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Abstract

The growing structural complexity of developed post-capitalist societies has led many political theorists to add numerous qualifications to the assumed salience of relationships to 'property' in the shaping of social, and especially political attitudes and behaviour. Deviations from a class model of voting behaviour (a model which assumes the two-party system of the modern state to be essentially a 'democratic translation of the class struggle'), have often been attributed to the believed need of men to have social recognition of their worth which may lead them to see their social position in terms which differ from those applied by the social scientist. Theorists disagree over the respective contributions made to class structuration by the positions men hold in the spheres of consumption and production but few deny that these two spheres have become increasingly separate and hence the possibility that men may attach different meanings to their positions in each sphere is recognised.

This thesis examines the theoretical links between orthodox class theory and two models of political behaviour (the embourgeoisement and housing class theses) which emphasise the importance of the sphere of consumption in shaping the socio-political orientations of specific groups in the class structure, especially home-owning manual workers. The applicability of both models to an understanding of political processes in New Zealand is discussed and the thesis concludes with the findings from an empirical survey which suggest that both models have some applicability to our understanding of why certain manual workers adopt a class identification and even political behaviours which do not conform with the pattern expected from sociologically conceived models of "objective" class position.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLASS AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR: THEORETICAL ORIGINS AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE.

"... In every modern democracy, conflict among different groups is expressed through political parties which basically represent a 'democratic translation of the class struggle'... The most impressive single fact about political party support is that in virtually every economically developed country the lower-income groups vote mainly for parties of the left, while the higher-income groups vote mainly for parties of the right..." [LIPSET, 1967 : 413-414]
Karl Marx:

Following the impetus of Marx and Weber, attempts to account for consistent patterns in all types of political participation, including voting behaviour, have accorded due emphasis to the importance of a person's 'class' position, defined as common chances in the market by Weber, and as a common relationship to the means of production by Marx.

In the works of Marx, classes involve relatively sustained differences in life experiences that closely foreshadow the development of men's values, beliefs and consciousness. ¹

In Marx's words, it is the "... mode of production of material life [that] conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general..." (Marx, 1972 : 4). Directly on the question of classes, Marx asserts, "... [classes] achieve an independent existence over against individuals, so that the latter find their condition of existence predestined and hence have their position in life and their personal development assigned to them by their class, become subsumed under it..." (Marx, quoted in Salaman, 1972 : 16). ²

For Marx, classes were commonly defined in terms of their ownership or non-ownership of the means of production, ³ thus

---

¹ According to Avineri, human consciousness cannot be seen as being exclusively determined by material forces because Marx did not insist that 'productive forces' were "... objective facts external to consciousness..." but rather he considered them to, "... represent the organisation of human consciousness and human activity..." (Avineri, quoted in Stratification and Class, Open University Press, 1972 : 33)

² In other translations the wording is slightly different, see for instance, Marx and Engels, 1972 : 114)

³ While the objective relations of ownership or non-ownership of productive mechanisms were the crucial distinguishing features of classes, Marx appears to have used at least three further criteria to define social groups. The particular sphere of production in which a social group was engaged, source of income, and more generally, whether historical factors indicated that a group had acted as a class, were all criteria Marx used in his writings to distinguish between groups. (see Duncan, 1973 : 123)
allowing for essentially two principal classes in a fundamentally antagonistic relationship. Consequently if political life is closely shaped by the mode of production, and finds expression through two principal classes, the relationship between class membership and political behaviour could necessarily be expected to be a close one, but it is clear from Marx's own analysis that this need not always, or even typically, be the case. For Marx there is really only one stage in each epoch of class struggles at which common experiences of exploitation within the subordinate class are recognised by all, or at least the great majority of class members, and this is at the stage of successful revolutionary upheaval marking the demise of an outmoded system of production. Only in this final phase, when changes in the system of production have fully matured, would class conflicts come to approximate the simple, and directly opposed interests, of an owning and non-owning class.

4 'Class struggles' are fundamental to Marx's interpretation of history, in Marx's words, "... the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another (carrying on) a fight that each time ended, either in the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes..." (Marx and Engels, 1972: 335). The 'class struggle' may, or may not, be manifest but even when not manifest, the word 'struggle' is appropriate since the relationship between classes is always one of antagonism.

5 Relations of dominance and subordination between classes have a central place in the class struggles of history. According to Marx, "...every form of society, has been based... on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes..." (Marx and Engels, 1972: 345)

6 As the struggle develops, the lines of conflict increasingly recognise only two contending classes. Referring to the epoch of the bourgeoisie for instance, Marx saw, "... society as a whole... splitting [increasingly] into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other..." (Marx and Engels, 1972: 336). Under pre-revolutionary conditions several classes could be in existence. In nineteenth century England these were the proletariat, the owners of 'capital' and the 'land owners', but even here said Marx "... middle and intermediate strata... obliterate lines of demarcation..." (Marx, 1971: 145)
In each mode of production, marked by class struggle, there is always one class destined to assume the revolutionary role. In capitalist society the proletariat, by virtue of their propertyless status, become revolutionary, while the dominant class, [the bourgeoisie] possessing productive wealth, by definition is conservative, committed to the defense of entrenched privileges. In each epoch when conflicts become simplified, and are represented through the struggle of two principal classes, a pre-determined pattern is adhered to. A revolutionary stance is adopted by the subordinate class, a conservative, or reactionary stance is adopted by the dominant class. According to Marx, in the destruction of feudal society the bourgeoisie were, "... conceived as the revolutionary class - as the bearers of large scale industry - relatively to the feudal lords and the lower-middle class, who desire to maintain all social positions that are the creation of obsolete modes of production... on the other hand, the proletariat is revolutionary relatively to the bourgeoisie, because having itself grown up on the basis of large-scale industry, it strives to strip off from production the capitalist character that the bourgeoisie seeks to perpetuate..." (Marx and Engels, 1972: 389). Marx treats the development of revolutionary consciousness in bourgeois society as unique, distinct from comparable phases in all previous class struggles, because while in previous upheavals, the mode of production had been appropriated by the emergent and victorious class, the proletariat, created by the capitalist mode of production, have a separate character, in that they are 'propertyless'. According to Marx, while, "... all the preceding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation, [the proletarians] have nothing of their own to secure and fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property..." (Marx and Engels, 1959: 18).

7 The 'propertyless' status of the proletariat is central to their identity as a class, they, "... do not draw profit from any kind of capital...", they are "... the class of the wholly propertyless...", unlike the serf who "... possesses and uses an instrument of production..." and unlike the manufacturing worker of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries who still has, "...with but few exceptions, an instrument of production in his own possession..." (Engels, 1952: 5-8).
8 see previous note '7'
Since it is the subordinate class, the proletariat, distinguished by their propertyless status, who are to form the nucleus of the predicted revolutionary overthrow of capitalist society, we could impute from Marx, that the worker of the twentieth century will identify his interests with political parties to the 'left' of the political continuum. Whether or not 20th capitalist societies do conform to a Marxist model [see Dahrendorf, 1959], rationally those without, or with less, should support political parties which promise them more. It is clear from Marx's own analysis, that class members in nineteenth century capitalist societies were not always 'rational' in this sense. Class members would not always recognise, or act upon, the political interests of their class, except in the closing stages of the revolutionary class struggle. In the formative stage of the capitalist and proletarian struggle, "... the organisation of the proletariat into a class, and consequently into a political party, is constantly being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves..." [Marx and Engels, 1959 : 16]. According to Engels, in the formative stages, when the proletariat is not yet ripe for emancipation, and regards "... in it's majority, ... the existing order of society as the only one possible... politically [it will] form the tail of the capitalist class, it's extreme left wing..." [Marx and Engels, 1959 : 394].

