Hall, 1972). However, most of this literature is anchored in a "human relations" approach or aims at characterizing different organizational structures, and does not deal directly with the implications of power and influence for the individual's general social standing or for the formation of social groupings.

In this paper I shall attempt to cast power and influence on the job (referred to hereinafter as "job power") primarily in terms of control or resources relevant to the work situation, and then to analyze the patterns of distribution of such control and the avenues of recruitment to controlling positions. It should be particularly interesting to examine whether job power is associated with specific occupations - presumably those enjoying high prestige - or is distributed throughout the occupational spectrum. Such findings would enable us to determine empirically whether job power is simply a proxy for occupational prestige, or whether it has significance in and of itself as an occupational characteristic which is both measurable and relevant to stratification processes. Further, we will attempt to determine the extent to which a connection exists between the control of various types of resources, autonomy on the job, and the receipt of returns and rewards. In general, Israeli society seems to be a particularly interesting setting for the study of a variable such as occupational authority or job power. This, in light of the fact that few <u>empirically-based</u> studies exist aimed at the measurement of the effects on social stratification of Israel's fairly recent attainment of political independence and of the process of absorption of massive numbers of immigrants. Beyond the assertion often made (see Eisenstadt, 1967) of such societal transformation being associated with increased differentiation of the class system and the growing importance of achievement-based status criteria, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that in such a society axes of status other than education, occupation, and income might assume considerable significance both for individual social status and as the bases for the formation of social groupings. The present study attempts to evaluate the significance of one such variable - job power - in this context.

#### The Definition of Job Power

As noted above, job power was conceived of as both a resource which may be converted into various privileges and rewards and as a reward in and of itself. Furthermore, our original conception of job power was based on a perception of this variable as the end-product of a balance between the power, influence, and control granted the worker in his work situation on the one hand, and the resources denied him on the other. The latter consisted primarily of a denial of such resources as freedom of choice, autonomy, physical strength, the possibility of engaging in other desired activities, etc. Thus a respondent enjoying maximum

- 3 -

control and power on the one hand, and having a minimum of the above resources denied him on the other, would be noted as having maximum job power.

At the outset, it was assumed that job power has significance for stratification not simply as a dichotomous variable (i.e., whereby the individual either controls or does not control the disposition of various resources in the context of his work situation). Rather, significance was attached to differential degrees of proximity to the focus of control or power. This approach clearly differs from that of Dahrendorf (1959) who believes that a clear-cut line can be drawn between those who participate in the exercise of authority in a given association and those who are subject to the authoritative commands of others. Thus, he notes, "Contrary to all criteria of social stratification, authority does not permit the construction of a scale." Our approach - which viewed job power as a continuous variable - was based on the assumption that differential degrees of proximity to the focus of control or power may be associated with the attainment of various privileges and both instrumental and expressive rewards. This seemed to be a particularly reasonable assumption in the Israeli context, where the relatively small scale of many places of employment is likely to allow for personal relationships between superiors and subordinates, with such relationships and "connections" yielding benefits and rewards. In addition, it seems reasonable to assume that differential degrees of proximity to the "center" would be associated with different levels of a sense of participation in and identification with the work organization.

#### Investigation of Job Power

In light of our original conception of job power as the product of a balance between the power and control wielded by the worker on the one hand, and

- 4 -

the resources denied him on the other, three major sets of questions (which will be described in detail in Part III) were viewed as relevant to the measurement of job power: a) Questions as to the control of various resources in the work situation; b) Questions as to autonomy on the job; and c) Questions as to resources denied the worker - physical strength, time to indulge in desired activities, and freedom of choice as to behavior in such spheres as style of dress, participation in savings or pension plans, charity donations, etc. We hoped to examine the following questions:

- 1) Which individuals or groups (primarily occupational)
  - a. exercise control either alone or with others over various resources on the job;
  - b. enjoy various levels of autonomy on the job;
  - c. are denied or are not denied various resources in the framework of their work situations.

Such information, we believed, would shed light on the degree to which job power is <u>not</u> synonymous with occupational prestige, and thus is significant in and of itself as a component of social status and as a potential axis for the formation of status groupings. On a more theoretical level, such data might also provide <u>empirical</u> support for one or another of the approaches to stratification described by Thielbar and Feldman (op.cit.).

2) What is the relationship between control of resources, autonomy, and negation of resources. For example, are those in control characterized by greater autonomy and/or by fewer resources being denied them? Such questions are addressed to the problem of status or class crystallization, and the extent to which job power serves as an axis for the formation of distinct social groupings.

- 3) What are the patterns of recruitment to positions of power and influence? How is recruitment to such positions associated with such socio-demographic variables as ethnic origin, education, age, occupation, and background variables such as father's education and occupation? Such information would enable us to delineate paths of attainment of job power and characterize the incumbents of powerful positions.
- 4) Is job power associated with the receipt of rewards and payoffs, primarily income? To what extent is job power (and each of its components - resource control, autonomy, non-denial of resources) associated with job satisfaction?

As will become apparent later, not all these questions could be answered satisfactorily in the framework of a small urban sample. However, our data do seem to yield several preliminary insights into power and authority in the work situation and its implications for individual status and the formation of social groupings.

which the state of the state is the second second and the second se

the start has been a second start where the start of a second start of the start as the

and a set in the set of a set of the set of the

a set and the set of the set of the set of a set of the set of the

President and the base of the training the set of the set of the second

1 TON STATES

tions as a rescriptional device execution of an and the second of a construction of a second of a second of the se

- 6 -

#### PART I: SOURCE OF DATA

The questionnaire of the Mobility and Stratification Study (see Appendix A) was addressed to 463 respondents aged 20 and over, in September-December 1974. The study population was arrived at by the Kifs sampling method and constitutes a representative sample of the urban adult population residing in Jerusalem, Haifa, and the Tel-Aviv urban complex. The study was carried out in cooperation with the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research. The sample comprised 80% males and 20% females. Two pretests were carried out prior to the actual study. The population of the first consisted of 28 respondents aged 20+ residing in the Tel-Aviv area, sampled by a similar method to that used in the final study, and the population of the second - of 19 respondents aged 20+ residing in Jerusalem. The study included questions in several spheres:

- General questions as to the socio-demographic background of the respondent (sex, age, marital status, education, geo-cultural origin and length of residence in Israel);
- Questions as to the respondent's current employment status, his employment
  5 years ago, and his first job;
- 3) The same series of questions as in paragraph two were asked with reference to a) the respondent's spouse (his/her current job, job 5 years ago, and first job), b) the respondent's father at the time the respondent was 14 years of age, and c) with reference to the respondent's spouse's father when the spouse was 14 years of age;
- Specific questions as to the respondent's current work situation. These dealt primarily with autonomy, control of resources, "negation" of resources, and job satisfaction;

- 7 -

- 5) Questions as to the education of the respondent's spouse and the respondent's parents;
- 6) Questions as to fertility and housing density;
- 7) Questions as to participation in voluntary associations;
- 8) Questions as to help-giving and help-seeking behavior.

In addition, a section of the questionnaire not directly relevant to the subject of this paper was devoted to the subjective ranking of occupations by means of an unstructured stimuli method (see V. Kraus, "The Social Grading of Occupations in Israel," 1976).

#### PART II: MEASURING JOB POWER

Questions in the study directly relevant to the investigation of job power and the method of measurement of each job power variable will be discussed in detail below. In Part IV the main <u>results</u> of the investigation of the various component variables of job power will be described.

#### Control of Resources

Control of various resources relevant to the work situation of the respondent was conceived of as being a significant component or dimension of "job power". The resources considered here can be classified, following Kluegel (1975), as referring to two types of control: task-related control and economic control. The former refers to the extent to which an individual exercises control over the way in which others perform their work, while the latter - to the extent of control over the amount of rewards others receive. Thus the three spheres of resource control examined in our study are:

- 8 -

- 1) Hiring and promotion of other workers;
- 2) The setting of work standards and/or supervision of the work of others;
- Control of financial resources i.e., responsibility for decision-making as to allocation of funds, investments, budgets, etc.

The response categories to the questions on these three spheres of resource control (Questions 32-34, see Appendix A) were arrived at in light of our conception of resource control as a continuum in which each level of proximity to the source of control is potentially significant in terms of the respondent's status profile and in terms of the crystallization of social groups. Furthermore, those respondents who indicated either exclusive responsibility for decisions as to a particular resource or participation in such decisions were asked specific questions both as to the scope of resources under their control and the number of persons sharing responsibility for resources in a given sphere.

#### A. The Distributions of Responses to Each of the Three Resource Control Questions

Marginal distributions obtained for the responses to each of the three questions indicated that it was necessary to combine response categories 3,4, and 5 (all indicating various levels of personal acquaintance with persons responsible for decision-making), inasmuch as the number of respondents in each category was too small to allow for meaningful analysis. From a theoretical standpoint, the three categories seem to represent almost identical degrees of proximity or access to the source or sources of control, so that this too constituted a justification for combining them. After combining these categories (into category 3) the distributions of responses appeared as follows:

· 9 -

Question 32: In your work, were you responsible for or did you take part in decisions as to the hiring or promotion of workers?

Res	ponse Category	No. of Respondents	% Distribution
	TOTAL	217	100.0
1)	Responsible for hiring or promotion	16	7.4
2)	Participated with others in decision as to hiring or promotion	s 36	16.6
3)	Personally acquainted with the person(s) responsible for hiring or promotion	63	29.0
4)	Know who is (are) responsible for hiring or promotion, but not personally acquainted with him (them	48 1)	22.1
5)	Do not know who is (are) responsible	54	24.9

Question 33: In your work, were you responsible for planning and/or did you supervise the work of others?

Res	ponse Category	No. of Respondents	% Distribution
	TOTAL	202	100.0
1)	Responsible for setting work standards and norms for other workers	17	8.4
2)	Supervision of the performance of workers in accordance with work standards and norms	26	12.9
3)	Personally acquainted with the person(s) responsible for planning and/or for supervision of workers	70	34.7
4)	Know who is (are) responsible for planning and/or supervision of workers but not personally acquainted with him (them)	39	19.3
5)	Do not know who is (are) responsible	50	24.8

Question 34: In your work, were you responsible for or did you take part in decisions as to acquisitions, investments, division of profits, and/or allocation of funds or budgets?

