

Social class was a prominent but contested concept in 1964, the year of the inaugural volume of the *Canadian Review of Sociology*. For the Canadian sociological community of that time, class was a default explanatory principle and analytical category, and thus was routinely invoked to frame or legitimate a study, or explain a finding. The utility of the everyday sociological application of the concept of class, however, was facing two major challenges. The first came from E.P Thompson, whose audacious *The Making of the English Working Class* was published in 1963; he asserted an historical, relational and cultural notion of class that contradicted the static, structural notions that dominated both sociological scholarship and orthodox Marxian analyses. "I do not see class as a 'structure', nor even as a 'category'," wrote Thompson, "but as something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships" (1980: 8).

The second challenge to sociological class analysis in the mid-1960s came from within the discipline, and indeed was the subject of the lead article in the *Review's* very first issue. Dennis Wrong asserted, "The emerging social structure of post-bourgeois industrial society can best be understood if, except for secondary purposes and for historical analysis, we abandon the concept of social class and re-define much of the work done under this label as a contribution to the sociology of equality and inequality" (1964: 11). Wrong was convinced that classes as real groups were a thing of the past, and as a consequence class was a superfluous analytical tool in contemporary research on inequality. He was particularly critical of sociologists "who persist in referring to combined measures of occupation, income, or education as 'indexes' of social class" since such an approach risked "confusion with the quite different meaning of class in the writings of the leading theorists of stratification" (p. 7).

One constant in the discipline of sociology since the *Review's* founding has been theoretical and methodological debates over class analysis. While some critics have sought to fundamentally reorient how class analysis is understood and practiced (with notable examples over the years including Parkin, 1979; Savage, 2000; and Acker, 2006), other critics have followed in Dennis Wrong's footsteps and argued that the concept of class is of limited utility in understanding contemporary patterns of economic inequalities and social change (e.g., Clark and Lipset, 1991; and Beck, 2002). These complex debates are one of the intellectual backdrops to the studies of class that have appeared in the *Canadian Review of Sociology* since 1964. The purposes of the present article are to identify the main trajectories of class analysis found in the *Review*, highlight some of the important articles found in each trajectory, and suggest how the broader debates about class analysis within the discipline have influenced the scholarship on class that has appeared in the *Review*.

The first section of the article briefly sketches the main intellectual challenges to sociological class analysis since the 1960s. This is contextual material to aid in understanding the development of different trajectories of class research in the *Review*. The second section reviews the scholarship on class that was published during the early years in the life of the journal. I judge the "early years" period to have ended in 1975, the year that the journal's publication of Dorothy Smith's groundbreaking analysis of the exclusion of women from ideological structures suggested that the logic of class analysis might need a fundamental rethinking.

The third and longest section assesses the period between 1976 and 2012, dividing the discussion into five streams of scholarship: (1) Class Structure; (2) Marxian Class Typologies in Quantitative Research; (3) The Plural Elite Tradition and Capitalist Class

Research; (4) Working Class Studies; and (5) Ascendant Class Trajectories (namely, class analysis utilizing Pierre Bourdieu's concepts, and the class analysis of social democracy).

The conclusion sketches how sociological debates on class analysis since 1964 are connected to the scholarship on class that has appeared in the *Canadian Review of Sociology* and offers three thoughts on future directions for class analysis in Canadian sociology. It argues that while class analysis is more fragmented today than it was during the early years of the *Review*, it is generally more attuned to conceptual and theoretical issues and to its own analytical limitations, and consequently remains a fruitful source of both explanatory and interpretive sociology.

### **CHALLENGES TO SOCIOLOGICAL CLASS ANALYSIS SINCE THE 1960S**

Three major intellectual challenges have reoriented and fragmented the sub-discipline of class analysis since the 1960s. For brevity I refer to these challenges as (1) feminist/anti-racist, (2) poststructuralist and (3) individualization.

The first challenge originated with sociologists associated with second wave feminism who criticized conventional models of social class for treating the structure of male employment as synonymous with class structure and ignoring housework altogether (Siltanen and Doucet, 2008: 7; Crompton, 2008: ix). The feminist critique later involved a deconstructive analysis that revealed the analytical limitations and hidden gender biases in the concepts employed not only in conventional class analysis but also in historical/cultural class research in the tradition of E.P. Thompson (Rose, 1997: 147). The salient point is that it is impossible to conduct a class analysis without taking into account the gendered character of both knowledge and social processes. This critique was later

deepened by critical race theorists like Himani Bannerji who, recognizing the way that gender, 'race' and class have "a formative relationship with each other" (1995: 14), identified the following implication for class analysis: "If class as an analytical and political concept is not going to be used as merely a tool of abstraction or an ideological trick to perform erasure of the social and the historical, then it cannot be understood independently of concrete social relations which specify the concretizing forms of difference" (1995: 34). Informed by this perspective, a new variety of class analysis has been crafted in recent years: it is embedded within an intersectionality paradigm that problematizes the complex interrelationships among different forms of social inequality (e.g., McCall, 2005; Acker, 2006).

The second challenge resulted from the poststructuralist critique of structural sociology. Structural class analysis of the 1970s and early 1980s had tended to be economistic and deterministic, with its Marxian variant also characterized by a teleological theory of history. The poststructuralist challenge at first strengthened the hand of historical and ethnographic studies of class, as opposed to the quantitative study of employment aggregates (see Thompson, 1978 and Willis, 1977). In addition, rather than assuming that class consciousness and class action automatically followed from location in a class structure, sociologists directly investigated these processes, often informed by new notions such as Anthony Giddens' model of class structuration (1981: 107-110). One long-term consequence of the poststructuralist critique has been the gradual development of a "pragmatic realist" variety of class analysis (Wright, 2009: 101). It studies the structural processes of social closure highlighted by Weber and of exploitation emphasized by Marx (Manza and McCarthy, 2011: 162) as well as the processes that sort people into particular

class places (Wright, 2009: 102-104) within a conventional post-positivist framework aimed at sociological explanation. The second long-term consequence of the poststructuralist critique has been the development of a class-centred understanding of politics that has both Marxian and non-Marxian followers (Manza and McCarthy, 2011: 164). Power resources theory and Gramscian hegemony theory are two variants of contemporary class analysis of politics.

Finally, the third intellectual challenge originated in the processes that have disorganized and in some cases destroyed traditional working class communities. Ulrich Beck theorizes this development as part of a shift to a new stage of modernity characterized not just by globalization, structural unemployment and ecological crisis, but also by individualization (2002: 206). "With the decline of class and status groups," he argues, "the individual must become the agent of his or her own identity making and livelihood. The individual, not his or her class, becomes the unit for the reproduction of the social in his or her own lifeworld" (p. 203). Beck contends that class has become a "zombie" analytical category since, although it is still in use, the reality it references is dead (p. 203). Ulrich Beck's own response to the changes caused by individualization is to dispense with the study of class and instead study "collective life situations" associated with new lifestyles (p. 207). However some sociologists, drawing upon Pierre Bourdieu's "notion that class inequalities are reproduced through the hierarchically differentiated nature of tastes" (Bottero, 2004: 990), have found a way to reassert the relevancy of class analysis by giving it an individualizing twist. For instance, Mike Savage grants that "collective class identities are indeed weak" yet argues, "People continue to define their own individual identities in ways which inevitably involve relational comparisons with members of various social

classes” (2000: xiii). In this conception, class cultures are “viewed as modes of differentiation, rather than as types of collectivity” (p. 102) and class is “implicit, as encoded in people’s sense of self-worth and in their attitudes to and awareness of others – in how they carry themselves as individuals” (p. 107). Wendy Bottero praises this new focus on “processes of implicit, individualized differentiation” since it creates “the opportunity to look afresh at how inequality and hierarchy work.” However she questions whether expanding the meaning of the concept of class to encompass such processes invites confusion with older definitions of class (2004: 999-1000). Bottero’s misgiving highlights the distinctiveness of this Bourdieu-inspired form of class analysis.

### **AN AUSPICIOUS BEGINNING: CLASS ANALYSIS IN THE *REVIEW*, 1964-75**

Dennis Wrong’s lead article in the very first issue of the *Canadian Review of Sociology* (discussed above) was an attempt to shift sociologists away from the language of class analysis, at least when they studied contemporary patterns of inequalities. He highlighted conceptual and epistemological questions that, to this day, are fundamental to the study of social class, including: (1) Should the idea of classes be reserved for real groups (or at least potential real groups) or should the term also be applied to statistical categories of individuals (1964: 6); and (2) When class formation is relatively weak and uneven throughout a society, should the notion of class be replaced by concepts, such as economic interest groups and political associations, which better capture the reality of people’s group lives and consciousness (p. 10)?