Marx and Engels were evidently ambivalent about the prospects for realising proletarian goals within a 'democratic' parliamentary framework. There is some evidence to suggest that they considered the struggle for the franchise, and the

9 The meanings of the labels 'left' and 'right' to refer to contemporary political parties, are adequately defined by MacIver. In MacIver's words, "... the rationale of the party system [in 20th parliamentary democracies] depends on the alignment of opinion from right to left... The right is always the party sector associated with the interests of the upper and dominant classes, the left the sector expressive of the lower economic or social classes [and while] the conservative right has defended entrenched prerogatives, privileges and powers; the left has attacked them. The right has been more favourable to the aristocratic position, to the hierarchy of birth and wealth; the left has fought for the equalization of advantage or of opportunity, for the claims of the less advantaged..." [MacIver, quoted in Bandix and Lipset, 1967 :413]

10 Relative differences in income may provide a source of conflict within classes. In Marx's words, "... the size of one's purse is a purely qualitative difference, by which any two individuals of the same class may be brought into conflict..." [Marx, quoted in Duncan, 1973 : 123]
representation of proletarian interests through the franchise, as a, 'political sham', propping up the real despotism of capital (see Duncan, 1973: 143 f.f.). However, in their later writings, they seem to accept that peaceful and far-reaching changes might be achieved through political parties working within a parliamentary system. As Duncan points out, Marx interpreted the Chartist demand for universal suffrage in England to be, "... the equivalent for political power for the working class of England, where the proletariat form the large majority of the population ... (the) inevitable result... is the political supremacy of the working class..." [Marx, quoted in Duncan, 1973: 159]. Clearly, in this instance, Marx assumed that when the franchise was extended, the proletariat would use their votes to support parties that promised to bring about the changes needed to further proletarian interests. In MacIver's terms, the proletariat could be expected to vote for parties to the left of the political continuum. Similarly, following the rapid growth of the German Social Democratic Party in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, Engels spoke of how the German workers had transformed the franchise "... from a means of deception, which it was before, into an instrument of emancipation..." [Engels, quoted in Duncan, 1973: 160].

However, Duncan suggests that the apparent change in the attitudes of Marx and Engels towards the franchise, was not so much because they believed that meaningful social reforms could result, but because the formation of political parties would help to organise and educate the proletariat for the revolutionary struggle to come. Writing of the abortive French insurrections of 1848-9, Marx noted that, even if universal suffrage was not the miracle-working wand democrats

11 In Marx's early writings, all struggles within the framework of the state could be dismissed as "... merely the illusory forms in which the real struggles are fought out among one another..." [Marx, quoted in Duncan, 1973: 143]. Proudhon and other socialist contemporaries of Marx were condemned for their willingness to seek partial changes through political reform, while agreeing to preserve such basic institutions of bourgeois society as private property. For Marx, these partial changes were hollow, they would help to stabilise the bourgeois social order and would thus threaten the realisation of 'true' proletarian emancipation. Marx condemned, what he saw to be, 'parliamentary idiocy', with it's tendency to, 'draw the teeth of socialism'. [see Duncan, 1973: 164]
believed it to be, it did unchain the class struggle and give it greater clarity (see Duncan, 1973: 158). For Marx and Engels the franchise was at one and the same time, a potential vehicle for furthering proletarian interests through it's educative and organising role, and a potential mechanism for inhibiting the development of revolutionary consciousness, for dividing workers against themselves. In Duncan's apt words, "... Negotiations, continuous peaceful dealings... agitation, and material rewards are enemies of the righteousness, the sense of mission and the feelings of separate identity, which in the bulk of Marxist theory, are the conditions of a radical proletarian assault on the system..." (Duncan, 1973: 163). Consequently, it is of no great surprise that Marx and Engels increasingly directed attention to those conditions that might impede the development of revolutionary consciousness. While in the final analysis, the growth of consciousness was 'inevitable', since it closely followed the development of economic conditions that were part of the inherent tendency of a maturing capitalist system, in the intervening phase, the development of class consciousness was bound to confront obstacles.

If revolutionary consciousness did not arise, or if revolutionary upheavels were unsuccessful, then in the first instance, this was likely to be due to the relative underdevelopment of economic phenomena, but both Marx and Engels invoked numerous additional 'explanations' of proletarian conservatism, explanations that in part foreshadow contemporary attempts to account for deviations in the expected political behaviour of

12 Because the bourgeoisie has "... agglomerated population, centralised means of production, ... has concentrated property in a few hands... the productive forces ... become too powerful... [for the conditions of bourgeois property] ... the conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them... [and in calling into existence the proletariat the bourgeoisie have forged]... the weapons that bring death to itself... the weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself... [Marx and Engels, 1959: 12-13]

13 For Marx, fully conscious classes and successful revolutionary action leading to new, higher relations of production, could "... never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society..." [Marx and Engels, 1972: 5]. Premature political action was doomed to failure.
working people. Poor leaders, following poor strategies were blamed for the failure of the 1848 Paris insurrections. The corrupting influence of good working conditions, the existence of ethnic conflicts that obscured class homogeneity, the growth of an 'aristocracy of labour' in England, were all considered to have taken their toll on the growth of revolutionary fervour. Bourgeois ideology, in one guise or another, also served to maintain existing divisions within the oppressed classes. Marx was greatly concerned at the persistent refusal of the petit bourgeoisie, the peasantry, to ally themselves with the proletariat. He attributed their conservatism to 'property fanaticism', to their tendency to cling to small property illusions that obscured and hindered their recognition of their 'true' class interests. (see Duncan, 1973: 128). A similar theme is evident in the works of Trotsky who used the theory of a conservative petit-bourgeois good effect in explaining Hitler's seizure of power in the 1930's. According to Trotsky, "... He [Hitler] the Wildewordene Kleinburger writlarge, answered their historic cravings for status and property..." (Trotsky, quoted in Duncan, 1973: 129).

Thus over a period of almost fifty years, Marx and Engels together constructed a theory of social and economic change that assumes the theoretical and empirical centrality of a class struggle, in explanations of all behaviour, including political behaviour. At the same time, the theory recognises and attempts to accommodate some of the potential sources of deviation in political behaviour, that result from a model

---

14 The failure of the 1848-9 insurrections in Paris were in part attributed to class immaturity, but poor leadership by the 'democrats', and the neglect of revolutionary interests for 'momentary ease and comfort', were both identified by Marx as important factors leading to the successful bourgeois counter-revolution. (see Duncan, 1973: 136; Marx and Engels, 1950: 244)

15 In England, emigration from Ireland provided a mass of labourers whose subsistence level was below that of their English counterparts. Marx and Engels noted the development of 'nationalistic' and economic conflicts, that divided the working class into, 'two hostile camps'. (see Duncan, 1973:137)

16 Engels noted how economic progress in England fostered divisions between the more skilled craft workers and the great mass of workers. (see Duncan, 1973 : 138; Engels, 1943 : XV, XVii)
assuming the salience of economic classes in shaping the life experiences of all men. While in the final analysis Marx and Engels predicted the growth of essentially two classes in capitalist society - the bourgeoisie and the proletariat - they allowed for a transition period in which sources of conflict that did not conform to the dichotomous class model would be present, perhaps be typical, in capitalist society.