Res	ponse Category	No. of Respondents	% Distribution
	TOTAL	206	100.0
1)	Responsible for acquisitions, investments, etc.	9	4.3
2)	Participated with others in decisions as to acquisitions, investments, etc.	23	11.1
3)	Personally acquainted with the person(s) responsible for decisions as to acquisitions, investments, etc.	72	34.9
4)	Know who is (are) responsible for decisions as to acquisitions, investments, etc., but are not personally acquainted with him (them)	40	19.4
5)	Do not know who is (are) responsible for decisions as to acquisitions investments etc	62	30.9

The distributions of responses to each of the three resource control questions are very similar, with the percentage of respondents reporting sole control or responsibility in regard to a given resource ranging from 4.3 (in reference to economic control) to 8.4 (in reference to supervision of other workers and/or planning). An additional 11-17% of the respondents report participating along with others in decisions on the disposition of the various resources. The most frequent response category in each of the 3 distributions is that of personal acquaintance with the individual or individuals having control of a particular response (29%-35% of the respondents). Between 17% and 22% of the respondents know who is (are) in control of a particular resource, but are not personally acquainted with him (them), while between 25% and 38% of the respondents do not even know who is in control. Thus access to sources of control or power is presumably non-existant, or at least very difficult for this last group.

While as noted, control of and access to each of the three resource spheres are similarly distributed, economic control seems to be somewhat more concentrated in the hands of a few. Thus while with reference to decisions as to hiring and promotion and as to planning and/or supervision of others' work, 24% and 21% respectively of the respondents indicated that they are either responsible for or participate in relevant decisions, with respect to economic resources, this is so for 15% of the respondents. Likewise, while with respect to the first two variables of resource control, 25% of the respondents indicated that they do not know who is in control, with respect to financial resources, 31% of the respondents responded in such a manner.

The above distributions were obtained when only the responses of employees were considered. This - in accordance with our original conception of the selfemployed as being by definition "powerful" - in the sense of having maximum control of resources.

Upon further consideration we noted that this was indeed so only with reference to control of financial resources (Question 34). Here we may indeed assume that <u>all</u> the self-employed are in a position to exercise maximum control. However, with reference to control of manpower resources (hiring and promotion) the supervision of other workers' performance, and the setting of work norms and standards we may note that such questions will be relevant only with reference to

- 12 -

those self-employed persons who employ other workers. Our sample included 41 such persons; 19 of them responded to Question 32 while only 10 responded to Question 33. The distributions of the responses of the self-employed employers are as follows:

(Question 32) TOTAL = 19

- 1) n = 142) n = 23) n = 24) n = 05) n = 1(Question 33) TOTAL = 10
  - 1) n = 7
  - 2) n = 2
  - 3) n = 1
  - 4) n = 0
  - 5) n = 0

The responses to these questions confirm our expectation that selfemployed individuals employing others are generally characterized by high levels of control of manpower resources and of supervision of others' work. The numbers of the self-employed involved here are very small and do not have particular significance for the analysis of the responses to the resource control questions. We note these responses only because in the resource control index which we later constructed (see following) the responses of self-employed persons were included as well.

## B. Relationships Between Control of Resources in Various Spheres

#### i) Crosstabulation Tables

After having noted that the distributions of responses to each of the three resource control questions were quite similar, an attempt was made to discover the relationships between any given response on one question to a given response on any other, by crosstabulating the responses. The total number of cases in any table and in any given cell are quite small. Thus from the analysis of such tables it is possible only to delineate general trends or tendencies in the relationship of specific responses on one variable to responses on another.

Table 1 seems to indicate a fairly strong relationship between the two relevant resource control variables, in the sense that a given response on one variable is generally accompanied either by the parallel response on the second, or by a response conceived of as being close to the first in terms of degrees of proximity to the source of resource control. Thus for example, of the 19 respondents who indicated that they bear sole responsibility for the hiring and promotion of workers, 12 indicated the same in reference to the setting of work standards for other workers. Thus in each row of the Table the highest percentage appears in the cell indicating an identical response to both questions (the diagonal), and the next highest percentages represent responses in adjacent categories. Particularly sizeable are the proportions of respondents who in reference to both spheres are personally acquainted with those in control (70%) and - on the other hand - the proportion of respondents who after indicating that they do not know who is in control in one sphere, indicated the same in reference to the other (73.6%).

P		participant and the second states of the second sta				
Responsibility for planning and/or Responsibility for hiring & promotion	Responsible	Responsible with others	Well acquainted with he/those responsible	Know who is/are responsible, but not personally acquainted	Do not know who is/are responsible	TOTAL
Responsible	n = 12 (63.1%)	n = 3 (15.7)	n = 1 (5.2)	n = 2 (10.4)	n = 1 (5.2)	n = 19 (100.0)
Responsible with others	n = 7 (26.9)	n = 9 (34.6)	n = 7 (26.9)	n = 0 (0.0)	n = 3 (11.5)	n = 26 (100.0)
Well acquainted with he(those) responsible	n = 1 (1,4)	n = 9 (12.7)	n = 50 (70.4)	n = 8 (11.2)	n = 3 (4.2)	n = 71 (100.0)
Know who is (are) responsible, but not personally acquainted	n = 0 (0,0)	n = 1 (2.3)	n = 13 (30.2)	n = 22 (51.2)	n = 7 (16.3)	n = 43 (100.0)
Do not know who is (are) responsible	n = 1 (1.9)	n = 4 (7.5)	n = 3 (5.7)	n = 6 (11.4)	n = 39 (73.6)	n = 53 (100.0)

Table 1: Employed Respondents by Responses to Questions 32 & 33: Responsibility for<br/>hiring & promotion of workers by responsibility for planning and/or<br/>supervision of work

Significance = 0

Gamma = .701

- 15 -

The relationship between the variables of control of hiring and promotion and of financial resources seems slightly less strong. This is particularly in evidence when the relationship between either responsibility for or participation in control for one sphere are examined in relation to the parallel categories in another. Thus for example, the number of respondents exercising sole responsibility in both spheres is relatively smaller than noted in Table 1. It must be noted however, that the numbers in question are extremely small and in general the trend noted in Table 1 applies here as well. Here again, we may note the sizeable proportions of respondents who, indicating lack of knowledge of the source of control in one sphere, indicated a similar lack of knowledge with reference to the other (74.5%).

Finally, similar conclusions can be drawn with regard to the relationship between planning and/or supervision of workers, and economic control. But, in addition, what is noteworthy here is that supervision of workers is not particularly associated with participation in decisions as to finances (the parallel category in economic control). Two possibilities arise in this context. First, it may be the case that since the two spheres are indeed very different in their content, control or power in one sphere may not be particularly associated with control or power in another. However, in light of the fairly strong relationships which were found between pairs of responses in the other categories, it seems more plausible to conclude that the somewhat deviant structure of Question 33 (on setting of work standards and supervision of workers) (see Appendix A) is reflected here. Thus it seems questionable if "supervision of the fulfilment of work norms by other workers" (category 2) is indeed representative of a level of access to control, one level below responsibility for setting

- 16 -

Table 2: Employed Respondents by Responses to Questions 32 and 34: Responsibility for hiring and promotion of workers by responsibility for finances

1 month of the second					and the second sec	
Financial responsibility Responsibility for hiring & promotion	Responsible	Responsible with others	Well acquainted with he/those responsible	Know who is/are responsible, but not personally acquainted	Do not know who is/are responsible	TOTAL
Responsible	n = 13 (52.0%)	n = 6 (24.0)	n = 4 (16.0)	n = 0 $(0,0)$	n = 2 (8.0)	n = 25 (100.0)
Responsible with others	n = 3 (9,7)	n = 11 (35.5)	n = 12 (38.7)	n = 2 (6.5)	n = 3 (9,7)	n = 31 (100.0)
Well acquainted with he(those) responsible	n = 2 (2.8)	n = 5 (6.9)	n = 45 (62.5)	n = 11 (15.3)	n = 9 (12,5)	n = 72 (100.0)
Know who is (are) responsible, but not personally acquainted	n = 1 (2.2)	n = 2 (4,3)	n = 9 (19.6)	n = 22 (47.8)	n = 12 (26.1)	n = 46 (100.0)
Do not know who is (are) responsible	n = 1 (1.8)	n = 2 (3.6)	n = 3 (5.5)	n = 8 (14.5)	n = 41 (74.5)	n = 55 (100.0)

Significance = 0

Gamma = .540

- 17 -

n = 229

Table 3:	Employed Respondents by Responses to Questions	33	§ 34:	
	Responsibility for planning and/or supervision	of	work	
	by responsibility for finances			

Financial responsibility Responsibility for planning and/or supervision	Responsible	Responsible with others	Well acquainted with he/those responsible	Know who is/are responsible, but not personally acquainted	Do not know who is/are responsible	TOTAL
Responsible	n = 10	n = 6	n = 2	n = 3	n = 1	n = 22
	(45.5%)	(27.3)	(9.1)	(13.6)	(4,5)	(100.0)
Responsible with others	n = 3	n = 4	n = 11	n = 2	n = 3	n = 23
	(13.0)	(17.4)	(47.8)	(8.7)	(13.0)	(100.0)
Well acquainted with he(those) responsible	n = 0	n = 9	n = 50	n = 12	n = 6	n = 77
	(0.0)	(11.7)	(64.9)	(15.6)	(7.8)	(100.0)
Know who is (are) responsible, but not personally acquainted	n = 0 (0.0)	n = 2 (5,3)	n = 5 (13.2)	n = 20 (52.6)	n = 11 (28.9)	n = 38 (100.0)
Do not know who	n = 2	n = 3	n = 3	n = 3	n = 42	n = 53
is (are) responsible	(3.8)	(5.7)	(5.7)	(5,7)	(79.2)	(100.0

n = 213

Significance = 0

Gamma = .542

of work norms and standards. A better wording of category 2 might have read "I <u>participated</u> in the setting of work norms and standards," and would thus have enabled easier comparison with the parallel category in the other two questions.

In sum, crosstabulations of responses to pairs of questions on resource control indicate a fairly strong relationship between a given response on any one question and the parallel or proximate response on any other. Furthermore, a given individual responding on one extreme of the degree-of-access continuum with respect to one resource almost never responded on the other extreme of the continuum with respect to another. Thus for example, of those respondents indicating lack of knowledge of the source of control of a given resource (the lowest level of control) <u>almost none</u> indicated responsibility for or participation in decisions as to another resource (maximum control).