Class analysis appeared in many guises in the early issues of the *Review*. One stream of scholarship centred on responses to and extensions of *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of*

*Social Class and Power in Canada*, published in 1965. That same year the *Review* published a major review essay on John Porter's famous book, written by none other than T.H. Marshall, best known for his identification of the historical development of the civil, political and social elements of citizenship. Marshall argued that Part I of *The Vertical Mosaic*, titled "The Structure of Class," was a necessary basis for understanding how power worked in Canada (1965: 216). He maintained, however, that Part I "is not really about social class, but about social differences of various kinds, including racial origin, religion, locality, occupation, education, and income" (p. 215). T.H. Marshall's terminological objection to John Porter's use of "social classes" stemmed from his view that "advanced democratic societies" were moving towards a condition where economic classes no longer constituted the dominant hierarchy of status groups (p. 217). Nevertheless his overall evaluation of *The Vertical Mosaic* was generous, respectful and constructive. The same cannot be said of a second review essay published many years later (Heap, 1972) that is notable only for the brusque response it evoked from John Porter (1972). Two other articles in this period updated some of Porter's empirical work on elites (Kelner, 1970; Clement, 1975) and Lorne Tepperman contributed an innovative and sophisticated set of studies on the dynamics of mobility into elite positions (see in particular 1972 and 1973).

There is a particularly rich vein of scholarship on working class formation and class conflict in Canada in the early issues of the *Review*. Ken Duncan, in analyzing the impact of Irish famine immigration on the social structure of Canada West, noted that what were "described by the contemporary press in simple Orange-Catholic terms involved such non-religious matters as political rights, working conditions, wages, and even the partisan enforcement of the law" (1965: 29). Donald Avery (1975) detailed the place of continental

European immigrants in the capitalist labour market in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the repression faced by immigrants who joined radical worker organizations and class conflicts. Patricia Marchak, reporting on a 1969 survey of white-collar workers in British Columbia, noted that women workers, compared to men, “enjoyed less control over their jobs, received lower incomes, and had fewer hopes for promotion” (1973: 137). To address these gender inequalities, Marchak provocatively called for “unions of women only, designed to bargain not only with employers but also with male workers and male-dominated unions” (p. 146). In the lead article of an issue titled, “Five Papers on Social Class in Canada,” Maurice Pinard presented an historically grounded explanation for why, into the 1960s, workers in Quebec did not tend to support leftist parties: “The lower classes often supported conservative organizations or parties, but only because they were not presented with strong alternatives more consonant with their interests and sentiments” (1970: 107). And finally, Hugh and Pat Armstrong used census data for the years 1941-1971 to document a structural division among workers with enormous implications for both class analysis and working class organizing: “Most women in the labour force remain concentrated in a few low-paid and low-skilled women’s jobs” (1975: 383).

Class analysis appears in unexpected ways in some articles in this period, but in other articles proves to be more apparent than real. Three examples of the former are: (1) Rex Lucas’s (1966) analysis of the status implications for middle-class women of participating in a job training program, which drew heavily on generalities about the social psychology of middle-class life; (2) Philippe Garigue’s (1964: 190) assessment of the development of sociological analysis concerning Quebec which concluded that, in the preceding decade, “the interest in the ethnic division of labour gradually developed into a



study of the class structure of Canada;” and (3) Donald Whyte’s (1965: 183) explanation for why the poor in North America do not constitute a class with a common consciousness and a propensity to engage in collective action. An example of the latter is an article that, although it includes “social class” in the title, does not involve much in the way of class analysis. Bernard Blishen (1970) reported the distribution of different immigrant groups across rank-ordered occupational prestige categories for the male 1961 labour force. As a preliminary to his main analyses, Blishen collapsed his own socio-economic index of predicted occupational prestige scores (1967) into six statistical categories that are termed classes (1970: 112). Blishen could just as easily have calculated the mean predicted occupational prestige for each immigrant group and compared the means; this demonstrates that the statistical classes created for the study were analytically unnecessary. Both of the trends noted in this paragraph suggest the ubiquity of class schemata in sociological thinking at the time.

Many studies in the early issues of the *Review* posited class as either a crucial social context or primary determinant of some outcome of interest. Examples include: Edmund Vaz’s 1965 study of delinquency among middle-class boys; Hyman Rodman’s 1968 assessment of how the notion of a “lower-class value stretch” helps to explain lower-class delinquency; Irving Rootman’s 1972 investigation of the class variation in mental illness in a small Saskatchewan town; Carl Cuneo and James Curtis’s research on whether the determinants of support for Quebec separatism varied by class (1974); and Jane Gaskell’s delineation of how social class background affects working class girls’ beliefs about sex roles (1975). Another study in this genre, which examined social class differences in the achievement orientations of grade nine students in Edmonton, justified the exclusion of

girls with a matter-of-fact sexist argument that would soon be decisively critiqued by feminist sociologists: “Boys were used because they are the ones who will set the social class level of their families of procreation” (Lawlor, 1970: 151). The original socio-economic index of occupations created by Blishen (1967:42) was biased by the application of this same assumption, with female-dominated occupations either being excluded entirely or assigned a predicted prestige score based only on the education and income scores for males.

My survey to this point has hopefully made clear that research on class was quite prominent in the 1964-75 issues of the *Review*. However in terms of reorienting how sociologists think about class and inequalities, and thereby changing the work that sociologists have undertaken since 1975, no other article comes close to matching Dorothy Smith’s “An analysis of ideological structures and how women are excluded: considerations for academic women” (1975; with 115 citations in Google Scholar on 7 April 2013). The only article that Dorothy Smith ever published in the *Review*, it makes the case for “constructing a sociology *for* women rather than *of* women” (p. 367). Embedded within Smith’s argument are at least three insights with direct relevance to class analysis.

First, “images, vocabularies, concepts, knowledge of and methods of knowing the world are integral to the practice of power” (p. 354). To understand class power, therefore, sociologists have to study ideological structures alongside economic and political structures. Second, “the class basis of ideology is articulated yet further to a sex basis” (p. 357). This implies that a sociological analysis of class ideology must incorporate a gender lens, just as a sociological analysis of gender ideology must incorporate a class lens. Third, although the edifice of sociological concepts, methods and theories is not completely

ideological, it has an ideological dimension. Sociology, including the sociological study of class, is ideological when it organizes “the local, particular, and directly known into the social forms of thought and discourse in which it is or can be ruled” (p. 356). The insights in Dorothy Smith’s 1975 article contributed to the feminist and anti-racist challenges that eventually led to the new form of intersectionality class analysis.

## **MAPPING PROMINENT RESEARCH TRAJECTORIES, 1976-2012**

### *Class Structure*

In the social ontology of the structural class analyst, the structure of the relations among class positions plays an important role in determining macro phenomena like the levels of class conflict, patterns of class alliances, segmentation of classes and extent of the wealth and income inequalities in a society. These phenomena, in turn, are important to the experiences that individuals have as participants in class relations.

In the earliest years of the *Review*, no studies on class structure were published. With the ascendancy of neo-Marxian class analysis in the social sciences in the 1970s, however, studies of class structure became a feature of the *Review* between the second half of the 1970s and 1990s. A popular focus for research has been the agrarian class structure. This research has often been framed by “the classical Marxist position that capitalist farming will necessarily supersede petit bourgeois production and come to dominate agriculture” (Ghorayshi, 1987: 365) and includes studies of: the historical process of capitalist expansion in Quebec agriculture (Bernier, 1976); “the uneven, but nevertheless growing, capitalist dominance of petty agriculture, the petty fisheries, and petty forestry” in the Maritimes (Sacouman 1980: 239); and changes between 1971 and 1981 in the relative

importance of petit bourgeois and capitalist farms in different agricultural sectors (Ghorayshi, 1987). In a conclusion shared by Bernard Bernier (1976: 422), Parvin Ghorayshi argued that even in those agricultural sectors (like grain) where petit commodity producers continued to thrive into the 1980s, these producers had “a capitalistic dimension” because of their “integration into the larger capitalist economy in various ways” (1987: 368).

Three additional articles added complexity to the picture of change in the agrarian class structure. Tony Winson’s research on the links between food processing companies and farmers in Nova Scotia in the 1980s concluded that petty commodity producers had only transferred to food processing companies much of their management control when the commodity being produced was highly perishable (1988: 549-550). Ellen Wall interpreted the trend towards the replacement of hired labour by machines for tomato harvesting in Ontario as consistent with “the Marxist model for the evolution of capitalist agriculture” (1994: 71). Finally, Tony Winson utilized a survey of 155 fruit and vegetable producers supplying food processors in Ontario in 1987 (1996: 97) to validate his earlier finding that there was not “any unified trend to capitalist farming” (p. 107). He also opined that even those farmers who employed many seasonal labourers and were thus fully capitalist during the growing season are best seen as “part-time capitalists” (p. 106).

Carl Cuneo’s (1978) research on changes over time in class exploitation (as measured by Marx’s ratio of surplus value to variable capital) in Canada properly belongs in the scholarly genre of Marxian economics (see Cockshott, Cottrell and Michaelson, 1995 for a more recent example). However Cuneo also postulated the level of class exploitation as a key, dynamic property of the capitalist class structure, and correlated calculations of

class exploitation, 1917-71, with strike and lockout measures for the same period. A positive correlation was interpreted as a structural effect, and the article concluded, "A Marxian approach to class analysis has much potency in the study of social inequality" (1978: 284). Setting aside conceptual and technical criticisms of Cuneo's work (e.g., Emmerson and Rowe, 1982), correlating time series of class exploitation and class conflict as a test of theoretical adequacy reveals the mistaken logic of the structuralist Marxism of that era: the constituent properties of class structures were expected to have a degree of unmediated explanatory power that exceeds anything that would be hypothesized today.