With the turn of the century, it became increasingly evident that significant and continuing changes in the structure and functioning of capitalist societies, were occurring. Salaman points out, that critics of Marx have argued for instance, that the spread of joint-stock companies (implying the separation of ownership and control), increases in middle-class occupations, the growth of the welfare state and increasing worker affluence, have all, "... either invalidated the distinctions Marx [made] between workers and owners or have served to reduce drastically, the possibility of conflict between them..." [see Salaman, 1972: 17-18]. Given that conflict between essentially two classes, defined in terms of ownership and control of productive wealth is central to Marx, these are severe criticisms, but Salaman challenges any suggestion that the usefulness of Marx's analytic approach is thereby significantly compromised. Salaman argues that the emphasis on the inherent conflict between those who benefit from capitalist society and those who do not, the recognition of the role of systems of legitimation in disguising conflict, and a recognition of the importance of the variables of class and class conflict, are all elements of Marxist analysis that have been, "... of enormous value in the analysis of industrial society..." [Salaman, 1972: 18; see also Bottomore, 1962: 194; Feuer,1959: xii-xiii.]

There is little doubt that the contributions of Marxist theory extend beyond the parameters of politics but political behaviour is certainly one of the key areas in which the contributions of Marx and Engels can be seen to have had the greatest impact. For Marx, "... every class struggle is a political struggle..." [Marx and Engels, 1959: 16], and for Bottomore, it is, "... the situation of individuals with regard to property [that]
provides a basis for statements about the probability of certain
types of social, especially, political action..." [Bottomore,
1962: 194]. Indeed, we should recognise with Bottomore that
Max Weber was interpreting Marx in this sense when he
reformulated Marxist theory to incorporate important bases of
political action, other than those of economic class. While
Weber introduced 'status' or prestige, as a potentially separate
basis of political action, with Marx, he acknowledged the
importance of economic factors. For Weber, "...men in the same
class situation regularly react in mass actions to such tangible
situations as economic ones..." [Weber, 1963: 47]. While Weber
recognised the importance of economic classes, it was Marx and
Engels that shaped the terms of debate. It is to Marx and Engels
that we owe a recognition of the importance of property ownership
as a basis for conservative political interests, and it is to
Marx and Engels that we owe a recognition of the link between
radical, or at least 'left' political interests, and the status
of being 'propertyless'. Through Marx and Engels, we are in
addition, sensitized to the growth of an 'aristocracy of labour'
[see MacKenzie, 1973: 2], and to the phenomenon of small property
'Fanaticism' [see Bechhofer, et.al, in Parkin, 1974 : 103 ff]
as two potential sources of division within the working-class.

Max Weber:
I have already noted that Weber saw economic classes as only one
of the possible bases upon which political action might arise. 17
[see also Weber, 1968 : 938-9] In general, it can be said that
Weber's criticisms of Marx pursue the theme that Marx tended to
confuse "... what is sometimes the case, with what is necessarily
the case..." [Salaman, 1972: 19]. Weber argued, in essence,
that it is more fruitful to treat stratification as involving
three conceptually distinct dimensions, 18 all of which can

17 For Weber 'parties' are characterised by the fact that they
always "...struggle for political control... [but]... in any
individual case, parties may represent interests determined
through class situation, or status situation [my emphasis],
and they may recruit their following respectively from one
or the other..." [Weber, 1968 : 938-9]

18 'Class', 'status' and 'party'. In the words of Weber, while
'parties' are concerned with power, "... towards influencing
communal actions... [Weber, 1963 : 57] "... 'classes' are
stratified according to their relations to the production
and acquisition of goods, whereas 'status groups' are
stratified according to the principles of their consumption
of goods as represented by special 'styles of life'..."
[ibid, 56]
relate closely to each other empirically, and frequently do, but which sometimes combine in ways that deny the primacy of the class factor. For Weber common economic interests leading to class situation could sometimes lead to status situations as well, but both class and status situations are to be seen as important components of stratification in their own right. Once a status hierarchy was established, there could be a strong tendency to negate the values of the market place.

Thus for Weber there are sources of power in society that do not necessarily reduce to one’s position in relation to the means of production, or to one’s market advantages. Weber argued for instance, that "... status honor, or prestige may even be the basis of political or economic power, and very frequently has been..." (Weber, 1963: 43). In a further qualification of the circumstances in which economic power is seen as important to class formation and political behaviour, Weber challenges the Marxist assumptions that class consciousness is a necessary and inevitable outcome of common class situations. For Weber class situations potentially could arise around different forms of property ownership, and not just on the basis of ownership or non-ownership of the means of production. These 'classes'

19 For Weber those in the same 'class situation' have a similar, "... chance for the supply of goods, external living conditions, and personal life experiences, in so far as this chance is determined by the amount and kind of power, or lack of such, to dispose of goods or skills for the sake of income..." [Weber, 1963: 43]. Furthermore while Weber recognised a basic distinction between the owners and non-owners of 'property' as did Marx, class situations were recognised as being further differentiated with categories of property ownership or non-ownership according to the kind of property owned in the case of owners and according to the kinds of services offered in the market, a distinction that can apply to those without 'property' as such, as well as to owners. [ibid, 44]

20 For Weber 'status groups' were important because they, "... hinder the strict carrying through of the market principle..." [Weber, 1968:930]. Even though the original source of status may be economic achievements, 'status' is necessarily scarce, if some have more others must have less, and groups with high status seek to restrict entry to their own status group by placing a negative value on the activities that originally made the acquisition of their own privileged positions possible. [see Lipset, 1968: 302; Weber, 1963 : 54 - 57]
in Weber's terminology are "... not communities, they merely represent possible, and frequent bases for communal action..." [Weber, 1963 : 43]. 'Communal action' in the Weberian sense, refers to action "... which is oriented to the feeling of the actors that they belong together..." [Weber, 1963 : 46], and to the extent that consciousness of kind, or a common identity is recognised by participants, this form of action is not dissimilar to class-conscious behaviour in a Marxian analysis. Both 'communal action' and the other form of possible class action, 'societal action', which "... is oriented to a rationally motivated adjustment of interests..." [Weber, 1963 : 46], can be considered to be "... conscious, interest determined activity..." [Lipset, 1968 : 301]. Even where communal and societal action do not arise from a common class situation, 'essentially similar reactions', may result. [see Weber, 1963 : 46]. According to Lipset we can take this to mean that those in a common class situation will exhibit common attitudes and behaviour, "... such as patterns of voting behaviour or of drinking habits... [reflecting] the effect of variations in life chances among the classes..." [ibid, 301].

For Weber the form of class action that could result depended to a considerable degree, on the general culture of society and the intellectual ideas that were present within a society. Conscious interest determined activity may be only partly manifest, the extent to which 'contrasts' have evolved and the 'transparency' of the connections between causes and consequences of common life chances, will in part determine the nature of the behavioural responses that follow. [see Weber, 1963 : 46]

Whether the proletariat in Weber's terms would necessarily vote for parties of the left is open to debate. Weber identified the 'modern proletariat' as being in one of the most, 'distinctly recognizable' class-situations, those from which conscious, interest determined activity was most likely to follow. [see Weber, 1963 : 46] To the extent that proletarian class action is 'rationally motivated' to the 'adjustment of interests', it
seems logical to assume that the proletariat would vote for
the parties of the left that claim to represent these interests.
Similarly, those who are 'propertied' could be expected to vote
for the parties of the right, but since Weber rejected the
relatively undifferentiated Marxist concept of 'property', the
link between rational interests and the political expression
of these interests becomes more complex in a Weberian analysis.