#### ii) Spearman Correlation Coefficients of the Three Resource Control Variables

While the crosstabulation tables presented above provide us with information as to the relationship between a given response on one variable and a given response on another, correlation coefficients indicate the overall or more general relationship between variables.

The following correlations were found to exist between pairs of resource control variables:

a) Hiring and promotion of workers (Question 32, Variable 1)
 with the setting of work standards and/or the supervision
 of other workers (Question 33, Variable 2) = 0.69

- b) Hiring and promotion of workers (Variable 1) with responsibility for acquisitions, investments, etc. (Variable 3)
- c) Setting of work standards and/or supervision of other workers (Variable 2) with responsibility for acquisitions, investments etc. (Variable 3) =

Thus it can be seen that the correlation between any two resource control variables is relatively high and quite similar to the correlation between any other two resource control variables. Such findings seemed to constitute a statistical justification for combining the three variables into one index which would allow for more compact analyses of resource control. From a theoretical standpoint, there did not seem to be any significant limitation to such a combination, for we do not at this stage have any reason to assume that any sphere of resource control is more significant than any other in functioning as both a reward and a resource for the individual.

#### C. Construction of a Resource Control Index

The resource control index is based on the three variables described above (control of hiring and promotion, supervision of the work of others and the setting of work standards, and the control of financial resources), with the response categories for each being recoded as follows:

1) Sole responsibility for or participation in decisions.

2) Personal acquaintance with person(s) responsible for making decisions.

3) Knowledge of who is (are) responsible for decision-making but no personal acquaintance with him (them).

4) Lack of knowledge of who is (or are) responsible for decision-making.

5) No response.

0.51

0.52

Our original conception of resource control included a) the concept of its extent or scope which presumably was to be measured in terms of the quantity of resources over which control is exercised and b) extent to which control is shared by many persons or is in the hands of one or only a few. Neither of these aspects of resource control could ultimately be included in the construction of the resource control index. The reason for this is the extremely small number of respondents who gave such information and the relatively great scattering of their responses. Respondents seemed to be particularly reluctant to indicate the extent of the financial resources over which they reported they exercised decisionmaking control.

The only conclusions that may be drawn from the limited data which are nevertheless available are that:

- a) The scope of the resources over which respondents claim control is generally fairly limited. Thus for example, of the 56 respondents noting the number of persons they hired in the previous year, 39 indicated that they hired five workers or less. Or - of the 34 respondents who noted the number of workers they promoted, 23 claimed to promote five workers or less. The same holds for the extent of financial resources over which the respondents claim decision-making authority.
- b) On the other hand, decision-making authority as to the disposition of a given resource is reported as being fairly concentrated in the hands of a small number of persons. Thus for example, when asked how many persons participated along with you in making decisions as to hiring of workers, 39 of the 56 respondents who provided information on this variable indicated that three or less persons participated in the decision-making process. Even with

reference to decisions on financial resources about 2/3 of the respondents indicated that three or fewer persons participated in decision-making in each case (in decisions as to investments, distribution or profits, purchases, etc.).

The resource control index was to be composed of 14 categories defined as follows:

- 1) Response category 1 on each of the 3 questions (i.e. maximum control).
- Response category 1 on any 2 questions, regardless of the response on the third.
- Response category 1 on one question and response category 2 on another, regardless of the response on the third.
- Response category 1 on one question and response category 3 on another, regardless of the response on the third.
- 5) Response category 1 on one question and response category 4 on another, regardless of the response on the third.
- 6) Response category 2 on all three questions.
- 7) Response category 2 on two questions.
- 8) Response category 2 on one question and response category 3 on another.
- 9) Response category 2 on one question and response category 4 on another.
- 10) Response category 3 on all 3 questions.
- 11) Response category 3 on two questions.
- 12) Response category 3 on one question and response category 4 on another.
- 13) Response category 4 on two questions.
- 14) Response category 4 on all three questions.

The following Table presents the distribution of responses to resource control variables, as categorized in the index described above:

Value	Absolute Frequency	Percentage
1	18	7.8
2	39	16.8
3		8.2
4	4	1.8
5	4	1.8
6	37	16.0
7	22	9.6
8	10	4.4
9	11	4.8
10	0	0.0
11	4	1.8
12	60	26.0
13	0	0.0
14	3	1.2
	231	100.0

#### Table 4: Responses to Resource Control Variables by 14 Response Categories

More than 1/3 of the respondents indicated responsibility for or participation in decision-making in at least one sphere (categories 1 through 5). Of these, 18 indicated such a response with reference to all three spheres, and an additional 39 responded thus with reference to two spheres. Of the remaining 27 respondents indicating authority in one sphere (categories 3,4,5) 19 noted that in one of the other two spheres they were personally acquainted with the person(s) wielding authority. Thus it can be seen that a respondent having authority in one sphere generally either has authority with reference to another sphere or else has easy and ready access to the source of such authority. Eighty respondents (categories 6 through 9) indicated that they were personally acquainted with the person(s) responsible for decision-making in at least one sphere of resources on the job - 37 of these being personally acquainted with those responsible in all three spheres.

Sixty-four respondents (categories 11 and 12) indicated having knowledge of the identity of the person(s) responsible for decision-making in at least one sphere. Only 3 respondents indicated not having any such knowledge with reference to two spheres, and no respondents indicated such a response with reference to all three spheres.

While originally the questions on resource control were to be asked only of employees, inasmuch as it was felt that the self-employed were by definition characterized by maximum control of resources, we later concluded that with reference to the first two spheres - i.e., hiring and promotion of workers and supervising the work of others - only those self-employed persons who employed others or who supervised others could exercise control, while self-employed respondents <u>not</u> employing others would wield no control in such spheres. Control of financial resources on the other hand, would seem to characterize <u>all</u> of the self-employed. Thus it was decided that the self-employed who employ others would be entered in category 1 of the original index (i.e., control in all spheres), while other self-employed persons would be entered into category 3 (i.e. - the category denoting control of one sphere, in this case - that of financial resources).

The above index serves to provide fairly detailed information as to the distribution of resource control among respondents in our sample and enables us to delineate response profiles with reference to the three resource control

- 24 -

variables. Furthermore, in such an index degrees of proximity to sources of job authority - for example, personal acquaintance with persons in possession of authority as opposed to only knowledge of their identity - can be noted. However, because of the relatively small number of respondents responding in any given category of the index, it was felt that for further analyses - and particularly for those attempting to ascertain the relationship between resource control and other socio-economic variables (such as geo-cultural origin, education, etc.), the categories of the original index would have to be combined so as to arrive at a more compact expression of the distribution of resource control.

#### D. The Dichotomous Resource Control Index

The original categories of the 14-point index were recoded so as to combine categories 1 through 5 into one category and 6 through 14 into another. Thus any respondent noting responsibility for or participation in decision-making as to at least one sphere of resource control was noted as having control of resources (category 1), while all other respondents - regardless of their degree of proximity to sources of decision-making - were noted as not having such control (category 2).

Ninety respondents (37.9%) were now classified as having control of resources, while 147 (62.1%) were classified as not having such control. When categorized by employment status, respondents are distributed as follows with reference to possession of resource control:

	Employees	Self-Employed Employing Others	Other Self- Employed
Having control	n = 64	16	10
Not having control	n = 131	3	13

- 25 -

While the resource control dichotomy is clearly a less sensitive measure of job authority than the 14-point index and while it is indifferent to degrees of proximity to sources of such authority, within the framework of the relatively limited sample at our disposal it seems to allow most efficiently for further analyses of job authority, and particularly for more meaningful analyses of the relationship of possession of resource control to other socio-economic variables and status characteristics.

## PART III: MEASURING ACCESS TO JOB POWER

In this section, the main results of the investigation of the component of job power termed "control of resources" will be described. Such a description will be based primarily on the delineation and measurement of the relationship between control of resources and other socio-demographic variables.

# Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Controllers of Resources

The next stage in analyzing the data was to attempt to locate and characterize respondents reporting resource control in terms of various sociodemographic variables. Such analyses were aimed at determining to what extent persons controlling resources are concentrated in specific occupations or industrial branches, are of particular geo-cultural origins, are characterized by a given level of educational attainment etc. Such data in turn would shed light on the extent to which those in control constitute a social group or stratum or - alternatively - are located in a broad range of social categories.

#### 1. Resource Control in Various Occupational Groups

a) <u>One-Digit Occupational Groups</u> (Central Bureau of Statistics, Standard Classification of Occupations):

In order to obtain a general picture of the distribution of resource control in various occupational groupings, as measured by the dichotomous index described above, respondents were classified according to their occupation in the week prior to the survey (by one-digit C.B.S. categories) and according to their score on the resource control index. Such information was available for a total of 215 respondents whose occupations were as follows:

1)	Scientific and academic (Digit 0)	29	cases	(13.5% of sample)
2)	Other professionals and technical workers (Digit 1)	33	5 "	(15.4%)
3)	Managers (Digit 2)	26	, "	(12.1%)
4)	Clerks (Digit 3)	38	3 "	(17.7%)
5)	Salesworkers and agents (Digit 4)	9	, "	( 4.2%)
6)	Service workers (Digit 5)	6	. "	( 2.8%)
7)	Agricultural workers (Digit 6)	1	. "	( 0.4%)
8)	Skilled workers (Digits 7-8)	63	5 "	(29.4%)
9)	Unskilled workers (Digit 9)	10		( 4.6%)

Of the total 215 respondents, 82 (or 38.1%) reported having control of resources on their jobs, while 133 (or 61.8%) were recorded as not wielding such control.

First an attempt was made to determine whether the representation of the various occupational groups among the "powerful" or controllers-of-resources is similar to their representation in the sample of employed persons. Only those occupational categories constituting at least 10 per cent of the sample were analyzed. (Thus categories 5,6,7 and 9 were not dealt with.).

The occupational group most clearly overrepresented among those having resource control is group 3 - the managers. Thus while constituting 12% of the sample, they constitute 22% of the respondents having control of resources. Scientific and academic workers are slightly overrepresented among those having control, constituting 13.5% of the sample and 18.3% of the controllers.

One occupational group is conspicuously underrepresented among those having control. Skilled workers (group 8), while constituting almost 30% of the sample are only 18% of the respondents having control of resources.