Another line of research on the Canadian class structure responded to the feminist challenge by examining changes in the gender composition of classes over time. The main finding of Carl Cuneo's study of government data for 1931-84 was, "Proletarianization in the sense of exclusion from decision-making authority at the workplace has increased more for women than men," (1985: 487). William Carroll followed up on this finding, using special tabulations for the 1981 census to study the proletarianization of women after controlling for occupational segregation. He identified "dramatic gender differences in class within certain occupations" such as physicians and hair stylists. In both cases women were much more likely to be employees than men (1987: 573, 580-82).

An early quantitative study of intersectionality is Peter Li's specification of the ways that race, gender and class interacted in affecting the earnings of Canadians in 1985. Li considered the race/gender fractioning of five classes defined according to Erik Olin Wright's original (1979) model. Net of the impact of control variables like nativity, full-time/part-time work status, sector of employment and education, there were large gender gaps in earning in all classes but substantial differences in earnings between white males

and non-white males only in three of five classes and between white females and non-white females only in the managerial class (1992: 499). Overall, race/gender fractioning was a much more important determinant of earnings for the managerial and working classes than for the other three classes (p. 502). Li concluded, "Labour market arrangements and work experiences are insufficient to understand the earning outcome for men's work and women's work" (p. 505); he recommended that future work link "the formation of race and gender relations outside the sphere of production to class relations" (p. 505). In anticipating the logic of what Leslie McCall has termed the "intercategorical complexity" approach to researching intersectionality (2005), Peter Li's study was ahead of its time.

Arguably the most influential substantive article on the Canadian class structure found in the *Review* is John Myles' study of how the shift towards a postindustrial economy between 1961 and 1981 affected not only the class structure but also the skill content of working class jobs (1988: 337; it had 69 citations in Google Scholar on 4 April 2013.) As the new middle class of professionals and managers expanded during this period as a percentage of the labour force, and the working class concomitantly contracted, there was "no change in the skill composition of blue collar jobs and substantial upgrading of white collar jobs" (p. 343). But even though working class jobs were not apparently deskilled on average as new middle class jobs increased, Myles found "a polarized skill distribution of skilled and unskilled workers" (p. 352) that led him to recommend future research on the 'good job' and 'bad job' segments of the working class (pp. 352-353). This was a more nuanced appraisal of changes in the post-industrial class structure than generally found in an international literature which claimed that good jobs were unambiguously replacing

bad jobs (Myles and Turegun, 1994: 118).

At least three comparative studies of class structure have appeared in the *Review*. Don Black and John Myles compared the class structures of Canada, the United States and Sweden circa 1980, utilizing survey data from the Comparative Class Structure and Class Consciousness project initiated by Erik Olin Wright. They concluded that the relatively large size of the petit bourgeois class in Canada, the lower average size of employers in Canada and “the apparent ‘overmanagement’ of the Canadian working class ... particularly in those sectors where the American branch plant has been dominant” are all traces of Canada’s history of dependent industrialization (1986: 177-178). In a largely descriptive study, Wallace Clement (1990) used the same survey data while expanding the cross-country comparisons to include Norway and Finland; he reported class distributions by gender for each country, with each class distribution broken down by sectors. A third comparative study demonstrated the use of a hierarchical regression technique to specify the “capitalist development processes” that generate cross-national variations in the strength of the relationships between the market position of labour (dependent variable) and explanatory variables such as strike volume and union growth (Griffin, O’Connell and McCammon, 1989). This approach rejected the idea that class structure affects class organization and struggle in a mechanistic way (p. 38) and instead sought to specify “the conditions under which a presumed theoretical proposition is operative” (p. 57).

Just as class structure is a limiting/enabling cause of macro phenomena like the wealth inequality in a society, class structure limits/enables the overall patterns of ascription. Richard Wanner’s (1999) research on the trends in educational opportunity in Canada over most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century can be seen as a study of the trend in the effect of

class structure on educational attainment. The substantive issue under investigation was whether the pattern of class-based ascription persisted during the 1960s and 1970s when there was a huge expansion of the educational system. Wanner designed the study as a test of competing theories, including “cultural reproduction theories ... [which] emphasize the role of education institutions in reproducing the class structure from generation to generation by making it difficult for members of lower-status groups to make the transition to higher education levels” (1999: 411). This study employed a technique (logistic regression), dependent variables (transitions to a higher level of educational achievement given completion of lower levels) and a model (including tests for trends) that allowed for the separation of the effect of the expansion of the educational system from the effect of class-based ascription (p. 429). Wanner found “at every transition level there has been no change in the effects of parental socio-economic status, as predicted by social reproduction theory.” More specifically, “class-based ascription is a constant, but it typically influences the early transitions to a greater extent than the later ones” (p. 437). The persistence of the class effect on educational attainment up until the 1990s contrasts with the pattern of results for gender and language: “so pronounced in older cohorts [but] negligible in more recent cohorts” (p. 409).

### *Marxian Class Typologies in Quantitative Research*

A survey of households in London, Ontario in 1970-71 (N=558) provided the data for an early study of class differences in economic and political beliefs (Rinehart and Okraku, 1974). “Socioeconomic class” (p. 211) was measured with an occupational breakdown that failed to separate owners from non-owners (p. 206). Measuring class using



occupational categories raised an important question: would a stronger relationship between class and beliefs be found if Marxian theory guided the operationalization of class or were all of the various measures of socioeconomic standing more or less equivalent in explanatory power?

It was this sort of class definitional question that propelled a study of the determinants of “left-wing radicalism” in North Winnipeg in 1973. Although Paul Stevenson’s project was a very early instance of neo-Marxian research on class, it unfortunately fell short of a groundbreaking effort since: (1) the measure of Marxian class locations was theoretically inconsistent because it incorporated the white-collar/blue-collar distinction to divide the working class; and (2) the four class categories were rank ordered, coded 1 to 4, and treated as a quantitative variable in correlation and regression analyses (1977: 274-277). Despite these limitations, Stevenson’s research was suggestive of something important since the Marxian class location variable had a stronger relationship with left-wing radicalism than alternative measures such as family income and socioeconomic status (p. 278).

The class definitional issue was likewise the focus for Erik Olin Wright’s early research on income determination in the United States. He found that a Marxian measure of class not only influenced income independently of occupational status, but also had a stronger influence on income than occupational status, net of education (1979: 124-126).

Studies employing theoretically derived Marxian measures of class soon appeared in the *Review*. The first reported on a comparison across seven advanced capitalist countries of the effects of class on schooling outcomes such as math test scores. The author, J. K. Lindsey, presented an original model of class structure that drew upon the work of Louis

Althusser while rejecting on theoretical grounds the typologies advanced by Wright, Nicos Poulantzas and Guglielmo Carchedi (1981: 301-303). A 1982 article by William Johnston and Michael Ornstein utilized a class schema derived from Carchedi's theory to study employed Canadians' economic beliefs. They found modest class differences in beliefs that were largely due to variations in the work and market experiences across classes (pp. 206-209). A second article by Johnston and Ornstein (1985) went into the question of the efficacy of class schemata in depth by comparing the predictive powers of three different models of class structure (derived from Poulantzas, Carchedi and Wright) as well as four other measures of socioeconomic standing. The criteria for the comparisons were a variety of economic and political beliefs (pp. 376-377). The authors reported that for many of the economic beliefs "class differences are stronger than cleavages along other lines of stratification" and concluded, "The class differences we have found are not simply another way of presenting the previously observed attitude differences among occupational, educational, or income groups" (p. 385). This was a convincing piece of research. It matched in quality and complemented the conclusions of the work that Erik Olin Wright himself was doing at the time on "empirically adjudicating contending class definitions" (1985: 136-191).

Over the next decade, a number of articles published by the *Review* deployed Marxian class typologies in quantitative investigations of the determinants of economic and political beliefs (Baer, Grabb and Johnston, 1987 and 1991; Pratt, 1987) or voting (Harrison and Krahn, 1995; Nakhaie and Arnold, 1996). A 1998 article even applied a Marxian class schema in a study of intergenerational educational attainment. Reza Nakhaie and James Curtis found that parents' class positions had significant effects on Canadian children's

educational attainments net of the effects of parents' educational attainments, demonstrating that overall intergenerational class effects only partially operate "through the consequences of certified cultural capital" (1998: 501-503, 508). They concluded that the use of a Marxian class schema to measure socioeconomic background is preferable to a conventional measure like occupational status not only on theoretical grounds but also since it reveals unique findings such as that the capitalist class "is comparatively successful in obtaining higher education for its offspring" (pp. 509-510).

Between the early 1980s and late 1990s, therefore, a number of researchers provided strong empirical support in the pages of the *Review* (and elsewhere as well) for including a neo-Marxian class schema as a key explanatory variable in quantitative studies of various outcomes. Nevertheless, this important insight seems to have not taken hold (although see Veenstra, 2007: 326 for an exception). For example, in a study of the determinants of attributions of poverty, Linda Reutter and co-authors (2006) measured socioeconomic background using only conventional measures of income and education even though class location could easily have been hypothesized as a determinant of the attributions. My contention, drawing upon Wright's "pragmatic realist" approach to class analysis (2009), is that there remains a compelling case for including a neo-Marxian class typology as an explanatory variable in any and all studies of the social determinants of individuals' attitudes, beliefs, decisions, behaviours or outcomes (such as contracting a disease). A recent article in the *Review* presented a theoretical overview of the causes of health disparities over the life course; it emphasized the importance of "fundamental social causes" that "involve resources such as knowledge, money, power, prestige, and beneficial social connections" (Seabrook and Avison, 2012: 52). Recognition of the resource

implications stemming from people's insertion in class relations would be a valuable addition to this theoretical model.