As has been noted at an earlier point, Weber elaborated the
Marxist concept of property to include class situations that
recognise different forms of property ownership, including
'marketable skills', or services, that confer distinct
advantages under market conditions. Rather than recognising
a trend towards two increasingly internally homogeneous and
antagonistic classes, Weber identified four main social class
groupings under capitalist conditions; the manual working class,
the petit bourgeoisie, 'propertyless' white-collar workers, and
those privileged through property and education. (see Giddens,
diverges significantly from the Marxian conception, partly
because he expected the 'propertyless' middle class to expand
and become further differentiated rather than to contract and
become proletarianised, and partly because he did not see modern
capitalism leading to the further pauperisation of the worker.
(see Giddens, 1973: 47). While Marx believed the increasingly
polarised interests of the two main classes formed on the basis
of the means of production - the propertied and the propertylesswould ultimately lead to revolutionary political action of the
part of the latter to overthrow the capitalist system, for
Weber, neither polarisation of the class structure nor the
revolutionary overthrow of capitalism were inevitable. According
to Giddens, Weber accepted that there was a tendency towards
"... a diversified system of class relationships... [stemming
from the]... complexity of market relationships generated by
the capitalist division of labour... [which creates]... a
variety of different, but overlapping, economic interests..."
(Giddens, 1973: 47). Giddens takes this to mean that groups
of manual workers who are able to monopolise or exercise some
control over access to marketable skills will "...serve to
introduce cleavages of class interest at the lower levels of the class structure..." (ibid, 47).

Weber's recognition of the complexity of economic interests is likely to be especially important for the types of political or class action that can arise, since class situations, and hence the types of class action generated, "... will become most clearly efficacious when all other determinants of reciprocal relations are... eliminated in their significance..." Weber, 1963 : 47]. To the extent that the converse is the case, where other determinants of reciprocal relations themselves become more, rather than less efficacious, as Gidden's elaboration of Weber's ideas suggests, then the tendency of white-collar propertyless and some manual workers to vote for parties of the right can be seen as 'rational' rather than 'irrational', in terms of their economic interests.

While such a model may not be able to account for all types of political behaviour, if we attribute the recognition of a diversity of economic interests to Weber, then some of his claims regarding the long term salience of market factors over and against status-groups have a renewed relevance. In Weber's words property may not "... always [be] recognised as a status qualification, but in the long run it is, and with extraordinary regularity..." [Weber, 1968 : 932]. At another point, Weber, emphasises that even though cultural and social circumstances sometimes arise where class structure are not the most salient forces shaping social action, "... today the class situation is by far the predominant factor...", [ibid, 935] leading to the formation of status groups, and hence we might impute that economic factors by and large assume primacy in political action.

However, status attributes were not the sole source of motivation. Weber recognised as having the capacity to run counter to common market interests, unless national or ethnic identity is also seen as an aspect of status stratification. For instance, Weber noted that nationalism may evoke sentiments among workers that operated against a common recognition of economically defined class interests. According to Beetham, "... while Weber recognised
the phenomenon of class interests and class conflict as a central feature of modern politics the idea of nation provided a common consciousness which transcended that of class, in particular it offered a means of drawing the working class away from an attitude of total opposition to the existing order..." (Beetham, 1974 : 144).

Marx and Weber: A Summary. Even if there are sources of political motivations that are non-material, a complete rejection of a Marxist model need not be implied, since Marx also recognised that ethnicity, or nationalism could create divisions that served to hinder the growth of a homogeneous proletariat. [see Duncan, 1973 : 137] Marx further acknowledged distinctions within the broad groupings of the 'propertied' and 'propertyless' that may be important for explaining some forms of political behaviour. However, the more sophisticated elaboration of the property concept to include a number of different categories of ownership, each conferring distinct market advantages, is attributable to Weber and those who have applied his ideas to the stratification systems of modern capitalist societies.

In contrasting the major contributions of Weber and Marx to our current understanding of political behaviour, it should be emphasised that although class consciousness need not follow from a common class situation, as Marx contended, class situations in the Weberian sense were expected to generate essentially similar reactions, even where Marxist class consciousness was absent. One of the patterns of similar reaction generated is likely to be common voting behaviour, but the extent to which the pattern is consistent, may in turn depend on cultural factors, ideas and values, that are present in society, and these may be partly independent of economic interests. While status distinctions can be important in their own right, empirically they are likely to be in some way contingent upon economic interests. Status distinctions may serve to complicate the direct translation of common economic interests into class behaviour involving a common recognition of these interests, but it is equally possible that status distinctions may serve to reinforce the lines of division that arise under market conditions.
Class and Voting in Contemporary Capitalist Societies:

Empirical research has largely substantiated a class theory of political behaviour. In the words of Lipset, "... In every modern democracy, conflict among different groups is expressed through political parties which basically represent a democratic translation of the class struggle... on a world scale, the principal generalization which can be made is that parties are primarily based on either the lower classes or the middle and upper classes... More than anything else the party struggle is a conflict among classes, and the most impressive single fact about political party support is that in virtually every economically developed country the lower-income groups vote mainly for parties of the left, while the higher-income groups vote mainly for parties of the right..." [Lipset, 1967: 413; see also MacIver, 1947: 216, 315].

Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the relationship between class position and political opinions or party choice is far from consistent. There are significant deviations from the expected pattern of class voting. Other characteristics or group affiliations, such as religious beliefs, may be more salient in particular situations than either high or low social or economic position. In his overview of deviations from the 'expected' class vote, Lipset begins from the premise that contemporary stratification systems are complex, consequently individuals may be subjected to a variety of pressures and experiences with conflicting political consequences. Some of these social positions men have in the class structure, it is suggested, may predispose them to be conservative while others may predispose a leftist political outlook. According to Lipset, "... men may hold power, like some civil servants, but have low income or status; they may enjoy high occupational prestige like many intellectuals, but receive low income..." [Lipset, 1967: 416]. A neo-Weberian theoretical basis for these assertions is evident. Non-material bases of stratification are assumed to be important along with the material. Indeed, in Lipset's account of the needs, which if they are not met, will predispose left-voting, desires for status, the social recognition of worth, takes their place along with income security and work satisfaction.
Research findings from the United States, Britain and some European countries suggest that manual workers who have never been unemployed, are more likely to be conservative than workers who have experienced unemployment. [see Nicholas, 1951: 297-8]; Centers, 1949: 177-9; Moos, 1952: 47-8; all are cited in Lipset, 1967: 418]. A further factor linked to dissatisfaction or satisfaction, and hence to political behaviour, is the nature of the work situation itself. The type of work environment commonly associated with larger industrial plants creates dissatisfaction because the work tends to be more segmented, routine, and allows little opportunity to exercise creative abilities. [see Blau, 1967: 475-6; Ingham, 1970: Chaps 2 & 10] While Ingham acknowledges that large scale industrial organisation is favourable for the development of solidaristic, left-wing attitudes he suggests, just the same, that it would be "... a mistake to see these responses as a direct and automatic consequence of such organisational factors..." [Ingham, 1970: 116]. The strong tendency of workers employed in large plants to vote left could also be attributable to union membership, since trade unions are likely to be better organised in large industrial plants. In Britain statistical associations between left-voting and union membership were found both by Rose [see Rose, 1968: 146] and Nordlinger [see Nordlinger, 1967: 198], but whether affiliation to parties of the left precedes, or follows as a consequence of union membership, is still a point upon which research findings are unclear.