Professionals and technical workers (group 2) constitute 13% of the powerful and 15% of the sample, while clerks (group 4) constitute 18% of the powerful and almost18% of the sample. Thus the representation of these two occupational groups among those in control of resources is almost identical to their representation in the sample.

Another way of describing the distribution of resource control in various occupational groups is to note the numbers and percentages of respondents in each group having resource control (see Table 5). Here we note that 18 of the 26 managers in our sample (or almost 70%) wield resource control, while - by contrast only 15 of the 63 skilled workers (or 23.8%) have such control. Respondents in scientific and academic occupations are divided almost equally into controllers and non-controllers of resources (15 respondents report control; 14 report no control). Among respondents in the professional and technical occupations (group 2) and among clerks (group 4) between 33% and 40% of the respondents report having control of resources.

Resource control Occupational category	Having resource control	Not having resource control	TOTAL
Scientific and	n = 15	n = 14 (48.3)	n = 29
academic workers	(51.7%)		(100.0)
Other professionals and technical workers	n = 11 (33.3)	n = 22 (66.6)	n = 33 (100.0)
Managers	n = 18	n = 8	n = 26
	(69.2)	(30.8)	(100.0)
Clerks	n = 15	n = 23	n = 38
	(39.5)	(60.5)	(100.0)
Skilled workers	n = 15 (23.8)	n = 48 (76.2)	n = 63 (100.0)

# Table 5: Respondents in Five Major Occupational Groups (CBS Classification) by Responses on Resource Control Dichotomy

n = 189

The fact that 70% of the managers have control of job resources is not surprising, inasmuch as such control is an almost inherent feature of managerial tasks. Perhaps what is more noteworthy is the fact that in the <u>other</u> occupational categories fairly high proportions of respondents have control of resources, with even 24% of skilled workers enjoying such control.

It should be noted, in addition, that the distribution by industry of current occupation (C.B.S. classification of industries) of respondents reporting resource control is not very different from the industrial distribution of the employed sample as a whole, and there is no substantial over- or underrepresentation of the "powerful" in any given industrial category.

#### b) Resource Control in Various Occupations as Ranked by Kraus Prestige Scores:

In a recent study, V. Kraus (1976) presented unstructured occupational stimuli to an urban Israeli sample who, in turn, were asked to group those occupations similar to one another. Analysis of the ways in which respondents in fact grouped the occupations permitted construction of an occupational prestige scale including 220 occupations each of which receives a score ranging from 1 to 100.

Such a score was assigned to each of 313 respondents in the sample on the basis of his occupation in the week prior to the survey. On the basis of the distribution of the respondents according to the Kraus prestige scores, the sample was divided into three groups of approximately equal size:

- 1) Group 1 Prestige scores ranging from 1 to 20 n = 109 (34.8% of the employed sample)
- 2) Group 2 Prestige scores ranging from 21-60 n = 107 (34.1% of the employed sample)

3) Group 3 - Prestige scores ranging from 61 to 100 n = 97 (31.0% of the employed sample)

Respondents who indicated that they controlled resources on their jobs were then classified by their occupational prestige group as defined above.

#### Respondents Reporting Control of Resources

Total - n = 83 (100%) Group 1 - n = 17 (20.4%) Group 2 - n = 25 (30.1%) Group 3 - n = 41 (49.4%)

Thus Group 1, or those respondents whose occupations score relatively low on the prestige dimension, is underrepresented among the group of respondents reporting resource control. These respondents constitute almost 35% of the sample, but only 20% of those having control. The representation of those respondents with intermediate occupational prestige scores among those controlling resources is quite similar to their representation in the sample as a whole, while respondents whose occupations score high on prestige are considerably overrepresented among the resource controllers. While constituting 31% of the total employed sample, respondents with high occupational prestige constitute almost half of those respondents reporting resource control.

Another way of expressing the relationship between occupational prestige and resource control is to note that while 16% and 23% of respondents with low and intermediate occupational prestige report resource control, 42% of those with high occupational prestige do so. Thus, with regard to the distribution of resource control among various occupational groups we may conclude that such control is fairly broadly distributed throughout the occupational spectrum, particularly when occupations are categorized and examined on the basis of the similarity of the tasks they involve (as in the C.B.S. classification) and somewhat less conspicuously, when classified by prestige.

Subsequently we will attempt to characterize respondents having and not having control in each occupational group in terms of socio-demographic origin variables (such as age, geo-cultural origin, etc.) and determine the implications of possessing resource control for receipt of rewards such as income and job satisfaction within each occupational category.

#### 2. Resource Control in Geo-Cultural Origin Groups

In the Israeli setting, it seems particularly interesting to examine the relationship between geo-cultural origin and resource control. This, in light of recurrent findings indicating the relatively disadvantaged position of persons of Asian-African origin with respect to various status criteria - such as occupation, education, and income. Thus it is worthwhile examining to what extent this holds true with reference to control of resources on the job (which, as Kluegel [op.cit.] notes, is a sphere in which achievement may not depend on objective credentials but rather on more vaguely defined criteria such as loyalty to the employer, dilligence, etc.), and if so - what are the factors underlying such a finding.

Information on resource control and on geo-cultural origin was obtained for a total of 219 respondents. Geo-cultural origin was defined in the following manner: Respondents born in Asia or Africa and respondents born in Israel whose fathers were born in Asia or Africa were classified as being of Asian-African

- 32 -
origin. The same procedure was adopted with reference to European-American origin. Of the 219 respondents for whom information was available both on resource control and on geo-cultural origin, none were born in Israel to fathers also born in Israel.

Resource Control Index Cultural Origin	Having Resource Control	Not Having Resource Control	TOTAL
Asian-African	n = 14	n = 44	n = 58
Origin	(24%)	(76%)	(100%)
European-American	n = 69	n = 92	n = 161
Origin	(43%)	(57%)	(100%)
TOTAL	n = 83	n = 136	n = 219
	(38%)	(62%)	(100%)

# Table 6: Employed Respondents by Geo-Cultural Origin and Control of Resources

Significance = .018 Phi = .170

Respondents of Asian-African origin are somewhat underrepresented among those respondents reporting control of resources. Thus, while constituting 27% of the sample of employed persons, they constitute 17% of those having control. And while 24% of respondents of Asian-African origin report controlling resources, 43% of those of European-American origin do so. However, the measure of association (Phi = .170) indicates that the relationship between the two variables is of moderate strength. In an attempt to determine the factors underlying these differences between geo-cultural origin groups we again noted that several occupational categories are characterized by much higher proportions of respondents reporting resource control than others, and attempted to determine whether respondents of Asian-African origin are generally excluded from the former occupational groups (see section on resource control in one-digit occupational groups). Furthermore we attempted to determine whether differences exist - <u>within</u> given occupational groups - between the degree to which European-Americans or Asian-Africans exercise resource control.

Thus we may note that in the Manager occupational category, in which 68% of the respondents report resource control, only 4 respondents are of Asian-African origin. Only 7 respondents of Asian-African origin are employed in Scientific and Academic occupations in which 50% of the respondents report resource control. By contrast, the occupational category characterized by the lowest proportion of respondents reporting resource control - skilled workers (24%) - includes 22 respondents of Asian-African origin (that is, almost 38% of all respondents of Asian-African origin),

Within both the category of Scientific and Academic workers and that of Managers, respondents of Asian-African origin do not seem to be disadvantaged as to the extent to which they control resources. Thus 2 of the 6 Asian-African respondents in the former category and 3 of the 4 in the latter report control of resources. However, among skilled workers, while 11 of the 37 respondents of European-American origin (that is, 32%) report control of resources, only 3 of the 22 Asian-African origin respondents (i.e., about 14%) report such control.

- 34 -

In sum, respondents of Asian-African origin are underrepresented in those occupational categories characterized by relatively large proportions of respondents reporting resource control - Managers, Scientific and Academic workers, and Professionals. On the other hand, almost 40 per cent of all respondents of Asian-African origin are skilled workers, and this occupational category is characterized by a relatively low proportion of respondents having control of resources. Furthermore, <u>within</u> the skilled workers category, Asian-African respondents are relatively and to a considerable degree - underrepresented among those workers reporting resource control. The latter finding raises questions of the relative deprivation of Asian-African workers in terms of resource control and of deprivation in terms of rewards and payoffs as well.

## 3. Education and Resource Control

In light of the commonly accepted notion of the significance of educational attainment in the process of early occupational status attainment (see for example, Sewell, Haller & Ohlendorf, 1970), and - on the other hand - of Jencks' (1972) argument that inequality of educational opportunity is <u>not</u> the major cause of inequality in occupational status or income in the United States, it seems to be of interest to attempt to determine the possible significance of educational attainment for the attainment of resource control on the job, with the assumption being that resource control is one component or dimension of occupational prestige.

Information obtained on the educational background of 221 employed persons indicated that 19.5% of the sample (n=35) had attained only elementary schooling, 46.6% (n=103) had attained Yeshiva or secondary schooling (both vocational and academic), 8.6% (n=19) had attained Teachers' Seminary and other post-secondary

- 35 -

educational levels, and 25.3% (n=56) had attained a university-level education.

The educational distribution of those respondents reporting resource control is as follows:

Edu	acational Category	No. of Cases	% of Sample
1)	No education, Heder, Elementary School	n = 11	13.4%
2)	Yeshiva, Vocational and Academic High School	n = 38	46.3%
3)	Teachers' Seminary and other post-secondary schooling	n = 8	9.8%
4)	University, Technion	n = 25	30.5%
		n = 82	100.0%

Thus the educational distribution of persons reporting resource control, and of the total sample of employed persons are quite similar. The representation of respondents with a secondary school education among those reporting resource control is exactly proportional to their representation in the sample of employed persons. While respondents with elementary schooling are underrepresented among those having control, this is so only to a limited extent; thus, while constituting almost 20 per cent of the employed population, they are 13% of those having control. The same holds true for the overrepresentation of respondents with university schooling among those respondents reporting control - while constituting 25 per cent of the sample, they are 31% of those controlling resources. (When crosstabulating educational attainments and resource control, the relationship between the two variables does not emerge as significant [Significance = .260].). In sum, educational credentials per se do not seem to be a significant factor differentiating between persons exercising and those not exercising resource control.

## 4. Age of Respondents and Resource Control

The age of the respondent was hypothesized as being a possibly significant factor in the attainment of resource control primarily because of the former's association with job seniority, and in light of the life-cycle notion of status attainment.