### *The Plural Elite Tradition and Capitalist Class Research*

In studying the overarching structure of power in Canada, John Porter posited the plural elite position "that power tends towards an equilibrium of competing elites" (1965: 214). Porter echoed the classical elite theorists' pessimism about the possibilities for democracy (pp. 552-558), and consequently argued that the best system of decision-making Canadians could realistically secure was an elite system where (1) no single elite becomes dominant since institutional elites maintain separate bases of power and identities, and therefore each effectively checks the powers of other elites (pp. 210-215); and (2) there is "open recruitment from all classes into the elites" (p. 558).

John Porter's plural elite preoccupations spawned a number of studies published in the *Review*. Changes in the recruitment patterns into the corporate elite between 1951 and 1972 were the focus of Wallace Clement's 1975 article. Surveys of business executives, civil servants, elected politicians and labour leaders in 1977-78 resulted in articles that compared these elite groups' economic beliefs (Ornstein, 1986) and analyzed their patterns of contact (Williams, 1989). The latter article concluded that, although there was "no monolithic elite structure in Canada," the business elite exercised the greatest capacity to influence other elite groups through elite interactions (pp. 234-35). Other articles in the plural elite research tradition have examined changes in the ethnic and racialized composition of elite groups (Ogumundson and McLaughlin, 1992; Black, 2000).

The articles cited in the previous paragraph demonstrate a modicum of continuing interest in John Porter's plural elite model of power. However taken as a whole, this thread of research is neither dynamic nor theoretically engaged. A stronger line of scholarship in the *Review* has re-theorized the corporate elite as the top-tier of the capitalist class and systematically studied changes over time in the character of capitalist class power in Canada. This scholarship is impressive because studies have systematically built upon one another, used evidence to test competing theoretical claims and established a solid corpus of knowledge on the social organization of the Canadian capitalist class. Among its contributions are the refutation of Canadian dependency theory (namely the 1970s notion that Canadian banks and mercantilists acted as compradors of foreign industrialists in underdeveloping Canada – see Carroll, 2007: 269-270); and the insight, based on the finding that globalization had not weakened capitalist class organization in Canada up until at least the early 1990s, that “nationally based systems of finance capital may even be part of the facilitation of globalization rather than a barrier to it” (Carroll and Alexander, 1999: 351).

The foundational studies on the capitalist class found in the *Review* applied network analytical methods to map the structure of the ties among major corporations, as evidenced by the sharing of common directors (Carroll, Fox and Ornstein, 1982; Ornstein, 1989; Carroll and Alexander, 1999). These articles constitute a coherent package, particularly when read alongside William Carroll's (2007) assessment of the development of his own research in the area. Carroll's research program, which analyzes corporate elites within a Marxian class perspective, considers how the social organization of corporate power is both “inseparable from the *accumulation* of capital” and a basis for the “exercise of

*hegemony* as a form of class power distinct from accumulation” (pp. 267-68). Capitalist hegemony in the era of neo-liberal globalization includes business activism that “has mimicked social movement activism,” the creation of national and transnational policy networks and a shift from oligarchy to meritocracy for recruitment into the corporate elite (pp. 275-76).

The richness of the Canadian research on corporate director interlocks stems from the fact that it is both longitudinal (analyses for the Keynesian era can be compared to analyses for the neoliberal era) and comparative (Canada has been compared to ten European countries for the 1980s and Australia for the 1990s). Additional articles in the 1980s and early 1990s on the capitalist class were: Michael Ornstein’s (1988) network study of the indirect ties between corporations that are created when corporate directors sit on the boards of hospitals and universities; and Jack Richardson’s incisive analyses of the significance of the rise in the financial trust industry in the 1970s and 1980s (1988) and why the original Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement happened (1992).

The focus on hegemonic class power within the Marxian perspective, as well as ideas found in alternative perspectives such as Bourdieu’s class theory and neo-institutionalism, open the door to new studies of capitalist class habitus, consciousness and action. For example, in an exploratory study in Toronto at the end of the 1980s, Bonnie Erickson found that “business culture,” signified by an “expert command of business language,” served as a work-relevant marker of class whereas “high-status culture” was irrelevant to workplace experiences (1991: 265-266, 276-77). Furthermore, two recent articles in the *Review* reported historical case studies of the strategic actions of business associations in Quebec (Graefe, 2004; Laroche, 2012). It therefore appears that the current

conjuncture presents ample research opportunities for sociologists to study capitalist class consciousness, formation and strategic action at the local, provincial, national and transnational scales.

### *Working Class Research*

The variety, scope and quality of studies on the working class published throughout the *Review's* history are remarkable. The themes used to organize this section are: (1) experiences of work restructuring; (2) values, identities and beliefs; (3) struggles and working class formation; (4) organizational challenges and leadership; and (5) regulation and social organization.

Work restructuring and its effects on workers have been the focus of a number of important studies published in the *Review* since 1990. Joel Novek's (1992) comparison of workplace injuries in two Canadian meatpacking plants in the 1980s found that when restructuring involved the intensification of labour, the result was a significant increase in the lost time injury rate. Belinda Leach's (1993) ethnographic research on labour flexibility at a Southern Ontario sportswear manufacturer was conducted in the 1980s just before the company closed due to bankruptcy. She documented the use of homeworkers, many employed by subcontractors (p. 72), and argued that the success of this labour strategy depended upon "the way in which the concept of 'work' is socially constructed in a gendered way, shaping common-sense ideas about work, and resulting in women constituting a segment of the workforce whose flexibility has been historically accepted" (p. 65).

The focus of Bob Russell's 1997 article on the effects of workplace restructuring was the Canadian potash industry. He reported an early-1990s comparison of two unionized mines run by separate companies, one with a managerial strategy that stressed teamwork and the second with traditional adversarial labour relations (p. 35). There were only limited differences in workers' sense of control between the two plants (pp. 45-46), indicating that the post-Fordist approach of management through teamwork does not automatically improve workers' quality of work life (p. 50).

The final two examples of work restructuring recorded negative health consequences for workers. Vivian Shalla's case study between 2000 and 2003 documented how "the new working-time realities of flight attendants at Air Canada ... have translated into more pressures and stress in the workplace" and jeopardized "the cabin crew's health and well-being" (2004: 345-46, 364). A second study examined the deleterious mental health consequences for municipal government workers in Toronto of the introduction of New Public Management practices during and after municipal amalgamation in 1998 (McDonough, Worts, Fox and Dmitrienko, 2008). Taken as a whole, these five studies of the effects on workers of the restructuring and reorganization of work in the neo-liberal era are notable for the quality of the evidence (involving multiple sources) and the depth of the research effort (often involving many years of work).

Paul Willis's *Learning to Labour* (1977) is the most famous of the cultural Marxist ethnographic studies. He found that the collective cultural resistance of disaffected working class male youth in Britain led to their academic failures and thereby explained "how working class kids get working class jobs." Three articles published in the *Review* tested whether this pattern likewise applied to Canada (Tanner, 1990; Davies, 1994; Nakhaie,



Silverman and LaGrange, 2000), and each decided in the negative. For instance, interviews with Edmonton high school dropouts in the mid-1980s led Julian Tanner to conclude, “There is insufficient rejection of qualifications, abandonment of individual ambitions or solidaristic affirmation of manual labour by our respondents to justify the argument that drop-outs are adolescents who have necessarily inverted the formal culture of the high school” (1990: 90).

Limitations in workers’ oppositional consciousness were also the focus of a well-argued article by James Rinehart. He asked how the very same workers can both express satisfaction with their jobs and engage in acts of on-the-job resistance. “In the final analysis,” stated Rinehart, “struggles of instrumental and ‘satisfied’ workers can only be described as a curious blend of acquiescence and defiance – an accommodation to the structure of capitalist authority and resistance to the actual exercise of this authority whenever it adversely affects working people” (1978: 13).

To the extent that Rinehart is correct, survey questions will systematically underestimate the potential for working class participation in collective action. Nevertheless, a number of researchers have studied the characteristic patterns in and determinants of workers’ identities and beliefs utilizing survey data. They include surveys of exclusively male workers in Victoria, B.C. in 1970 (Coburn and Edwards, 1976) and male blue-collar workers in four cities in Ontario in 1971-72 (Keddie, 1980). Two other studies (Langford, 1992; Johnston and Baer, 1993) drew upon data from the 1982 Canadian survey mounted as part of the Comparative Class Structure and Class Consciousness Project (Clement and Myles, 1994: vii-viii). The former article validated patterns in the 1982 survey by comparatively analyzing data from the 1984 National Election Study, and

extended the earlier research of Johnston and Ornstein (1982) on the work and market determinants of beliefs. The latter article compared Canadian workers' class identities and oppositional consciousness to that of Swedish and American workers. William Johnston and Douglas Baer then offered a power resources historical explanation for why the Swedish working class circa 1980 was much further to the left in beliefs than the working classes in the two other countries even though Swedish supervisors and owners were not much different than their North American counterparts (1993: 283-291).