Given that there may be a link between income insecurity, work dissatisfaction and left voting, Lipset's suggestion, that skilled workers, who are afterall likely to be less exposed to these sources of discontent, are, "... almost everywhere the more conservative among manual workers..." [Lipset, 1967: 419], is at least plausible, though there is some evidence to the contrary. [see MacKenzie, 1973: 98-100]

If we accept left voting as an expression of discontent than one of the persistent problems that remains for contemporary political theorists is to explain why a significant minority of manual
workers continues to register support for parties of the right rather than the left. Nordlinger suggests that working class conservative voters in Britain constitute slightly more than a third of the manual workers in a country whose population is two-thirds working class and thus provide nearly half of the Conservative Party's electoral strength. (see Nordlinger, 1967 : 13) I have noted earlier that Lipset, promoting an approach to stratification that recognises non-material sources of inequality, attributes a propensity to vote for parties of the right, at least in part, to conflicts that arise when individuals hold discordant positions in the class structure. It still remains uncertain as to which particular social positions are likely to predispose individuals to which specific political orientations. Whether particular group affiliations, religious or ethnic for instance, are best seen as 'prestige hierarchies' is debatable.

There may be some merit in treating Weber's status dimension as a generalised social phenomenon with applicability to all social positions in society. There may be a case for linking particular group affiliations with political predispositions that run counter to, perhaps even in some situations, override, the salience of high or low class position. Affiliations to religious organisations, for instance, may involve a commitment to ideologies that function to maintain the hegemony of the dominant class. The suggestion that conservative political predispositions may result from such affiliations is not necessarily inconsistent with a Marxist model of stratification. Parkin, who is commonly identified with a neo-Marxist approach

21 Parkin suggests that in some respects the "... multi-dimensional approach [where individuals are treated as having a different rank on a number of different dimensions] has led to the trivialization of Weber's ideas...". For Parkin the functional independence of the class and status dimensions in particular have been greatly exaggerated. (Parkin, 1974 : 18)

22 Religious institutions in the bourgeois social order were seen by Marx in a role where they could mislead the proletariat, religion was, "... the sigh of the oppressed... the opium of the people..." (Marx quoted in Duncan, 1973 : 81)
to stratification, suggests that religious affiliations may be important. Religion has the capacity to serve an important role in stabilising and legitimising the social order. According to Parkin religious institutions are particularly important, "... because they present an alternative system of meaning to that current in the secular world..." (Parkin, 1971 : 70), and furthermore they "... entail the conviction that earthly suffering is but an interlude before a heavenly reversal of fortunes..." (ibid, 70)

There is considerable research evidence to suggest that particular religious affiliations may predispose a conservative political orientation. In Britain, Australia, Canada and the United States, workers belonging to the more 'well-to-do' churches such as the Anglican (or the Episcopal in the United States), were found to be more likely to back conservative parties than workers belonging to poorer churches. (see Birch : 1959 ; Argyle, 1959 : 81 -3 ; Benney et.al., 1956 : 111]. In Birch's study of the 1951 electoral behaviour of British industrial workers, quoted by Lipset, while only 43% of the Anglicans voted Labour, the percentage among Non-Conformists and Catholics rose to 64 and 73% respectively. There are some indications that the pattern is reversed for non-manual workers. Australian Gallup Poll data from 1951 and 1955 showed that while less than 30% of urban non-manual workers backed the Labour Party the proportion increased to approximately 50% among Catholics in comparable occupational positions. (see Lipset, 1967 : 421) In a more recent study of an American community in New England, MacKenzie concluded that Catholicism was,"... one of the most important factors in explaining the maintenance of manual support for [the Democratic Party], (see MacKenzie, 1973 : 111]. If MacKenzie's findings were notable in that they further support a link between religious factors and voting, they also are of considerable interest in that his data did not produce a strong positive correlation between income and voting behaviour, or between education and voting behaviour, despite the longstanding generalisations that have recognised a link between voting and 'class position' as measured by these variables. (see MacKenzie, 1973 : 105).
In Lipset’s overview of sources of deviation from class-based political behaviour he prefers to treat the indications of a link between voting and religious affiliation as evidence of the discrepancies that can arise where religious organisations take the form of a ‘prestige hierarchy’.

[see Lipset, 1967: 421] While alternative explanations are wanting, the demonstration of a statistical association between voting and religious affiliation need not necessarily imply that individuals recognise a status discrepancy as such, and act accordingly. Evidence of the importance of a status dimension seems to be more clearly apparent where the link between social mobility and voting is concerned. According to Parkin, "... as a rough general estimate, between about a quarter and a third of those born into the manual working class in modern Western countries will move into the ranks of the middle class..." [Parkin, 1971: 49]. Parkin argues further that, "... there is little doubt that the overall tendency is for the upwardly mobile to shift their political allegiances from parties of the left to parties of the right..." [ibid, 51].

Lipset is in general agreement with this assertion and suggests further, that the tendency to vote for the more conservative party, is not just confined to upwardly mobile manual workers but applies equally to non-manual workers who are downwardly mobile. (see Lipset, 1967: 421). However evidence from cross-cultural studies indicates that the generalisation needs to be qualified.

While it seems to be the case that parties of the left have most to lose and the parties of the right have most to gain from mobility, this pattern is by no means consistent in all places.

23 The downwardly mobile seem to be much more likely to hang on to their existing, usually conservative political commitments, because a continued belief in an open opportunity structure, the temporary nature of their 'misfortune', is much less damaging to them personally. [see Parkin, 1971: 54; Wilensky and Edwards, 1959; MacCoby et al., 1954]. Those that are upwardly mobile on the other hand are led to evaluate themselves more favourably and one of the adjustments to a new class position seems to be a transfer of political allegiance from left to right. [see Parkin, 1971: 52; Lipset, 1967: 416, 427] Thus parties of the right that have the advantage of being associated with the more prestigious sections of the population are more likely to benefit from the processes of redefinition that accompany both downward and upward mobility.
countries. In Italy, Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States, the likelihood of left voting increases as the socio-economic position of the worker decreases but in Sweden and Germany it appears that 'affluent' workers are more likely than their lower-income counterparts to support union oriented, left wing parties. [see Lipset, 1967: 420 -1]. Lipset hypothesises that these differences can be attributed to the relative salience of status linked factors in the stratification systems of the countries concerned. He suggests, "... that the more open the status-linked social relations of a given society, the more likely well-paid workers are to become conservative politically...". [Lipset, 1967: 421]. It is suggested that in societies where relations are more status linked, those workers who are affluent will be made to feel more conscious of their rejection by the middle class and will tend to left-voting, while in societies where status is less important, [as Lipset believes is the case in Australia and the United States], affluent workers will be more conscious of their separation from those workers who are less well off.