When the sample of employed persons is divided into two major age categories we may note that 127 respondents (or 54.9%) were over age 40 at the time of the study, and 104 respondents (or 45.1%) were 40 or under. Almost the identical distribution prevails among those respondents reporting control of resources: 51 (or 58.6%) were over age 40 and 36 respondents (or 41.4%) were age 40 or under.

The age distribution of respondents possessing resource control in any given occupational category was also found to be very similar to the age distribution of the total sample of persons employed in that category. Thus age does not emerge as a significant factor or credential in the attainment of resource control. Indeed, the Spearman correlations of resource control and job seniority ("vetek") are -.109 and -.138 (see Appendix B).

#### PART IV: RETURNS TO JOB POWER: REWARDS AND PAYOFFS OF RESOURCE CONTROL

The significance of job power as a component of individual social status may be examined also in terms of the extent to which it is accompanied by rewards and payoffs for the individual. While in the framework of a limited study such as ours only two reward spheres will be examined - income and job satisfaction - theoretically, at least, we can hypothesize that other rewards may accrue to job power.

## 1) Income Payoffs for Resource Control

An attempt was made to determine whether income rewards accrue to possession of resource control beyond what may be predicted by the specific occupational category of the respondents. Thus respondents in each major occupational grouping were divided into 2 groups - those reporting control of resources and those indicating no such control, and their responses to Question 118 on monthly personal income noted (see Apppendix A). As noted earlier, only five major occupational groupings have a sufficient number of respondents within them to permit meaningful analysis:

# a) Scientific and Academic Workers (n=40)

This group of respondents is split exactly in half, with 20 respondents reporting resource control and 20 indicating no such control.

Of the 20 respondents indicating control, 13 report a monthly personal income of IL 2,500 or more (i.e. - the highest income category indicated on the questionnaire - see Question 118), and another 5 report an income of between IL 2,000-2,499, i.e. - the next highest income category.

By contrast, of the 20 scientific and academic workers reporting no control of resources, only 3 are in the highest income category, and another 5 report income in the next highest category.

- 38 -

# b) Other Professional, Technical and Related Workers (n=34)

In this group comparison between the "powerful" and "powerless" involves two groups of very different sizes - 12 respondents reporting resource control and 22 reporting no control.

However, it may be noted that 9 of the 12 respondents (75%) reporting resource control report income in the top three categories, while only 10 of the 22 respondents (45%) not having control report income in these categories.

## c) Managers and Administrators (n=27)

In this group, the relative income advantage enjoyed by those possessing resource control is somewhat less in evidence. Of the 19 respondents reporting control of resources, 9 (or 47%) report income in the highest income category and an additional 6 (32%) report income in the next highest category. However, the 8 "non-powerful" managers also seem to enjoy fairly high income levels: 2 (25%) report income in the highest category and 2 (25%) in the next highest category.

# d) Clerical and Related Workers (n=38)

A relatively large proportion (almost 40%) of this group reports control of resources. Of the 15 respondents reporting resource control, 7 are in the highest income category and another 6 in the second highest, while corresponding numbers among the 23 "non-powerful" respondents are only 5 and 4 respectively. Thus we may note that while virtually all of the clerical workers reporting resource control receive relatively high incomes, only 9 of the 23 clerks having such control attain such income levels.

## e) Skilled and Semi-Skilled Workers (n=66)

While this is the largest occupational category in the sample, only 16 of the respondents within it (or 24.2%) report resource control. Of these, 9 (56%) indicate earnings at the highest income level and anothe 3 (19%) - at the next highest level. The corresponding numbers among the 50 respondents reporting no control of resources are only 7 (14%) and 9 (18%).

In sum, in 5 major occupational groupings we consistently find that respondents reporting control of resources generally attain higher income levels than other respondents within the same occupational category but not wielding such control. We may note in passing - and this will be discussed at length later on this paper - that the Spearman correlations between resource control and income are -.40 and -.44, while the Pearson correlation between occupational prestige (Kraus 3-digit scores) and income is .26. Thus it would seem that resource control - in and of itself - is associated with the reward of differential income, beyond what would be predictable on the basis of the association between income and occupational prestige.

## 2) Job Satisfaction and Resource Control

General satisfaction from one's job has been examined in many studies in the framework of a general theory of worker alienation, with powerlessness or lack of control of the process or conditions of work being regarded as one dimension of alienation (see for example, Blauner, 1964, 1967). The direct relationship found in many studies (see Blauner, 1967; Argyle, 1972 etc.) between general job satisfaction and occupational prestige does <u>not</u> render the possible job power-satisfaction relationship a trivial one, for both resource control,

- 40 -

and as will be shown subsequently - even more so - autonomy on the job, are fairly broadly distributed throughout a wide range of occupations. Thus the relationship between the various components of job power and job satisfaction is not necessarily identical to that found between occupational prestige and satisfaction, and is a subject of interest in and of itself.

The first step in examining the relationship between resource control and job satisfaction consisted in an examination of the relationship of the respondent's score on the resource control index and both his general job satisfaction and his satisfaction from various specific aspects of his job. This was done both by crosstabulating responses on resource control and satisfaction and by computing Pearson correlation coefficients between the two variables. The three categories of the satisfaction variable were:

1) Satisfied to a very great extent (High Satisfaction).

2) Satisfied to a great extent (Intermediate Satisfaction).

3) Satisfied to a certain extent or not satisfied (Low Satisfaction).

While within category 3 there may appear to be included responses of a very different nature (satisfaction and dissatisfaction) the number of respondents indicating dissatisfaction (which was originally coded as a separate category) was so small as not to permit separate analysis of such responses. This finding seems to be consistent with the findings of almost all job-satisfaction studies in which only a very small proportion of respondents indicate dissatisfaction from their jobs (see Herzberg, 1957 and Kornhauser, 1965).

General job satisfaction seems to be associated with resource control, as can be seen from the following Table:

Satisfaction Resource Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having resource	n = 32	n = 42	n = 6	n = 80
control	(40.0)	(52.5)	(7.5)	(100.0)
Not having resource	n = 31	n = 72	n = 27	n = 130
control	(23.8)	(55.3)	(20.9)	(100.0)

# Table 7: Employed Respondents by General Job Satisfaction and Control of Resources

Significance = 0 Gamma = .482

Thus while 24 per cent of those not having control of resources indicate a high degree of job satisfaction, among those having control the corresponding percentage is 40 per cent. Furthermore, while 21 per cent of those not in control express a low degree of staisfaction, only 7.5 per cent of those having control do so. The relationship between the two variables is a significant one, and the Gamma measure indicates a fairly high degree of association.

Resource control was found to be associated with job satisfaction from almost all the specific aspects of the respondent's job which we studied. Such an association can be noted particularly with reference to satisfaction from the degree of power and influence over others on the job, from the extent to which the job allows for independence, initiative, etc., the extent to which the respondent finds his work interesting, and from the standard of living which the job allows for. With reference to several other aspects of the job, the association between resource control and satisfaction is somewhat less in evidence: the degree of social importance of the occupation, the degree to which it allows for the utilization of skills, labor relations, opportunities for advancement, and the amount of esteem awarded the respondent in society as a result of his occupation. It should be noted, however, that even with reference to these aspects of the job, findings indicated a higher proportion of persons possessing control of resources expressing a high degree of satisfaction (as compared with persons not having control) and a lower proportion indicating a low degree of satisfaction (for relevant crosstabulation tables, see Appendix C).

# PART V: A PATH MODEL OF ACCESS AND RETURNS TO JOB POWER

Path analysis may be employed as a convenient method for delineating the important social characteristics in the process of recruitment to positions of job authority - here defined only in terms of resource control because of the conspicuous limitations of the data on autonomy and resource-negation described above. In addition, the resource control variable when incorporated in the "traditional" path model of status attainment (see for example, Blau & Duncan, 1967; and Matras, Kraus & Noam, 1976) may be hypothesized as having significance as an independent variable, primarily in its possible effects on attainment of income. Thus our purpose in presenting the following data in path model form is twofold:

- To attempt to determine the primary factors accounting for the attainment of resource control on the job;
- To attempt to evaluate the role of resource control in the explanation of variance in income.

The model to be presented below includes two basic categories of variables: Status-origin or background variables and variables measuring status <u>attained</u> by the respondent himself. The former group (including Father's Education  $[x_1] - i.e.$ , last school attended by the respondent's father; Father; soccupation  $[x_2]$ , and geocultural origin  $[x_3]$ ) is included in order to enable determination of whether there exists a direct influence of such variables on attainment of job authority. Kluegel (op.cit.) notes that such influence may operate in two ways: first, through the tendency of respondents from relatively advantaged socio-economic backgrounds to stand in favorable positions on other factors influencing recruitment to authority positions (for example, occupational and educational attainment), and second through the transference of "values and role skills" increasing the likelihood of incumbency in a position of authority.

- 44 -

On the basis of distribution of respondents' fathers' education in the sample, four educational categories for fathers were delineated:

1) Did not attend school, attended Heder or elementary school.

2) Yeshiva, vocational or academic high school.

3) Teachers' seminary or other post-secondary institution.

4) University or Technion.

Fathers' occupation at the time the respondent was 14 years of age (presumably a critical stage for the respondent's decision-making as to his future educational and occupational career) was coded in terms of Kraus prestige scores (see V. Kraus, op.cit.) based on unstructured stimuli based orderings for 3-digit occupational groups in Israel.

Ethnicity is treated here as a dummy variable, valued 1 for respondents born in Europe or America, or born in Israel with father born in Europe or America, and zero for persons born in Asia or Africa or born in Israel with Asian or African-born fathers. Respondents born in Israel to Israeli-born fathers were deleted from computations of correlations and regressions involving this variable in light of their relatively small number (n=30).

Attained status variables include: Respondent's education  $(x_4)$ , respondent's occupational prestige  $(x_5)$ , control of resources on the job  $(x_6)$ , and monthly income  $(x_7)$ . Respondent's education and occupation were coded in a similar fashion as father's education and occupation. Control of resources was coded in terms of the 14-point index described above because of the statistical difficulties in including a dichotomous variable as a dependent variable in path analysis.