An additional article on workers' identities and beliefs examined the gender consciousness of Hamilton steelworkers and their spouses in the mid-1980s. David Livingstone and Meg Luxton used the Marxian theory of class consciousness as an analogy for developing a model of gender identities, oppositional gender consciousness and hegemonic gender consciousness (1989: 248), all of which are "continually constructed by men and women in class and race-specific practices within paid workplace, household and community spheres" (p. 240). This example of intersectionality analysis concluded, "A strong adherence to a hegemonic masculinist ideology ... can inhibit the development of oppositional working class consciousness in settings that are usually presumed to be most conducive to such development" (p. 264).

Yet another impressive thrust of scholarship in the *Review* has been case studies of workers' collective struggles and organizational formations. Examples that draw upon historical data are Rennie Warburton's (1986) class-analytical account of the development of teaching in British Columbia; Gillian Creese's (1996) investigation of how a white-collar union in British Columbia contributed to the process of gendering office work through the collective agreements it negotiated over 50 years, beginning in 1944; Peter Archibald's

(1998) study of how the Great Depression of the 1930s had minimal effects on status differences among Hamilton workers; and Becki Ross's (2006) analysis of the barriers that prevented the unionization of striptease artists in Vancouver between 1965 and the early 1980s. Creese's study is noteworthy since it is grounded on the insight, derived from Dorothy Smith's work, that "the most ordinary practices in collective bargaining, as in other spheres, recreate male privilege while rendering it invisible" (1996: 453). The article demonstrated how, even when collective bargaining clauses are written in a gender-neutral language, they can result in outcomes that are more favourable for male than female union members.

Two other articles analyzed working class struggles through contemporaneous research. Agnes Calliste's research (1996) on the anti-racist resistance and organizing by African-Canadian nurses in Quebec and Ontario in the 1980s and early 1990s is notable for its careful juxtaposition of reports on racist practices drawn from interviews with African-Canadian nurses and 'official' findings of racism drawn from decisions on grievances and human rights complaints. It highlighted the need for anti-racist organizing inside working class organizations like nurses' unions as well as in workplaces, communities and other social settings. The second article is a nuanced case study of the counter-hegemonic activism of the Westray Families Group (WFG) that came together in the wake of the 1992 explosion that killed 26 underground miners at the Westray coal mine at Plymouth, Nova Scotia (Verberg and Davis, 2011). After charges against company officials were stayed in 1995, "the WFG worked tirelessly to restore the corporate negligence narrative in the public discourse" (p. 41). Norine Verberg and Christopher Davis traced the activism of the WFG over time, analyzing its mnemonic practices and successful attempts to expand the

mnemonic community to include potentially sympathetic groups like Nova Scotia unions (pp. 36-37). The study “illuminates that families can play a critical role in drawing the public’s attention to key social justice issues, and in so doing, they can shape how the public will remember an event” (p. 43).

A final article on class formation takes the struggles of indigenous peasants in Latin America as the referent for a theory of political-class formation. Gerardo Otero and Heidi Jugenitz contend, “Both economic and cultural issues are integral parts of what constitutes classes *politically*” (2003: 512). They develop their theory in opposition to (1) “pre- or non-Gramscian” Marxism that downplays cultural issues, and (2) “cultural reductionism” that fails to acknowledge “existing patterns of inequality as more than constructions” (p. 509).

The fourth group of studies of the working class are specifically concerned with organizational challenges and leadership issues. In a 1998 article, Charlotte Yates documented the organizational growth of the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) between its break with the United Auto Workers in 1985 and 1994. Much has changed with the CAW since the 1990s, not least of all its decision in 2012 to merge with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. Nevertheless, Yates’ study is still very useful since it identifies persistent organizational dilemmas for unions, such as the trade off between the “efficiency and expediency” of a centralized structure and the rank-and-file engagement that is encouraged by a decentralized structure (p. 105). A more formal approach to leadership issues is found in a case study of the leadership of Brazil’s rural landless workers’ movement (Veltmeyer and Petras, 2002). The authors present ten elements of successful leadership in the form of hypotheses (such as “The movement

leaders have a common vision of an alternative social system...”) in the context of the assertion of “a reconstituted form of class analysis” (p. 83, 89).

The class division between the occupational health and safety (OHS) and environmental movements was the focus of a recent article by Robert Storey that drew upon interviews with OHS activists in the early 2000s. The activists thought the prospects for an alliance between the movements were good “because diseases such as stress and cancer are epidemic on both sides of factory gates and office doors” (2004: 438). Storey questioned whether this is a likely eventuality, however, since “differing class interests remain deeply embedded in the environmental understandings and prescriptions of both movements” (p. 441).

The last group of articles shifts the ontological unit of analysis to the regulatory mechanisms or social organization of working class life. This is a diverse set of studies that provide considerable insights to readers. Two early studies that focused on regulation producing social control are Walters (1985) and Russell (1987). The former depicted the “constraints which workers face in pursuing health and safety issues” (1985: 57) and in particular critiqued the roles of medical knowledge and company doctors (pp. 68-74). The latter study analyzed the labour relations outcomes from the first eight years (1907-1914) of the operation of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (IDIA) in Canada. It concluded that “while the state clearly was not an ‘impartial umpire,’ (employers always met with more success in industrial struggles than workers, with or without state involvement), it can accurately be viewed as the author of a hegemonic project aimed at stabilizing an immature wage economy” (1987: 228).

Ron Laliberte and Vic Satzewich (1999) investigated the incorporation of aboriginal migrant labour from northern Alberta and Saskatchewan in the sugar beet industry in Southern Alberta between the 1950s and 1970s. They demonstrated that the creation of a large pool of aboriginal migrant workers was a result of “an early case of workfare” since state officials cut off welfare payments during the summer months in order to force aboriginal families to migrate to sugar beet country for work (p. 82).

The early 2000s saw the publication of a trio of studies on regulation and social organization in the neo-liberal period. Constance de Roche studied a short-term “labour-force enhancement program” in Cape Breton that was initiated by the federal government in 1999 at approximately the same time as it decided to close the two remaining coal mines in Cape Breton (2001: 317-319). This was a voluntary program, unlike workfare, but still had important consequences for the working class. “Active social-welfare policies,” noted de Roche, “promise to exacerbate economic dualism by promoting tolerance for non-standard jobs (ones that are insecure, poorly paid, and carry few benefits)” (p. 331). She argued, as well, “Both workfare and make-work carry invidious connotations that do little to promote self-esteem or to control status inequality” (p. 333).

Willem de Lint and Alan Hall investigated the introduction in 1987 of a new policy for policing labour disputes in Windsor and analyzed this change as part of a shift in the strategies of social regulation that accompanied the shift from Fordist to Post-Fordist accumulation practices (2002: 4). Drawing upon the governmentality literature, de Lint and Hall interpreted the new policy as following a “policing at a distance” strategy which aimed “to induct others into the direct provision of security” and leave police with the responsibility for tactical oversight (p. 19).

The third article in the trio applied Dorothy Smith's institutional ethnographic approach to the social organization of the category of 'migrant workers' in Canada. Through the study of House of Commons debates between 1969 and 1977, Nandita Sharma examined "*how it is that the Canadian state works at shaping people's consciousness around the boundaries of 'Canadianness' in ways that contribute to the 'common-sense' realization of the category migrant workers*" (2001: 418). Sharma argued that ideological textual practices lead to material divisions in the working class: "Even while the Other is *ideologically* differentiated from the 'norm,' the construction of binary codes is intimately connected to the establishment and reproduction of unequal materialities, so that those who are categorized as 'different' (from Canadians) *do* become truly differentiated in relation to resources and power, as is the case with migrant workers" (p. 431). Sharma also tied her study into an understanding of how class becomes socially organized: "The social co-ordination of the practices of ruling over migrant workers has involved the creation of national state categories of differentiation that have worked to accomplish, both materially and ideologically, the gendered racialization of class" (p. 435).

A more recent article on migrant workers examined the partial replacement of Caribbean by Mexican migrant workers in Canada's Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (SAWP) since the mid-1990s. Kerry Preibisch and Leigh Binford argued, "Growers' country surfing is a quest for the most docile, reliable and, therefore, exploitable labour force—regardless of their country of origin" (2007: 32). They note, however, that country surfing is based upon essentialized understandings of entire categories of people as well as "lesser voiced racist beliefs" (p. 32). This is a further example of how a

government program (SAWP) organizes lines of cleavage in the working class, dividing even the category of migrant worker into racialized/nationalized fractions.

### *Ascendant Trajectories*

Two additional sets of articles must be highlighted as ascendant trajectories of class analysis in the *Review*. The first investigates class through the prism of Pierre Bourdieu's concepts, especially cultural capital and habitus. Bonnie Erickson's (1991) exploratory investigation of business culture in Toronto, discussed above, is an early example. Furthermore, there are a number of other articles that use a Bourdieusian concept to help explicate some finding, although this is not their central focus (e.g., Nakhaie and Curtis, 1998: 508; Godley and McLaren, 2010: 398). Worth special attention, however, are three recent studies that introduced and framed their investigations in Bourdieusian terms.