There are a number of structural conditions in the economic and social relations of a society that Lipset believes may be relevant to the conditions under which the hypothesis might hold true. It is suggested that the likelihood of workers believing in individual opportunity is enhanced when they are living in an affluent society [such as in the United

---

24 Status linked relations are considered to be 'closed' in those countries that had an established aristocracy until well into the twentieth century [Germany and Sweden]. It is assumed that interpersonal relations in this case will still reflect a 'considerable explicit emphasis on status', whereas in Australia, Britain, America and France, given the absence, or diminished importance of a nobility, it is assumed that status differences will be less salient. [see Lipset, 1967: 420 - 421].
States, Australia and perhaps New Zealand) with a developing economy that continually creates new jobs above the manual labourer level. Men, Lipset argues, are constantly striving to see themselves favourably and they will therefore attempt to arrange their impressions of their environment and themselves in ways that maximise their sense of being superior to others. (see Lipset, 1967: 416) Wherever the possibility exists, Lipset contends people will either try to improve their prestige position by individual efforts, or through collective action of some sort. (ibid., p416) The conditions that are most likely to lead to one or the other course of action are uncertain, so it could not necessarily be argued that status aspirations act against class, for class action in the collective sense may operate to enhance status, though the perspective would necessarily be non-revolutionary.

Some evidence bearing on the importance of the status motive in political behaviour is available from the 'class identification' studies. Centers found that subjective class identification made a great difference to the political attitudes of white-collar workers but less of a difference to white-collar workers of

25 Whether the opportunity structure is objectively 'open', is perhaps less important than are perceptions or beliefs that opportunities for individual advancement exist. In Wellington O'Malley and Collette found upwardly mobile manual workers to have attitudes that were actually more consistent with a belief in individual opportunity, than either 'stable' manual, or 'stable' non-manual workers. However few of any of these groups felt that opportunities were closed. Only 5% of the manual mobiles agreed that a man's chances in life were fixed at birth, compared with 23% of the 'stable' manual and 16% of the stable non-manual workers. (see O'Malley and Collette, 1974: 17)

26 Furstenburg argues that individualistic responses to deprivation are becoming more typical than collective responses. According to Furstenburg, "... large areas of social activity [are] no longer based upon solidarity but rather upon the individual pursuit of private goals... While workers can also enter into relationships with each other in private life, these relationships are mainly private in their nature and are not directed toward concerted action to improve the conditions of the working class as was the case in the 1920's..." (Furstenberg, 1968: 172). Some writers have perceived changes in a different light and point to white-collar unionization as evidence of the growth of collective responses to deprivation and its spread throughout the occupational structure rather than it's decline. (see Lockwood, 1958 : 138 ff)
working class origin. [Centers, 1949 : 130 - 2] In Sweden, with a stratification system in which relations are more status-linked according to Lipset's terminology, men in non-manual occupations who have risen from the working class appear to continue their left voting, unless their patterns of consumption also change. Those who have not experienced mobility, on the other hand, appear to retain their left-wing behaviour, whether or not they change their patterns of consumption. [see Lipset, 1967 : 426] In Britain there is some evidence to suggest that class identification affects voting irrespective of mobility. Both Rose [see Rose, 1968 : 145 - 6], and Nordlinger found a strong link between the middle class identifications of manual workers and their likelihood of voting for the Conservative Party. In Nordlinger's findings 29% of working class subjectives compared to 53% of middle class identifiers voted Conservative. [see Nordlinger, 1967 : 164]

In the Swedish study cited by Lipset, car ownership was used as an indicator of changed consumption styles with which to compare upwardly mobile and immobile groups. In the United States, the apparent shifts in political loyalties from Democrat to Republican that seem to accompany a move to homeownership in suburban locations, could be interpreted as evidence of a comparable phenomenon. 27 Greenstein and Wolfinger found marked differences between the party identifications of urban and suburban residents. Suburban residents showed a pronounced Republican Party preference.

27 Lipset suggests that the findings are "... consistent with the impact of mobility upon lower-class people..." [Lipset, 1967 : 426]. However this interpretation is perhaps only valid if both objective social mobility [manual family of origin but white-collar job] and subjective social mobility [the individual's own interpretation of his past and present status] are considered. While Greenstein and Wolfinger suggested that there was a link between party identification and subjective social mobility their findings did not support a link between objective social mobility and Republican allegiance [see Greenstein and Wolfinger, 1958 : 481].
that evidently could not be attributed to class factors alone. When education, income and occupation were held constant the significance of the differences between the urban and suburban samples was reduced but, nevertheless, a relationship of sufficient strength still remained for the authors to conclude that both processes of self-selection, [implying aspiration to middle-class status] and perhaps environmental conversion [implying the influence of a more Republican environment] were taking place in the suburbs. (Greenstein and Wolfinger, 1958: 481) Furthermore the authors recognised that homeownership in itself, could be considered as a significant variable contributing to a shift in voting patterns, primarily because of it's association with an interest, "... in tax rates and other issues connected with property rights..." (ibid, 481). In this conclusion they were a little more cautious than 'pop' sociologist Vance Packard, who saw fit to claim that, "... nothing makes a person a Republican faster than acquiring a mortgage..." (Packard, 1959: 213).

A connection between worker homeownership and conservative voting has also been recognised in several British studies. Crewe, analysing aggregate data from 258 'working-class urban English constituencies', found that relatively higher levels of both Conservative Party voting and worker homeownership tended to coincide. Where the Conservative share of the two-party vote was higher than expected, more than 40% of the skew towards Conservative voting could be attributed to the higher than expected levels of house and car ownership. The variance 'explained' by car ownership was largely a spurious reflection of car ownership's statistical association with owner-occupancy, which suggests that homeownership is by far the more important factor. (see Crewe, 1973: 258 - 9) Fletcher, reanalysing data collected in Banbury by Stacey et.al. in 1975, was able to show a strong correlation between Conservative voting and homeownership (see Fletcher, 1976: 402) and similar correlations were noted by McKenzie and Silver, 1968: 96).
Goldthorpe and Lockwood et.al. found that even when the 'middle class' ties of their Luton sample were held constant, "... workers who own their own homes [had] a rather lower Labour vote than those who did not..." (Goldthorpe and Lockwood et.al., 1968 : 58).

Blue-collar homeownership and the phenomenon of even a small minority of blue-collar home-owners voting conservatively or abstaining from left voting, raises some important theoretical questions about the nature of changes in the distribution of property rights in contemporary societies and the implications they may have for the socio-political orientations of a 'new working class'. To the extent that blue-collar owner-occupancy has become widespread, problems are created for orthodox Marxist theory that has defined the broadening of the property owning base in capitalist society as impossible. In Marx's words, the wish that, "... all people shall be property owners... [could be as little realised] as the wish to make all people emperors, kings and popes..." (Marx, quoted in Duncan, 1973 : 180). To be fair, Marxist 'property' strictly speaking, excludes property for use or consumption and is taken to include only that property with a capital producing capacity but even within this narrow definition of property theoretical problems remain. In the first place the proletarian, subject to diminishing wages, could never afford to buy property, domestic or otherwise. To the extent that blue-collar workers now have the capacity to purchase houses, Marxist theory needs to be modified to accommodate unexpected changes in the nature of blue-collar incomes that seem to indicate affluence rather than poverty. 28

The second problem is that while it is easy analytically to make a distinction between property for use and property for profit, the distinction is not so easily applied in the empirical world. A distinction that appears to be one of kind, in practice is one of degree. The landlord who is able to

28 This is not to deny that the working class may still be relatively deprived.
extract surplus value from a contract that confers rights of use of the house he owns to others, is not in the same relationship to domestic property as the homeowner who retains rights of use for the enjoyment and security of his family. The extension of property rights to formerly 'propertyless' groups through homeownership involves more than the legal sanction of use value per se, since the rights conferred allow the homeowner to exercise some measure of control over his own circumstances that extend beyond the mere possession of 'labour power', and labour power alone, that distinguished the status of the nineteenth century proletarian in relation to property. Property rights of the homeowner that confer both the power to exclude others from use value and the power to extend use value to others for profit, are not consistent with the 'propertyless' status of the proletarian as originally conceived by Marx and Engels, as Engels himself seems to have acknowledged. 29 A more detailed account of how the extension of property rights may relate to the socio-political orientations of formerly 'propertyless' groups is one of the central concerns of the following chapters. However, it is important at this stage to point out how a Marxist might attempt to account for a link between extended property rights, and an acceptance of bourgeois values, that may involve a conservative political orientation on the part of blue-collar workers.