Two path models will be presented here (see Models 1 & 2). The models differ in that in the first no attempt is made to determine the possible relationship MODEL 1: Attainment of Resource Control



- 46 -



- 47 -

-

between resource control and income. From such a model we may obtain two main types of information: first, we may delineate status variables relevant to the attainment of job authority and the extent of their direct effects, and second - we may note to what extent the "traditional" path model - that is, one which does <u>not</u> include resource control as an independent variable - can account for variance in income in our sample. In the second model, on the other hand, resource control precedes income, and its effect on the attainment of income may be examined. Thus the model indicates to what extent resource control is a significant variable in terms of its contribution to the explanation of variance in income, beyond the more commonly measured variables of education, occupation, etc.

#### Effects of Origin Variables on Attained Status

Educational attainments of the respondent are affected to the greatest extent by father's occupation, but also by father's education. Ethnicity per se does not have a substantive effect on respondent's education, but may effect attainment indirectly by virtue of its correlation with father's occupation and father's education (see Table 8 and Model 1).

The direct effects of ethnicity, father's education, and father's occupation on respondent's occupational prestige are small (.038, .107, -.053 respectively: see Model 1). However, the total effect of father's education - when its indirect effects via respondent's education are combined with its direct effect - is substantial (.22) (see Table 8). Clearly however, the respondent's occupational attainments are determined primarily and to a very great extent by his own educational achievements. The direct effect of the latter is .589.

It should be noted that inasmuch as control of resources was coded so that "1" denoted respondents reporting maximum control, while "14" denoted those having

Dependent Variable	Predetermined Variable	Total Effect	Indirect Effects Via R's Educ.	Indirect Effect Via R's Occup.	Direct Effect
Respondent's	Ethnicity	.082			.082
Education	Father's Education	.192			.192
	Father's Occupation	.167	24-1-1-1	-	.167
Respondent's	Ethnicity	.086	.048		. 038
Occupation	Father's Education	.220	.113		.107
	Father's Occupation	.104	.157	-	.053
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Respondent's Education	.589	10 Met - 10	-	.589
Decreardantia	Fthnisitu	177	004	006	171
Control of	Ethnicity	1/5	.004	006	1/1
Resources	Father's Education	. 204	.008	018	.214
	Father's Occupation	111	.011	.008	130
191-5-17 C	Respondent's Education	054	1 . A. S. S.	097	.043
	Respondent's Occupation	165		-	165
Respondent's	Ethnicity	.006	.012	004	- 010
Income	Eatheric Education	.000	026	017	.010
	Facher's Education	-,040	.020	.013	087
	Father's Occupation	.055	.036	006	.025
	Respondent's Education	.198	er de Historie	.065	.133
	Respondent's Occupation	.110	(1995) - Burgh		.110
(in Model 2)	Control of Resources	301			301

.

minimal control, direct effects on resource control of variables such as ethnicity and respondent's occupational prestige which are coded from "low" to "high" are expected to be negative. Indeed the direct effect of ethnicity is -.17 and that of occupational prestige is -.165.

The direct effects of the status-origin variables of Father's education and Father's occupation do not seem to be of significance in explaining recruitment to positions of authority, and even the respondent's own education does not have a substantial direct effect on the respondent's control of resources. An examination of the total effects on control of resources indicates that respondent's occupational prestige and geo-cultural origin have the greatest effects. These results seem to be consistent with those noted earlier in the form of crosstabulations between such variables as education, occupational prestige, and origin and control of resources.

What is perhaps the most significant finding which emerges from the model is that the variables presented can account for only 9 per cent of the variance in resource control, and thus we have very little information as to the process of attainment of control of resources. Direct effects of the variables in the model on resource control are quite small, except for those of geo-cultural origin and respondent's occupation.

In Model 2, income is presented as the major dependent variable, with resource control as one of its possible determinants. Two significant findings emerge here:

 The direct effect of resource control on income is substantial (-.301) and is larger than the direct effect of any other variable in the model on income.
Perhaps particularly noteworthy is that the direct effect of resource control

- 50 -

on income is considerably greater than that of the respondent's occupational prestige (.110). Clearly then income rewards seem to be affected to a very great extent by the respondent's authority on the job.

2) As a result of the inclusion of resource control in the second model, the per cent of the variance in income explained - which in the first model was only 8 per cent - increases to almost 17 per cent. Thus the contribution of job authority to the explanation of variance in income emerges as a very significant one.

#### PART VI: SUMMARY OF MAIN RESULTS

The following section will summarize the major results in our investigation of the three main types of variables which we a priori conceived of as being significant components of job power. The implications of these results for both the conceptualization and measurement of job power will be discussed in the last section of this paper as will their broader theoretical significance in terms of individual social status and status-group formation.

I. The sphere of control of resources in the job framework yielded the most information relevant to our original research questions, and seems to be more adequately measured and examined than were autonomy and negation of resources. Control of resources in one sphere of the work situation was found to be fairly strongly associated with control of other spheres. Likewise respondents generally noted similar degrees of access or proximity to sources of control of the various resources. Only very rarely was a respondent close to the "center" with reference to one sphere and far removed with reference to another.

Such findings enabled the construction of an index of resource control which in turn allowed for much more compact analyses of relationships of resource control to other socio-demographic variables than were possible with reference to either autonomy or negation of resources. Nevertheless the two indexes arrived at do seem to suffer from two major drawbacks which derive from limitations inherent in the size of our sample and possibly in the form and wording of certain questions. First, the indexes do not include any expression or measurement of the <u>scope</u> of control wielded by a given respondent, which would seem to be a significant factor in the evaluation or scoring of the degree of his resource control. Thus, for example, a carpenter employing two workers cannot be distinguished from a manager of a government office responsible for 20 subordinates. A second feature of an individual's control of resources not expressed in the indexes presented is the extent to which the individual exercises exclusive and sole control over a given resource or alternatively - is one of a few or of many persons wielding such power. Intuitively, it would seem that both these dimensions are important for the evaluation of the significance of resource control as a component of the individual's status profile and as an axis for the formation of social groupings of "powerful" persons.

The 14-point index provides relatively detailed information as to the frequency of various profiles of control of and access-to-controllers of resources. In a much larger sample such an index might allow for delineation and analysis of a "power elite" and, on the other hand, of the most "powerless" and possibly alienated workers. In our sample, 1/3 of the respondents indicated responsibility for or participation in decision-making in at least one sphere, with most indicating such a response as to <u>two</u> spheres. An additional 35 per cent of the sample reported personal acquaintance with persons controlling resources. Such a finding is not surprising in the Israeli context where most places of employment are on a relatively small scale, and explains the finding that virtually no respondents reported total ignorance of the sources of resource control at their workplaces.

Analyses of the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents reporting resource control can be summarized as follows:

a) Resource control, as defined in the present study, is found to be fairly broadly distributed throughout the occupational spectrum, when occupations are categorized primarily in terms of the similarity of the tasks they involve (as is

- 53 -

done in the classification of the Central Bureau of Statistics). Thus while managers are indeed overrepresented among respondents reporting resource control and skilled workers underrepresented, still a fourth of all skilled workers note possession of such control.

When occupations are classified by the prestige attributed to them a somewhat different picture emerges, with the proportion of respondents reporting resource control increasing among incumbents of the more prestigious occupations. However, occupational prestige is <u>not</u> an automatic indicator of resource control, and even respondents whose occupations are classified as of low prestige, constitute 20 per cent of the respondents reporting control. Clearly resource control is <u>not</u> a status component which is characteristic only of respondents in prestigious occupations. This is particularly evident when we note that the representation of respondents in intermediate prestige-level occupations among the controllers of resources is almost identical to their representation in the sample as a whole.

b) Respondents of Asian-African origin were found to be somewhat underrepresented among those respondents reporting control of resources. The finding was found to be largely a function of the almost total exclusion of respondents of Asian-African origin from occupational groups characterized by high percentages of incumbents who control resources. However, what seems to be equally significant is the fact that within the skilled worker category (which includes almost 40 per cent of all respondents of Asian-African origin) 32% of the respondents of European-American origin report control of resources, while only 14% of the Asian-African respondents do so.

c) Perhaps somewhat surprising is the fact that the educational attainments of respondents reporting resource control do not differ significantly from those of non-controllers. Thus we may conclude that educational credentials in and of themselves

- 54 -

do not seem to be significant determinants of a respondent's control or non-control of resources.

d) Age of respondents was hypothesized to be correlated with resource control primarily because of the correlation of the former with work experience. However, this expectation was not fulfilled, and almost the identical age distribution prevails among controllers and non-controllers of resources.

After analyzing the socio-demographic characteristics of persons wielding authority in their jobs, we attempted to examine the significance of resource control as a key to the receipt of rewards and payoffs - for example, income and job satisfaction. Indeed, control of resources was consistently found to be associated with higher income levels within given occupational categories, and the Spearman correlation between resource control and income was found to be quite high (0.39), and considerably higher than the Pearson correlation between occupational prestige and income (0.26).

General job satisfaction was found to be moderately associated with resource control as was satisfaction from various specific aspects of the job. Even with reference to satisfaction from certain job features (such as the degree of the occupation's social value, labor relations on the job, etc.) with reference to which the satisfaction-control association is somewhat less in evidence, findings consistently indicated a higher proportion of persons possessing control of resources expressing a high degree of satisfaction as compared with those not in control.

II. As noted at the outset of this paper, our original conception of job power included two sets of variables not discussed in this paper: autonomy on the job, and negation of resources on the job. (For a detailed discussion of the conceptualization

- 55 -

and measurement of these variables see Noam, G. "Patterns of Occupational Authority & Control of Resources", M.A. Thesis, Dept. of Sociology, Hebrew University, 1977.).

Little information was obtainable as to autonomy on the job. This seemed to stem first, from the lack of an examination of various aspects of autonomy other than freedom of manipulation of time. Such aspects include freedom to define work goals and aims, freedom to determine priorities of various tasks, etc. Second, perhaps because of distinctive features of the Israeli labor force or alternatively because of a lack of sensitive means of measurement in our study, the very large proportions of respondents reporting autonomy made analyses of the autonomous versus the non-autonomous somewhat problematic.

Much more so than with reference to control of resources, job autonomy was found to be distributed fairly evenly throughout the range of occupations held by respondents in our sample. Likewise, associations between autonomy and geo-cultural origin, and autonomy and educational attainment were found to be minimal. We may note that the finding indicating autonomy for virtually <u>all</u> of the self-employed raises the question as to the meaningful applicability of such a variable to the work situation of these respondents.

Moderate correlations were found to prevail between resource control and job autonomy.