Rebecca Raby analyzed the implicit content of Ontario secondary schools' codes of conduct following the passage of a provincial "Safe Schools Act" in 2000. She argued that the rules aim to groom students "to be certain kinds of workers (and citizens): punctual, restrained in dress, and obedient" (2005: 78). Furthermore, Raby drew upon the concept of habitus within a broader governmentality framework to analyze how the codes of conduct reinforced the hierarchical differentiation of classes: "Habitus is ... linked to the hidden curriculum, as some students are more familiar with, and invested in, the dominant values that are embedded in the school curriculum and rules, while other students are marginalized" (p. 79).

In a study of the determinants of sports knowledge and participation in sporting activities in British Columbia, Gerry Veenstra stated, "Empirical investigations of class



differences in Canadian sports culture would benefit from utilizing theoretical approaches that introduce subtle distinctions between socioeconomic status and class position – the social class framework offered by Bourdieu is such an approach” (2007: 338). The third article set in a Bourdieusian framework is a quantitative study of the effects of body size on the income attainment of female and male workers. Thomas Perks (2012) began with Bourdieu’s idea that “class inequality can find expression in embodied ways, such as physical appearance, pronunciation, stride, style, posture, nonverbal communication, diet, handwriting, and so on” (pp. 3-4) and accepts the argument of Chris Shilling that the body, as physical capital, is “far too important to be seen merely as a subcategory of cultural capital” (p. 4). Perks proceeded to investigate the interaction of physical capital and gender in determining income (p. 8), finding a strong interaction (p. 19).

The second ascendant trajectory is concerned with the class struggles faced by social democratic parties, particularly when they form a government. Two early examples of this scholarship in the *Review* were Legaré (1978) on Quebec and Chorney and Hansen (1985) on Manitoba. In 1999 Gregg Olsen analyzed retrenchments in the Swedish welfare state through the lens of power resources theory (p. 259). The article showed how the power of the Swedish capitalist class grew in the 1980s and 1990s as major manufacturers became increasingly export oriented, corporations increasingly shifted capital into foreign investments and the Swedish business association, SAF, launched an aggressive political campaign in favour of neo-liberal policies (pp. 259-260).

Within the past decade, two articles analyzed recent examples of the New Democratic Party (NDP) forming provincial governments in Canada. Malcolm Fairbrother

(2003) took issue with those who have criticized the NDP governments of Ontario (1990-95) and British Columbia (1991-2001) for not doing a very good job in serving workers and the poor (p. 312). His main argument was that business class resistance to the NDP, especially in terms of rejecting corporatist initiatives and withholding private sector investment, put “genuine constraints” on the NDP administrations (p. 313).

The article by William Carroll and R.S. Ratner on the 1991-2001 NDP government in British Columbia (2005) drew upon an unprecedented set of interviews with state officials, including 45 civil servants, nine cabinet ministers and the three NDP premiers. It is a brilliant analysis of “the points of tension and contradiction—between government and social movements and between government and capital—in social democratic state management” (p. 169). With NDP provincial governments a regular feature of the Canadian polity, and the federal NDP having its first real shot at forming a government in 2015, there should be significant opportunities for extension of this important scholarly discussion.

## **CONCLUSION**

In setting the intellectual context for this article, I discussed three challenges to sociological class analysis since the 1960s: (1) feminist/anti-racist; (2) poststructuralist; and (3) individualization. To what extent have these challenges impacted the trajectories of class analysis published in the *Canadian Review of Sociology*?

A number of articles reviewed above undertake a gendered analysis of class processes, including Smith (1975), Livingstone and Luxton (1989), Leach (1993) and Creese (1996). Other articles consider class in relationship to both gender and racialization, notably Li (1992) and Sharma (2001). Nevertheless, given the broader

significance of the feminist/anti-racist challenge to class analysis in Canadian sociology (see Stasiulis, 1999; and Siltanen, 2009), it is surprising to find little formal discussion of intersectionality in the pages of the *Review*. It is also disappointing to discover that some of the Canadian sociologists who have made significant contributions to developing the intersectionality paradigm (such as Himani Bannerji and Daiva Stasiulis) have never placed any of their papers in the *Review*. I do not make the latter point to lay blame but rather to lament a missed opportunity. Although Jeff Manza and Michael McCarthy recently claimed that intersectionality research “has little resonance in Sociology today” (2011: 175), it is hard to square this judgment with the popularity of intersectionality textbooks in courses on social inequalities (e.g., Andersen and Collins, 2012; McMullin, 2010) and the continuing publication of significant theoretical statements on intersectionality (e.g., Choo and Ferree, 2010; and Walby, Armstrong and Strid, 2012). It is to be hoped that creative means will be found in coming years to encourage more of the leading Canadian sociologists pursuing class analysis within the intersectionality paradigm to submit their work to the *Review*.

As noted earlier, an important consequence of the poststructuralist challenge has been the development of a “pragmatic realist” approach to class analysis that is theoretically pluralistic and operates with a conventional post-positivist epistemology. Although Erik Olin Wright’s manifesto for an “integrated analytical approach” is quite recent (2009), a number of studies published in the *Review* in the past 25 years are consistent with the pragmatic realist approach, including Myles (1988), Nakhaie and Curtis (1998) and Wanner (1999). Structural, quantitative research on class has more potential now than at any time in the past, although relatively few of the latest generation of Canadian sociologists seem to be committed to ploughing this field.

A second consequence of the poststructuralist challenge has been the ascendancy of the class analysis of politics. This is seen very clearly in those articles in the *Review* concerned with the political dilemmas and constraints faced by social democratic governments. Both power resources theory (e.g., Olsen, 1999) and Gramscian hegemony theory (e.g., Carroll and Ratner, 2005) have informed this important work. In addition, the vitality of William Carroll's research on the capitalist class, so well represented in the *Canadian Review of Sociology* over the years, is in no small part due to his careful attention to the hegemonic form of capitalist class power. Studies of the politics and ideology of business organizations in the neo-liberal era (e.g., Graefe, 2004) are in keeping with the political turn in class analysis.

Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and cultural capital have informed a handful of recent studies in the *Review*, and I have termed this an ascendant trajectory of class analysis. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that to the end of 2012 the seminal publications in the new British school that posits class cultures as modes of differentiation (Savage, 2000; Bottero, 2004; Devine and Savage, 2005) had never been cited in the *Canadian Review of Sociology*. This is not because the sociological world has generally ignored this new approach; for instance, as of 9 April 2013, Mike Savage's *Class Analysis and Social Transformation* had a healthy count of 516 citations in Google Scholar. Consequently there would seem to be a grand opportunity to engage this literature in coming years and entrench an individualized, Bourdieusian approach to class analysis in Canada.

In closing, I offer three thoughts on where things stand with class analysis as the *Canadian Review of Sociology* looks ahead to its second half-century. First, a prominent feature of the first five decades is the breadth and depth of the articles on the working

class. This reflects the broad commitment to social justice and equality in the Canadian sociological community and perhaps the continuing influence of Marxian ideas, especially in a Gramscian reformulation. It is also consistent with the continuing strength of the field of labour studies in Canada (see, for examples, the journals *Labour/Le Travail* and *Global Labour Journal*) and the rising importance of the new interdisciplinary field of Working Class Studies in the United States (Strangleman, 2008). Although much sociological research on the working class comes in the form of case studies, virtually any mode of sociology can be deployed, depending upon the particular intellectual puzzle that is posed. Therefore working class research can serve as a common meeting ground for explanatory and interpretive sociologies of different types. While all modes of research are needed, my inclination is to encourage an approach that has largely been neglected by Canadian sociologists: research that tests propositions about diversity through the systematic comparison of small sets of cases, perhaps using a technique like Qualitative Comparative Analysis (Ragin, 1994: 105-130).

Second, one pleasant thing I learned from doing the reading for this article is how many truly excellent articles on class have been published in the *Review* over the past five decades. At the risk of sounding both banal and boosterish, let me go so far as to say 'world-class' excellent articles. Yet it has been perplexing to learn that many of these excellent articles have not been cited very often, not even by those who have published in subsequent issues of the *Canadian Review of Sociology*. Is this a reflection of the centrifugal force of interdisciplinarity within Canadian sociology? Or is it a reflection of an internalized inferiority complex that causes Canadian sociologists to want to associate their own work with studies published in international journals rather than with studies published in

'pedestrian' homegrown journals? Whatever the explanation, Canadian sociology would benefit from more sociologists paying attention to the cumulative development of research. In ignoring the excellent work of our colleagues found in the *Review* and other Canadian journals, we help to create the conditions where our own excellent work will likewise be ignored.

Finally, each of the trajectories of class analysis reviewed in this article holds out the promise of interesting new scholarship in coming years. Nevertheless, class analysis is just one approach among many in today's sociology, so it will have to win new friends and influence through the quality of its scholarship. The good news is that while class analysis is more fragmented today than it was during the early years of the *Review*, it is generally more attuned to conceptual and theoretical issues and to its own analytical limitations. In this light, it remains a fruitful source of both explanatory and interpretive sociology.

## REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 2006. *Class Questions. Feminist Answers*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Andersen, Margaret L., and Patricia Hill Collins. 2012. *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology, eighth edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Archibald, W. Peter. 1998. "Do Status Differences among Workers Make a Difference during Economic Crises? The Case of Depression Hamilton." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 35(2):125-63.
- Armstrong, Hugh, and Pat Armstrong. 1975. "The segregated participation of women in the Canadian labour force, 1941-71." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 12(4):370-84.
- Avery, Donald. 1975. "Continental European immigrant workers in Canada 1896-1919: from 'stalwart peasants' to radical proletariat." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 12(1):53-64.
- Baer, Doug, Edward Grabb, and William A. Johnston. 1987. "Class, crisis, and political ideology in Canada: recent trends." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 24(1):1-22.
- Baer, Douglas E., Edward Grabb, and William A. Johnston. 1991. "Economic dissatisfaction, potential unionism, and attitudes toward unions in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 28(1):67-83.
- Bannerji, Himani. 1995. *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism, and Anti-Racism*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2002. "Zombie Categories: Interview with Ulrich Beck." Pp. 202-13 in *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences*, edited by Ulrich Beck and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bernier, Bernard. 1976. "The penetration of capitalism in Quebec agriculture." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 13(4):422-34.
- Black, Don, and John Myles. 1986. "Dependent industrialization and the Canadian class structure." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 23(2):157-81.
- Black, Jerome H. 2000. "Entering the Political Elite in Canada: The Case of Minority Women as Parliamentary Candidates and MPs." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 37(2):143-66.
- Blishen, Bernard R. 1967. "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations In Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 4(1):41-53.
- . 1970. "Social Class and Opportunity In Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 7(2):110-27.
- Bottero, Wendy. 2004. "Class Identities and the Identity of Class." *Sociology* 38(5):985-1003.
- Calliste, Agnes. 1996. "Antiracism Organizing and Resistance in Nursing: African Canadian Women." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 33(3):361-90.
- Carroll, William K. 1987. "Which women are more proletarianized? Gender, class and occupation in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 24(4):571-85.
- . 2007. "From Canadian Corporate Elite to Transnational Capitalist Class: Transitions in the Organization of Corporate Power." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de*

- sociologie* 44(3):265-88.
- Carroll, William K., and Malcolm Alexander. 1999. "Finance Capital and Capitalist Class Integration in the 1990s: Networks of Interlocking Directorships in Canada and Australia." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 36(3):331-54.
- Carroll, William K., John Fox, and Michael D. Ornstein. 1982. "The network of directorate links among the largest Canadian firms." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 19(1):44-69.
- Carroll, William K., and R. S. Ratner. 2005. "The NDP Regime in British Columbia, 1991–2001: A Post-Mortem." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 42(2):167-96.
- Choo, Hae Yeon, and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities." *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129-49.
- Chorney, Harold, and Phillip Hansen. 1985. "Neo-conservatism, social democracy and 'province building': the experience of Manitoba." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 22(1):1-29.
- Clark, Terry Nichols, and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1991. "Are Social Classes Dying?" *International Sociology* 6(4):397-410.
- Clement, Wallace. 1975. "Inequality of access: characteristics of the Canadian corporate elite." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 12(1):33-52.
- . 1990. "Comparative class analysis: locating Canada in a North American and Nordic context." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 27(4):462-86.
- Clement, Wallace, and John Myles. 1994. *Relations of Ruling: Class and Gender in Postindustrial Societies*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill University Press.
- Coburn, David, and Virginia L. Edwards. 1976. "Objective and subjective socioeconomic status: intercorrelations and consequences." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 13(2):178-88.
- Cockshott, Paul, Allin Cottrell, and Greg Michaelson. 1995. "Testing Marx: Some New Results from UK Data." *Capital & Class* 19(1):103-29.
- Creese, Gillian. 1996. "Gendering Collective Bargaining: From Men's Rights to Women's Issues." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 33(4):437-56.
- Crompton, Rosemary. 2008. *Class and Stratification, third edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cuneo, Carl J. 1978. "Class exploitation in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 15(3):284-300.
- . 1985. "Have women become more proletarianized than men?" *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 22(4):465-95.
- Cuneo, Carl J., and James E. Curtis. 1974. "Quebec Separatism: An Analysis of Determinants within Social-Class Levels." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 11(1):1-29.
- Davies, Scott. 1994. "Class dismissed? Student opposition in Ontario." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 31(4):422-45.
- de Lint, Willem, and Alan Hall. 2002. "Making the Pickets Responsible: Policing Labour at a Distance in Windsor, Ontario." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 39(1):1-27.
- de Roche, Constance P. 2001. "Workfare's Cousin: Exploring a Labour-force Enhancement Experiment in Cape Breton." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*



- 38(3):309-35.
- Devine, Fiona, and Mike Savage. 2005. "The Cultural Turn, Sociology and Class Analysis." Pp. 1-23 in *Rethinking Class: Culture, Identities and Lifestyle*, edited by Fiona Devine, Mike Savage, John Scott, and Rosemary Crompton. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Duncan, Kenneth. 1965. "Irish Famine Immigration and the Social Structure of Canada West." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 2(1):19-40.
- Emmerson, R. J., and P. M. Rowe. 1982. "Professor Cuneo's analysis of class exploitation in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 19(2):279-89.
- Erickson, Bonnie H. 1991. "What is good taste good for?" *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 28(2):255-78.
- Fairbrother, Malcolm. 2003. "The Freedom of the State? Recent NDP Governments and a Reply to the Globalization Sceptics." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 40(3):311-29.
- Fox, John, and Michael Ornstein. 1986. "The Canadian state and corporate elites in the post-War period." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 23(4):481-506.
- Garigue, Philippe. 1964. "French Canada: A Case-Study in Sociological Analysis." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 1(4):186-92.
- Gaskell, Jane S. 1975. "The Sex-Role Ideology of Working Class Girls." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 12(4):453-61.
- Ghorayshi, Parvin. 1987. "Canadian agriculture: capitalist or petit bourgeois?" *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 24(3):358-73.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1981. *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies, second edition*. London: Hutchinson.
- Godley, Jenny, and Lindsay McLaren. 2010. "Socioeconomic Status and Body Mass Index in Canada: Exploring Measures and Mechanisms." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 47(4):381-403.
- Graefe, Peter. 2004. "The Quebec Patronat: Proposing a Neo-liberal Political Economy after All." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 41(2):171-93.
- Griffin, Larry J., Philip J. O'Connell, and Holly J. McCammon. 1989. "National variation in the context of struggle: postwar class conflict and market distribution in the capitalist democracies." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 26(1):37-68.
- Harrison, Trevor, and Harvey Krahn. 1995. "Populism and the Rise of the Reform Party in Alberta." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 32(2):127-50.
- Heap, James L. 1972. "Conceptual And Theoretical Problems In The Vertical Mosaic." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 9(2):176-87.
- Johnston, William, and Michael D. Ornstein. 1982. "Class, work, and politics." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 19(2):196-214.
- . 1985. "Social class and political ideology in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 22(3):369-93.
- Johnston, William A., and Douglas Baer. 1993. "Class consciousness and national contexts: Canada, Sweden and the United States in historical perspective." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 31(2):271-96.
- Keddie, Vincent. 1980. "Class identification and party preference among manual workers: the influence of community, union membership and kinship." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 17(1):24-36.

- Kelner, Merrijoy. 1970. "Ethnic Penetration Into Toronto's Elite Structure." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 7(2):128-37.
- Laliberte, Ron, and Vic Satzewich. 1999. "Native Migrant Labour in the Southern Alberta Sugar-beet Industry: Coercion and Paternalism in the Recruitment of Labour." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 36(1):65-85.
- Langford, Tom. 1992. "Social experiences and variations in economic beliefs among Canadian workers." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 29(4):453-87.
- Laroche, Mélanie. 2012. "Action collective patronale sur fond de crise: vers une reconfiguration du modèle associatif." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 49(3):271-91.
- Lawlor, S. D. 1970. "Social Class And Achievement Orientation." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 7(2):148-53.
- Leach, Belinda. 1993. "'Flexible' work, precarious future: some lessons from the Canadian clothing industry." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 30(1):64-82.
- Legaré, Anne. 1978. "Les classes sociales et le gouvernement PQ à Québec." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 15(2):218-26.
- Li, Peter S. 1992. "Race and gender as bases of class fractions and their effects on earnings." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 29(4):488-510.
- Lindsey, J. K. 1981. "Social class in the educational system: an international comparison." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 18(3):299-320.
- Livingstone, D. W., and Meg Luxton. 1989. "Gender consciousness at work: modification of the male breadwinner norm among steelworkers and their spouses." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 26(2):240-75.
- Lucas, Rex A. 1966. "Some Dimensions of Adult Status." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 3(2):84-97.
- Manza, Jeff, and Michael A. McCarthy. 2011. "The Neo-Marxist Legacy in American Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37:155-83.
- Marchak, Patricia. 1973. "Women Workers and White-Collar Unions." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 10(2):134-47.
- Marshall, T. H. 1965. "Class and Power in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 2(4):215-21.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30(3):1771-1800.
- McDonough, Peggy, Diana Worts, Bonnie Fox, and Klaudia Dmitrienko. 2008. "Restructuring Municipal Government: Labor-Management Relations and Worker Mental Health." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 45(2):197-219.
- McMullin, Julie. 2010. *Understanding Social Inequality: Intersections of Class, Age, Gender, Ethnicity and Race in Canada, second edition*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Myles, John. 1988. "The expanding middle: some Canadian evidence on the deskilling debate." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 25(3):335-64.
- Myles, John, and Adnan Turegun. 1994. "Comparative Studies in Class Structure." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20:103-24.
- Nakhaie, M. Reza, and Robert Arnold. 1996. "Class Position, Class Ideology and Class Voting: Mobilization of Support for the New Democratic Party in the Canadian Election of 1984." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 33(2):181-212.