While Marx insisted that the inherent contradictions of capitalism would eventually lead to class conscious behaviour, he recognised that in the intervening period, there would be some members of the deprived classes who would identify with the values and concepts that furnished the basis of the dominant class hegemony. Ownership of the means of production meant control of the state and hence control over the production and dissemination of ideas. In the short term these ideas would play a crucial role in the maintenance of

29 See Engels 'The Housing Question' where he accepts that, "... the worker who owns a little house to the value of a thousand talers is certainly no longer a proletarian..." (Marx and Engels, 1950 : 531)
a state of 'false consciousness' among the oppressed classes. In this context, Marx recognised the 'small property illusions' of the European peasantry as one conservatising influence and clearly it would have been in the best interests of the capitalist ruling class to foster and preserve these illusions. (While for the European peasantry property included the ownership of the land as their means of livelihood, in addition to the ownership of their dwellings, the analogy with domestic property ownership within contemporary capitalist societies, will receive the detailed attention it deserves in the chapters to follow).

Residual elements of traditionalism from feudal society that inhibited the development of a proletarian consciousness among the peasantry, were only one of the sources of 'false consciousness' that concerned Marx and Engels in the nineteenth century. Engels recognised a problem of false consciousness within sections of the working class in Britain on a number of occasions when he visited that country. Since Britain was the world's most advanced capitalist state at the time the problem was one of some importance. Engels was concerned about why the working class in Britain had failed to exploit the new franchise of 1867 to secure working class dominance in parliament. He recognised as one significant factor the British workers' cravings for 'respectability' and enhanced social status, which he believed led to a willingness, even eagerness to accept bourgeois social values, life styles and political ideas. Engels, along with Marx, assumed that the circumstances under which workers would accept bourgeois values were temporary and that ultimately the contradictions inherent in capitalism would sharpen and class conscious political behaviour would crystallise [see Engels, 1892: xviii, xix; Lenin, 1970: 751] but contemporary theorists have been less easily convinced.

Marxist theory has been criticised for being historically relative, and the failure of changes in capitalist societies to clearly assume the shape and form that Marx and Engels predicted has led to a renewal of the debate about the nature of changes in class relationships and the socio-political consequences that follow these changes.
Class Relationships in Contemporary Capitalist Societies: A Debate Renewed.

One group of theorists (e.g., Parkin, 1971; Hamilton, 1964; Lockwood et al., 1968), drawing their inspiration from the Marxist perspective, argue that the differences in socio-political orientation that have separated blue-collar and white-collar workers in the past still remain largely unchanged. While it is recognised that there have been changes in the consumption patterns of blue-collar workers, these are considered to be less significant in shaping social and political attitudes than the persisting contrasts in the work and social relationships of the two groups.

Another group of theorists, the embourgeoisement theorists as they are often labelled, (e.g., Wilensky, 1964; Geiger, 1969; Mayer, 1969) stress that changes in consumption patterns are important and maintain that class lines are becoming increasingly blurred, or that different occupational groups are becoming increasingly homogenised in outlook as a result of diminishing differences in levels of income, education and the ownership of consumer durables, especially housing.

Some theorists, including Lockwood (1958) and Mills (1956) acknowledge that the work environments of blue-collar workers and routine white-collar workers may be becoming less distinct in some respects, but they see these changes as being more consistent with a process of 'proletarianisation' than with a process of embourgeoisement. If the increasing mechanisation and rationalisation of some clerical occupations is seen as the first step in a process of becoming 'proletarian' for routine white collar workers, then it could be argued that the

---

30 In an exposition of this view Lockwood argues that, "...to the extent that relatively large groups of semi-skilled employees are concentrated together, separated from managerial and supervisory staffs, performing continuous, routinized and disciplined work, often rewarded in accordance with physical output, with little chance of promotion - their clerical work becomes, in terms of social and physical environment, extremely like that of the factory operative..." (Lockwood, 1958: 92)
embourgeoisement thesis implies that changed blue-collar consumption patterns are the first step in a process of becoming 'middle class'. Certainly this is Goldthorpe and Lockwood's interpretation of the thesis.

According to Goldthorpe and Lockwood, who are among the foremost critics of the embourgeoisement thesis, the thesis contends that, "... as manual workers and their families achieve relatively high incomes and living standards, they assume a way of life which is more characteristically 'middle class' and become in fact progressively assimilated into middle class society..." (Goldthorpe and Lockwood et.al., 1968 : 1). For Goldthorpe and Lockwood the process of becoming 'middle class' in theoretical terms would necessarily involve three stages. However, while the third stage, assimilation into middle class primary networks, is a logical extension of the embourgeoisement thesis, some writers have interpreted the thesis in a more restricted sense. McKenzie and Silver see the thesis involving little more than the adoption of 'characteristics that are traditionally features of middle class life'. If manual workers use saving devices, own homes and see themselves as 'middle class', then they are 'bourgeois' but 'assimilation' into middle class primary networks need not be implied. (see McKenzie and Silver, 1968 : 95ff)

For the embourgeoisement theorists, homeownership is one of the factors that is commonly taken to indicate 'affluence' and the adoption of a traditionally middle class pattern of consumption. (see Geiger, 1969; Mayer, 1969) Furthermore Butler and Rose, in their attempt to account for the declining electoral fortunes

---

31 For Goldthorpe and Lockwood 'assimilation' is the terminal stage of this three-stage process of becoming middle class. The first stage, 'privatisation' is marked by social isolation from the working class community. Next comes a stage of 'aspiration' in which middle class norms are adopted and finally in the 'assimilation' stage, the 'worker' who has adopted bourgeois values is accepted into middle class primary networks and is, therefore, effectively 'middle class', in all but occupation. (see Runciman, 1964: 139 - 140)
of the British Labour Party in the 1950's, suggested that the increasingly home-centred and privatised life-styles of affluent workers could be linked to their voting behaviour. For Butler and Rose, in 'a new democracy of consumption' "... individual preference has become increasingly important in determining the style of life people choose... the importance of the family as a centre of social life has been increased by economic prosperity... the well-paid worker [is now] much less dependent on his trade union... he may think of himself as a consumer first and only secondly as a worker..." [Butler and Rose, 1960 : 13 - 15]. Butler and Rose proceed to the claim that 'privatisation' of life styles is followed by 'aspirations', presumably to become middle class, but as with McKenzie and Silver, the final stage of 'assimilation' does not seem to be part of the embourgeoisement thesis as they understand it. The implication is then, that affluence, and a change in patterns of consumption and a life style that is home-centred, may lead to conflicting political pressures, even if affluent workers are not accepted into the primary networks of the middle class. 32 Ineichen refers to homeowners specifically in the context of political and social embourgeoisement. According to Ineichen, "... homeownership indicates a whole new approach to money... the extension of the idea of the acquisition of wealth through property... [and] the way ahead for home owning manual workers is seen as progress materially, rather than occupationally... the value of far and away the chief possession - the house - will therefore take on immense importance..." [Ineichen, 1972 : 410] Ineichen goes on to claim that homeownership will have implications for the political process and these will not just affect, "... party affiliation and voting... homeownership may affect the willingness of workers to strike..." [ibid, 411].