The association between autonomy and general job satisfaction was found to be negligible, but those between autonomy variables and satisfaction from certain specific aspects of the job were considerably higher (for example - the correlation of workhours flexibility and satisfaction from the degree of independence on the job is 0.23).

III. Negation of resources also proved to be a very problematic sphere, both in terms of its conceptualization and because of problems involved in its measurement. While a relationship was indicated between negation of resources in one sphere and negation in others, the general reluctance of respondents to report such negation

- 56 -

of their resources combined with the difficulties in defining any given feature of the job as constituting a denial of resources negatively perceived by the respondents render analyses involving this variable tentative at best.

The inverse relationships which we might tend to predict between negation of resources and resource control and negation of resources and autonomy were not found to prevail.

Ethnic origin and educational attainments were not found to be associated in a significant manner with negation of resources. The negative relationship predicted between job satisfaction and negation of resources was found to exist only with reference to some aspects of the job, and in any case - is a relatively weak one.

IV. In light of the obvious limitations of the data on autonomy and negation of resources, path analysis aimed at description of the process of attainment of job power was employed only with reference to resource control. Except in the case of occupational prestige and ethnicity, the variables represented in the path model do not seem to have significant direct effects on resource control. Thus the variables in the path model presented account for only 9 per cent of the variance in resource control so that we are left with little information as to the process of recruitment to positions of control.

On the other hand the second model presented indicates the very substantial direct effect which resource control has on income, greatly exceeding that of occupational prestige on income. The inclusion of the variable of resource control in the model significantly increases the explained variance in income and perhaps serves to shed new light on the determinants and components of income attainment.

- 57 -

# PART VII: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of the study reported on in this paper was twofold: first, to attempt to arrive at a clear conceptualization and definition of the concept of "job power" and develop procedures for its measurement, and second - to attempt to determine to what extent such a variable is an independent and significant component of the individual status profile and a possible basis for the formation of solidary social groupings.

It would seem that these goals were attained, at least in part. From various analyses of the data, job power - or at least, control of resources on the job emerges as a significant status component, and does not appear as merely a proxy for occupational prestige. The conclusion can be derived both from the findings indicating that the distribution of resource control among respondents in our sample is not identical with the distribution of prestige, and second - from the findings indicating that income rewards accrue to possession of resource control beyond, and possibly independently of, what might be predicted on the basis of occupational prestige. In a path model analysis, the contribution of resource control to the explanation of income attainment was found to be even more significant than that of occupational prestige.

However, it seems difficult to test the hypothesis as to the role of job power as a basis for the formation of social groupings in the framework of a small sample such as ours. Those respondents reporting control of resources do not seem to be bound by common social class origins (see Model 1) or even by common educational attainments, so that their control of resources on their various jobs in and of itself would have to serve as the main bond uniting them into a solidary social group. The extent to which this is empirically so is very difficult to determine by use of the data at hand. It would be desirable to collect data on interaction patterns, participation in voluntary organizations, political behavior, stratification images, etc. of these respondents, and thus attempt to determine to what extent they indeed constitute a group sharing in common values on these axes as well. In addition, the possibility should be examined that a sub-stratum of the most powerful can be delineated among all controllers of resources which indeed has the qualities of a distinct elite.

A particularly interesting question in the Israeli context is the relative representation of persons of various geo-cultural origin and length-of-residence in Israel among those in control of resources. The analysis of such a component in the individual's status profile may prove to shed new light as to the factors underlying the inequality noted between various groups. In order for such a question to be fruitfully examined a larger sample and a more ethnically varied one than was available to us should be employed.

With regard to the variables of autonomy and negation of resources, it would seem that the present study was less successful both in terms of the conceptualization of these variables and possibly as a result - in their measurement. Autonomy was examined only in terms of the worker's time resource and proved to be especially problematic with reference to the self-employed. Likewise, with reference to negation of resources, a clearer and possibly more objective definition of this variable is indicated. When the respondent is asked to <u>evaluate</u> to what extent negation of resources is a feature of his work situation, he seems to be reluctant to admit to such "deprivation" in such a central feature of his day-to-day life. Furthermore, as presently conceived, many of the spheres we defined as indicating negation of

- 59 -

resources are likely to be perceived as benefits by various respondents.

Several suggestions for the future study of job power may be made. First, it seems to be essential to investigate this variable in the framework of a much larger sample than was available to us. Such a sample would allow for greater ethnic variation among the respondents and would thus allow for more in-depth analyses of the role of ethnic origin in the attainment of job power. Furthermore, it would be desirable to have work organizations of both large and small scale represented in the sample, thus allowing for the comparison of the implications of possession of job power in each type of setting for the individual's status.

Second, it might be necessary to differentiate between employees and the self-employed and develop separate "theories" and measures of job power for each. This conclusion is indicated in various analyses of the current data described above which cast doubt as to the applicability of the same criteria for the determination of the job power of both groups.

Several questions which were not examined in the current study seem to be of interest for future investigations. First, in the sphere of control of resources it seems important to determine the implications of differential degrees of control (in terms of the scope of resources involved), of control over different types of resources on the job, and of differential degrees of proximity to sources of control for the receipt of payoffs and rewards. It might be particularly interesting to examine to what extent even being <u>close</u> to the center - in terms of personal acquaintance and interaction - without exercising actual control, confers various privileges and rewards.

- 60 -

Finally, as a complement to the development of objective measures of job power it might be interesting to study job power from a more subjective standpoint as well. Thus it may be useful to investigate to what extent job power is perceived as a criterion for attributing prestige to occupations or individuals, and/or to what extent it is viewed as a reward which should accrue to prestigious occupations. The self-images and status self-evaluations of persons in powerful positions as compared with their non-powerful colleagues in a given occupational category might also be examined. Such research would provide information as to the subjective importance of job power as a component of individual status.

The present research seems to have provided at least a beginning in the study of the job power variable primarily in terms of description and measurement of its components, in the identification of persons and positions possessing this status attribute, and in the measurement of the extent to which it serves as a medium of exchange for the attainment of rewards and payoffs.

#### REFERENCES

## Argyle, M.

#### 1972 The Social Psychology of Work. London: Methuen.

## Bachman, J.G. & A.S. Tannenbaum

1968 "The Control-Satisfaction Relationship across Varied Areas of Experience," in A.S. Tannenbaum (ed.), Control in Organizations, New York: McGraw Hill.

the state of the second of the second of a state of the second of the se

a here and the contract of the state of the

## Baron, H.M. et al.

1972 "Black Powerlessness in Chicago," in R. Lejeune (ed.), <u>Class and Class</u> Conflict in American Society. Chicago: Markham.

#### Bierstedt, R.

1950 "An Analysis of Social Power," in <u>American Sociological Review</u> 15, December 1950, pp. 730-738.

#### Blau, P.M.

	1964	Exchange	and	Power	in	Social	Life.	New	York:	Wiley	æ	Sons
--	------	----------	-----	-------	----	--------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---	------

#### Blau, P.M. & O.D. Duncan

1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley.

## Blauner, R.

1964 Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

#### Blauner, R.

1967 "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (eds.), Class, Status, and Power. New York: Free Press.

#### Cartwright, D.

1965 "Influence, Leadership, and Control," in J.G. March, <u>Handbook of</u> Organizations. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co.

## Clark, T.N.

1968 Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analyses. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.

#### Clement, W.

1975 "Inequality of Access: Characteristics of the Canadian Corporate Elite," in <u>Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology</u>, February 1975, pp. 33-53.

Cohen, A.K. & H.M. Hodges Jr.

1972 "Characteristics of the Lower Blue-Collar Class," in H.R. Stub, <u>Status</u> Communities in Modern Society. Illinois: Dryden Press Inc.

#### Dahrendorf, R.

1959 <u>Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society</u>. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

## Eisenstadt, S.N.

1967 Israeli Society. London and New York: Basic Books.

## Eisenstadt, S.N.

1971 <u>Social Differentiation and Stratification</u>. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.

#### Form, W.H. & G.P. Stone

- 1968 "Clothing and the Man at Work," in R. Dubin, <u>Human Relations in</u> Administration. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Goldhammer, H. & E.A. Shils
  - 1968 "Types of Power," in R. Dubin, <u>Human Relations in Administration</u>. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Goldthorpe, J.H. et al.

1967 "The Affluent Worker and the Thesis of Embrourgeoisement: Some Preliminary Findings," in Sociology, Vol. 1, pp. 11-31.

## Hall, R.H.

1972 Organizations, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, R.O. Peterson, D.F. Capwell

1957 Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pennsylvania: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.

#### Jencks, C. et al.

1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

### Kahn, R.L.

1972 "The Meaning of Work: Interpretation and Proposals for Measurement," in A. Campbell and P.E. Converse, <u>The Human Meaning of Social Change</u>. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

## Kluegel, J.R.

1975 Occupational Authority and Social Inequality: A Proposal for a Thesis for the Degree of Dr. of Philo., University of Wisconsin.

#### Kornhauser, W.

1965 Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: J. Wiley.

## Lasswell, T.E.

1965 Class and Stratum. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.

#### Lenski, G.

1966 Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification. New York: McGraw-Hill.

## Lopreato, J.

1968 "Authority Relations and Class Conflict," in <u>Social Forces</u> 47(1), September, pp. 70-79.

Lynd, R.S. & H.M. Lynd

1929 Middletown: A Study in American Culture. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

## MacKenzie, G.

1973 The Aristocracy of Labor: The Position of Skilled Craftsmen in the American Class Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, J., V. Kraus, & G. Noam

1976 "Factors in Status Attainment in Israel," Paper prepared for the ISA Research Committee on Stratification, Jerusalem, Seminar on Mobility, The Hebrew University.

## Mills, C.W.

1956 The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press.

#### Mills, C.W.

1970 "The Higher Circles," in E.O. Laumann, P.M. Siegel and R.W. Hodge, The Logic of Social Hierarchies. Chicago: Markham.

#### Presthus, R.

1962 The Organizational Society. New York: Vintage Books.

- Schein, E.H. & J.S. Ott
  - 1962 "The Legitimacy of Organizational Influence," in <u>American Journal of</u> Sociology 67(6), May 1962, pp. 682-690.

#### Schwartz, B.

- 1974 "Waiting, Exchange, and Power: The Distribution of Time in Social Systems," in AJS 79(4), January, pp. 841-869.
- Sewell, W.H., A.O. Haller, & G.W. Ohlendorf
  - 1970 "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process: Replication and Revision," in ASR 35, pp. 1014-1027.