- Nakhaie, M. Reza, and James Curtis. 1998. "Effects of Class Positions of Parents on Educational Attainment of Daughters and Sons." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 35(4):483-515.
- Nakhaie, M. Reza, Robert A. Silverman, and Teresa C. LaGrange. 2000. "Self-control and Resistance to School." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 37(4):443-60.
- Novek, Joel. 1992. "The labour process and workplace injuries in the Canadian meat packing industry." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 29(1):17-37.
- Ogmundson, R., and J. McLaughlin. 1992. "Trends in the ethnic origins of Canadian elites: the decline of the BRITS?" *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 29(2):227-42.
- Olsen, Gregg M. 1999. "Half Empty or Half Full." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 36(2):241-67.
- Ornstein, Michael. 1986. "The political ideology of the Canadian capitalist class." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 23(2):182-209.
- . 1988. "Corporate involvement in Canadian hospital and university boards, 1946-1977." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 25(3):365-88.
- . 1989. "The social organization of the Canadian capitalist class in comparative perspective." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 26(1):151-77.
- Otero, Gerardo, and Heidi A. Jugenitz. 2003. "Challenging National Boundaries from Within: The Political-Class Formation of Indigenous Peasants in Latin America." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 40(5):503-24.
- Parkin, Frank. 1979. *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Perks, Thomas. 2012. "Physical Capital and the Embodied Nature of Income Inequality: Gender Differences in the Effect of Body Size on Workers' Incomes in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 49(1):1-25.
- Pinard, Maurice. 1970. "Working Class Politics: An Interpretation of the Quebec Case." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 7(2):87-109.
- Porter, John. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1972. "Conceptual And Theoretical Problems In The Vertical Mosaic: A Rejoinder." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 9(2):188-89.
- Pratt, Geraldine. 1987. "Class, home, and politics." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 24(1):39-57.
- Preibisch, Kerry, and Leigh Binford. 2007. "Interrogating Racialized Global Labour Supply: An Exploration of the Racial/National Replacement of Foreign Agricultural Workers in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 44(1):5-36.
- Raby, Rebecca. 2005. "Polite, Well-dressed and on Time: Secondary School Conduct Codes and the Production of Docile Citizens." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 42(1):71-91.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1994. *Constructing Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Reutter, Linda I., Gerry Veenstra, Miriam J. Stewart, Dennis Raphael, Rhonda Love, Edward Makwarimba, and Susan McMurray. 2006. "Public Attributions for Poverty in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 43(1):1-22.
- Richardson, R. Jack. 1988. "'A sacred trust': The trust industry and Canadian economic structure."

- Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 25(1):1-22.
- . 1992. "Free trade: why did it happen?." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 29(3):307-28.
- Rinehart, James W. 1978. "Contradictions of work-related attitudes and behaviour: an interpretation." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 15(1):1-15.
- Rinehart, James W., and Ishmael O. Okraku. 1974. "A Study of Class Consciousness." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 11(3):197-213.
- Rodman, Hyman. 1968. "Controversies About Lower-class Culture: Delinquency and Illegitimacy." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 5(4):254-62.
- Rootman, Irving. 1972. "Social Class and Attitudes toward Mental Illness: a Study of a Canadian Prairie Community." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 9(1):21-32.
- Rose, Sonya O. 1997. "Class Formation and the Quintessential Worker." Pp. 133-66 in *Reworking Class*, edited by John R. Hall. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Ross, Becki L. 2006. "'Troublemakers' in Tassels and C-Strings: Striptease Dancers and the Union Question in Vancouver, 1965-1980." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 43(3):329-44.
- Russell, Bob. 1987. "State constructed industrial relations and the social reproduction of production: the case of the Canadian IDIA." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 24(2):213-31.
- . 1997. "Rival Paradigms at Work: Work Reorganization and Labour Force Impacts in a Staple Industry." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 34(1):25-52.
- Sacouman, R. James. 1980. "Semi-proletarianization and rural underdevelopment in the Maritimes." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 17(3):232-45.
- Savage, Mike. 2000. *Class Analysis and Social Transformation*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Seabrook, Jamie A., and William R. Avison. 2012. "Socioeconomic Status and Cumulative Disadvantage Processes across the Life Course: Implications for Health Outcomes." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 49(1):50-68.
- Shalla, Vivian. 2004. "Time Warped: The Flexibilization and Maximization of Flight Attendant Working Time." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 41(3):345-68.
- Sharma, Nandita. 2001. "On Being Not Canadian: The Social Organization of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 38(4):415-39.
- Siltanen, Janet. 2009. "Inequalities of Gender and Class: Charting the Sea Change." Pp. 197-212 in *Social Inequality in Canada: Patterns, Problems, and Policies, fifth edition*, edited by Edward Grabb and Neil Guppy. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Siltanen, Janet, and Andrea Doucet. 2008. *Gender Relations in Canada: Intersectionality and Beyond*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1975. "An analysis of ideological structures and how women are excluded: considerations for academic women." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 12(4):353-69.
- Stasiulis, Daiva K. 1999. "Feminist Intersectional Theorizing." Pp. 347-97 in *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada, second edition*, edited by Peter S. Li. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Stevenson, Paul. 1977. "Class and left-wing radicalism." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue*

- canadienne de sociologie* 14(3):269-84.
- Storey, Robert. 2004. "From the Environment to the Workplace and Back Again? Occupational Health and Safety Activism in Ontario, 1970s–2000." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 41(4):419-47.
- Strangleman, Tim. 2008. "Sociology, Social Class and New Working Class Studies." *Antipode* 40(1):15-19.
- Tanner, Julian. 1990. "Reluctant rebels: A case study of Edmonton high school drop-outs." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 27(1):74-94.
- Tepperman, Lorne. 1972. "The Natural Disruption of Dynasties." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 9(2):111-33.
- . 1973. "The Multiplication of Opportunities: A Model of Sponsored Mobility, Coventry, England, 1420–1450." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 10(1):1-19.
- Thompson, E.P. 1978. *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*: Monthly Review Press.
- . 1980 [1963]. *The Making of the English Working Class, with a new preface*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Vaz, Edmund W. 1965. "Middle-Class Adolescents: Self-Reported Delinquency and Youth Culture Activities." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 2(1):52-70.
- Veenstra, Gerry. 2007. "Who the Heck Is Don Bradman? Sport Culture and Social Class in British Columbia, Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 44(3):319-43.
- Veltmeyer, Henry, and James Petras. 2002. "The Social Dynamics of Brazil's Rural Landless Workers' Movement: Ten Hypotheses on Successful Leadership." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 39(1):79-96.
- Verberg, Norine, and Christopher G. Davis. 2011. "Counter-Memory Activism in the Aftermath of Tragedy: A Case Study of the Westray Families Group." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 48(1):23-45.
- Walby, Sylvia, Jo Armstong, and Sofia Strid. 2012. "Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory." *Sociology* 46(2):224-40.
- Wall, Ellen. 1994. "Farm labour markets and the structure of agriculture." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 31(1):65-81.
- Walters, Vivienne. 1985. "The politics of occupational health and safety: interviews with workers' health and safety representatives and company doctors." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 22(1):57-79.
- Wanner, Richard A. 1999. "Expansion and Ascription: Trends in Educational Opportunity in Canada, 1920–199." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 36(3):409-42.
- Warburton, Rennie. 1986. "The class relations of public school teachers in British Columbia." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 23(2):210-29.
- Whyte, Donald R. 1965. "Sociological Aspects of Poverty: A Conceptual Analysis." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 2(4):175-89.
- Williams, A. Paul. 1989. "Access and accommodation in the Canadian welfare state: the political significance of contacts between state, labor and business leaders." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 26(2):217-39.
- Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Winson, Anthony. 1988. "Researching the food processing-farming chain: the case of Nova Scotia." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 25(4):520-59.
- . 1996. "In Search of the Part-Time Capitalist Farmer: Labour Use and Farm Structure in Central Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 33(1):89-110.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1979. *Class Structure and Income Determination*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1985. *Classes*. London: Verso.
- . 2009. "Understanding Class: Towards an Integrated Analytical Approach." *New Left Review* 60:101-16.
- Wrong, Dennis H. 1964. "Social Inequality without Social Stratification." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 1(1):5-16.
- Yates, Charlotte A. B. 1998. "Unity and Diversity: Challenges to an Expanding Canadian Autoworkers' Union." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 35(1):93-118.