## Shils, E.A.

1970 "Deference", in E.O. Laumann, P.M. Siegel and R.W. Hodge, <u>The Logic</u> of Social Hierarchies. Chicago: Markham.

## Tausky, C.

1970 Work Organizations: Major Theoretical Perspectives. Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Thielbar, G.W. & S.D. Feldman (Eds.)

1972 Issues in Social Inequality. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

#### Weber, M.

1946 "Class, Status, and Party," in From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, edited and translated by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

קרארס, ורד

1976 <u>דירוג חברתי של מקצועות בישראל</u> – חיבור לשם קבלת תואר דוקטור לפילוסופיה. האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, תשרי תשל"ז.

שמחה, ניצה

1974

"מוביליות תעסוקתית ותחושת קיפוח מקצועית בקרב קבוצות מוצא שונות", עבודת גמר לקבלת התואר "מוסמך במדעי החברה" בחוג לסוציולוגיה, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים.

	Two Measures of Resource-Control (14-po Index and the Dichotomous Index) and ot Socio-Demographic Variables					
	14-Point Index*	Dichotomous Index*	N			
×1	177	177	217			
x2	028	067	263			
x <sub>3</sub>	034	026	188			
×4	.085	.122	216			
×5	.032	.076	236			
x <sub>6</sub>	104	131	221			
×7	057	129	218			
x <sub>8</sub>	151	168	173			
x <sub>9</sub>	109	138	225			
×10	160	236	220			
×11	.260	.219	228			
x <sub>12</sub>	.288	.267	237			
x <sub>13</sub>	.103	.158	212			
x <sub>14</sub>	053	017	217			
x15	400	440	224			

\*) Both indexes of Resource-Control were coded from high to low control. Thus in the 14-point index, a score of 1 represents maximum control, while a score of 14 - minimum control. In the dichotomous index, a score of 1 indicated the respondent's control of resource, and 2 - no control of resources. Thus many of the correlations of the indexes with variables coded from low to high values (for example, ethnic origin, education, occupational prestige, income, etc.) are negative.

in apparent the second activity of the second

time ConfCiningto

# Appendix B (continued)

<sup>x</sup> 1	=	Ethnic origin (0=Asia-Africa; 1=Europe-America)
x2	E a c	Father's education (last school attended)
x <sub>3</sub>	=	Father's occupation when respondent was 14 years of age (Kraus prestige score)
×4	=	Father's employment status when respondent was 14 years of age (1=employee or member of a cooperative; 2=self-employed)
×5	=	Number of siblings when respondent was 14 years of age
×6	=	Respondent's education (last school attended)
x <sub>7</sub>	=	Respondent's first occupation (Kraus prestige score)
×8	=	Respondent's occupation 5 years ago (Kraus prestige score)
x <sub>9</sub>	-	Number of years respondent is employed in present job ("vetek")
x10	=	Respondent's current occupation (Kraus prestige score)
×11	=	Autonomy on the job: Flexibility of work-hours
×12	=	Autonomy on the job: Freedom to leave work to arrange personal matters
<sup>x</sup> 13	=	Negation of resources: Feeling of fatigue after work
x <sub>14</sub>	=	Negation of resources: Extent to which job prevents respondent from engaging in other activities
x15	=	Monthly income from current job.

# APPENDIX C: Employed Respondents by Resource-Control (Dichotomous Index) and Degree of Satisfaction from Various Aspects of Their Jobs

A) Satisfaction from degree to which skills and training are used on the job

Skills and Training Control	High	High Intermediate		TOTAL	
Having Control	n = 28	n = 46	n = 12	n = 86	
	(32.5%)	(53.4)	(14.1)	(100.0)	
Not Having Control	n = 26	n = 74	n = 34	n = 134	
	(19.4)	(55.2)	(25.4)	(100.0)	

Significance = 0

Gamma = .578

B) Satisfaction from initiative and independence which the job allows for

Initiative and Resource Independence Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL	
Having Control	n = 31	n = 43	n = 12	n = 86	
	(35.9)	(50.0)	(14.1)	(100.0)	
Not having Control	n = 27	n = 58	n = 49	n = 134	
	(21.5)	(43.2)	(35.3)	(100.0)	

Significance = 0

Gamma = .605
### Appendix C (Continued)

Interest Resource Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 35	n = 46	n = 5	n = 86
	(40.8)	(53.4)	(5.8)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 41	n = 56	n = 38	n = 135
	(33.7)	(41.4)	(24.9)	(100.0)

## C) Satisfaction from the extent to which the work is interesting

Significance = 0 Gamma = .552

D) Satisfaction from standard of living which the job allows for

Standard of Resource Living Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 16	n = 49	n = 21	n = 86
	(18.6)	(55.8)	(25.6)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 14	n = 58	n = 61	n = 133
	(15.2)	(41.2)	(43.6)	(100.0)

Significance = 0 Gamma = .510

E) Satisfaction from degree to which the job is important to society

Social Resource Importance Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 30	n = 47	n = 9	n = 86
	(35.9)	(53.4)	(10.7)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 30	n = 72	n = 32	n = 134
	(22.3)	(55.1)	(22.6)	(100.0)

Significance = 0 Gamma = .547

# Appendix C (Continued)

F) Satisfaction from degree of power and influence respondent wields on the job

Power and Resource Influence Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 24	n = 43	n = 17	n = 84
	(31.5)	(49.9)	(18.6)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 12	n = 65	n = 51	n = 128
	(9.3)	(50.1)	(40.6)	(100.0)

Significance = 0

Gamma = .511

G) Satisfaction from prestige the job enjoys in society

Prestige Resource Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 22	n = 47	n = 16	n = 85
	(28.1)	(53.3)	(18.6)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 26	n = 73	n = 36	n = 135
	(21.5)	(55.1)	(23.4)	(100.0)

Significance = 0 Gamma = .557

## Appendix C (Continued)

### H) Satisfaction from labor relations on the job

Labor Resource Relations Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 32	n = 41	n = 12	n = 85
	(35.9)	(49.9)	(14.1)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 35	n = 72	n = 27	n = 134
	(21.5)	(55.1)	23.4)	(100.0)

Significance = 0

Gamma = .602

I) Satisfaction from possibilities of promotion and advancement

Promotion Resource Possibilities Control	High	Intermediate	Low	TOTAL
Having Control	n = 20	n = 35	n = 29	n = 84
	(23.8)	(41.6)	(34.6)	(100.0)
Not Having Control	n = 22	n = 50	n = 60	n = 132
	(16.8)	(37.8)	(45.4)	(100.0)

Significance = 0

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES:

-----

- רשימת פרסומי אמכון:
- 1-75 "Compensation for Inflation Under Israel's Emergency Economic Policy," Jack Habib & Robert Lerman.
- 3-76 "Equity and the Social Insurance Paradox," Jack Habib & Robert Lerman.
- 5-76 "Economic Aspects of Reforming Pensions in Israel," Haim Factor, Jack Habib & Robert Lerman.
- 7-76 "The Effect on Poverty Status in Israel of Considering Wealth and Variability of Income," Jack Habib, Meir Kohn & Robert Lerman.
- 9-76 "Alternative Benefit Formulas in Income Support Programs for the Aged," Jack Habib & Robert Lerman.
- 11-76 "Intergenerational Educational Mobility in Israel An Overview," Judah Matras & Gila Noam.
- 13-76 "The Cross-Section Processor CDC Version 1," Meir Kohn.

15-76 "A Critical Overview of Israeli Housing Policy," Robert Lerman.

17-76 "Programs for the Elderly in Community Centers in Israel," Susie Linder-Pelz.

19-76 "The Mortality of Moslems, Druze & Christians in Israel," J.H. Abramson & R. Gofi

21-76 "Guide to Israeli Research in Social Gerontology," Marcia Kretzmer.

- 23-76 "Disability and Rehabilitation A Mathematical Model," Moshe Nordheim.
- 25-77 "Ethnic and Other Primordial Differentials in Intergenerational Mobility in Israel," Judah Matras & Dov Weintraub.
- 27-77 "Services for Older New Immigrants in Israel," Yehiel Eran & Gerda Friedheim.
- 29-77 "Ethnic and Social Origin 'Dominance' in Occupational Attainment in Israel," Judah Matras.
- 31-77 "The Causes of Death of Moslems, Druze & Christians in Israel," R. Gofin & J.H. Abramson.
- 33-78 "Patterns of Occupational Authority and Control of Resources," G. Noam.

DISCUSSION PAPERS PUBLISHED IN HEBREW:

- "הפצוי על ההתיקרות בגין מדיניות החרום הכלכלית", יעקב חביב ורוברט לרמן. 2-75 "שרותים לעולים קשישים בישראל", יחיאל ערן וגרדה פרידהיים. 4-76 "מוגבלות ושיקום - שלב בהתפתחות האדם: מודל מתימטי", משה נורדהיים. 6-76 "תכניות לקשישים במרכזים קהילתיים בישראל", סוזי לינדר-פלץ. 8-76 "טיפול בית - קווים מנחים לגיבוש מדיניות וארגון הספקת השרות", נסים ברוך. 10-76 "סקירה בקורתית של מדיניות השכון בישראל", רוברט לרמן. 12-76 "שמוש בפנאי של גילאי +70 - סקר ראשוני", חנה וייל ואירית ברמן-אשכנזי. 14-76 "לברור המונח 'זקן' במקרא", משה א. קורץ. 16-77 "סקירת ספרות בנושא הכנה לפרישה מהעבודה", נורית ניראל. 18-77 "הקשישים בירושלים: תמורות ותחזיות דמוגרפיות", מרים שטרקשל ועמירם גונן. 20-77 "דיור תומך קבוצתי לקשישים (מעונות ודינל מוגז): מספר מקומות ושטחי הקרקע לאוכלוסיה 22-77 היהודית בירושלים, 1977-1992", עמירם גו'נן, מרים שטרקשל וישראל קמחי. "סיבות פניה למעונות לקשישים עצמאיים", חנה וייל ואילה ביבר. 24-78 "תמורות במערכת הפנסיה", יעקב חביב וחיים פקטור. 26 - 78
  - 28-78 "מערכת הפנסיות מעבודה בישראל הכדאיות לפרט", חיים פקטור.
    - 30-78 "נטיה לניידות בקרב שכירים בישראל", יעקב ויסברג.