32 For Butler and Rose, "... those on the threshold of the middle class are divided by conflict between their past and their present, between their family and occupational traditions and their aspirations. They are thus exposed to conflicting political pressures [and are] particularly likely to abstain or switch their voting allegiance..." [Butler and Rose, 1960 : 16]
With some over-simplification it might be said that theorists focussing on the development of a 'new working class' or on the thesis of embourgeoisement per se, have tended to see homeownership as important because it is linked to apparent changes in life styles and consumption patterns. These changes in consumption patterns are in turn considered to have a bearing on socio-political orientations. In their study of Sparkbrook in 1967 Rex and Moore introduced a model of housing classes that may represent a distinctly changed approach to any connection between socio-political orientations and housing circumstances. They recognised the close links between housing and the sphere of consumption, but at the same time argued strongly for a recognition of the potential importance of housing under market conditions where the development of class situations are implied. The theoretical impetus is Weberian, since it was Weber who argued that within the categories of 'property' and 'lack of property' "... class situations are further differentiated... according to the kind of property that is usable for returns... [and] according to the kinds of services that can be offered in the market..." [Weber, 1963: 33]. For Weber, the 'ownership of domestic buildings' is one distinction that "... differentiate[s] the class situation of the propertied just as does the meaning which they can give to the utilization of property..." [ibid, 44]. Rex takes Weber's arguments to mean that he intended to relativise the Marxist notion of class, thus suggesting that, "... in any market situation and not only in the labour market, groups could emerge with a common market position and common market interests that could be called classes..." [Rex, 1968: 177]. Since for Weber class situations were expected to lead to 'essentially similar' behavioural reactions and these reactions are considered by Lipset to include voting behaviour, then it could reasonably be expected that class-like groups developing within the housing market, would also have consequences for social and political behaviour. Indeed the claim that attitudinal and behavioural consequences follow from objective 'housing class' membership is fundamental to the Rex and Moore thesis.

For Rex and Moore, "... being a member of one or other of these [housing] classes is of first importance in determining a man's associations, his interests, his life styles, and his position in the urban social structure..." [Rex and Moore, 1967: 36].
CHAPTER TWO


THE STRUGGLE FOR HOUSING "... IS WHAT THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND SOCIALISM MEANS TO THE RESIDENTS OF CENTRAL AREAS IN THE CITY..." [REX AND MOORE, 1967 : 194.]
Housing Classes: Classes in the Market or Classes in Consumption?
In the previous chapter it was argued that despite the persuasive theoretical logic of Marx and Weber, and the substantial empirical evidence supporting a close link between political behaviour and class position, a vigorous debate persists because theorists strongly dispute both the extent to which structural changes have occurred in liberal capitalist societies and the significance these changes have had for contemporary political behaviour.

One of the strongest issues in contention is the extent to which the sphere of production, or work, has become separate from the sphere of consumption, a sphere in which 'styles of life' are of importance. Ineichen (1972), McKenzie and Silver (1968), and Butler and Rose (1969), among others, tend to emphasise the importance of consumption patterns in shaping social and political attitudes, particularly among affluent workers. Those writings in which the worker is seen to attribute an equal, or greater significance to his position in the sphere of consumption, rather than to his position in the sphere of production, are loosely identified with the thesis of embourgeoisement. Proponents of the embourgeoisement thesis tend to treat worker homeownership as one important index of middle class patterns of consumption. Even Goldthorpe and Lockwood, perhaps the foremost critics of the embourgeoisement thesis, acknowledge that significant changes have occurred in the consumption patterns of some workers. They point out that an affluent section of the manual working class in Britain, is equalling and sometimes surpassing many white-collar families in standards of domestic living and in the ownership of desirable goods, the most important of which is housing. [see Goldthorpe and Lockwood, 1962: 18-19] They suggest that embourgeoisement as a process would involve the sequential stages of privatisation, aspiration and assimilation. Homeownership for the affluent worker could be important in the first and third of these stages, since to the extent that a move to suburban locations is involved, the leisure activities of the new suburbanites may become sharply separated from those activities that are worker based. Goldthorpe and Lockwood deny that there is any significant evidence of the complete three stage process having occurred,
but in their Luton study they acknowledge a persistent association between not voting Labour and worker homeownership, an association that is recognised in a number of studies in both Britain and the United States.

In the previous chapter it was argued that the evidence of some kind of association between political behaviour and homeownership raises some important theoretical questions about the nature of changes in twentieth century property rights. It was suggested that worker homeownership involves a measure of control over life circumstances that is more than the mere possession of labour power, that characterised the proletariat in the writings of Marx and Engels. It was further suggested that any extension of property rights may have implications for socio-political behaviour and this suggestion was linked with Marx's observation, that in any period in which revolutionary development was still embryonic, some of the oppressed class would identify their interests with those of the bourgeoisie. The possibility was raised that the phenomenon of widespread worker homeownership and relative affluence, is in some sense analogous to the 'small property illusions' of the nineteenth century peasantry, who contributed to the failure of the 1848 insurrection. Rex and Moore's housing class model was introduced as one further approach to the explanation of socio-political behaviour that has the apparent advantage of linking behavioural outcomes directly with Weberian class theory. If common market interests can lead to the formation of class-like groups in the housing market, it can then be suggested that any tendency for worker homeowners to vote for parties of the right may be linked to their housing market interests. Tenure status and the various property rights associated with tenure are important elements in the structuring of liberal capitalist societies. Murie argues that tenure status may be taken to be "... a surrogate for various important aspects of life style, including home centredness, time horizons, saving, income and occupational factors, attitudes to debt, status perceptions, social contacts and networks, aspirations, career channels and family background..." [Murie, 1974 : 38] According to Murie, rather than tenure being associated with household characteristics
it may "... itself be indicative of such characteristics..." [loc.cit., p.38] Tenure status and associated property rights may be important in the market to, as Rex and Moore suggest. How differences in patterns of consumption are connected with these market interests and whether in some combination they have a bearing on socio-political behaviour is central to the arguments in the remainder of this chapter. The relationship between patterns of consumption and the structuring of orthodox classes is also important, and it is to the arguments of Giddens who discusses this relationship, that I now want to turn.

Class Structuration and 'Distributive Groupings':
The belief that something of a separation has taken place between workers as producers and as consumers, is a common theme in the writings of theorists of such diverse persuasion as Dubin, Schelsky, Gorz and Marcuse. [see Giddens, 1973: 221]. Giddens argues that along with the authority relationships and the division of labour within the productive enterprise groups he labels 'distributive groupings' are important in the structuring of class relationships. 1 'Consumption classes', or 'distributive groupings' arise out of the urbanization process and are characterised by, "... those relationships involving common patterns of the consumption of economic goods regardless of whether the individuals make any type of conscious evaluation of their honour or prestige relative to others..." [loc.cit., p.109] Giddens arrives at this formulation from the argument that in Weberian analysis, the notions of 'status' and 'status group' have confused two separable elements. In the sphere of consumption, Giddens argues, there will be groups forming on the one hand, in which no invidious distinctions on the basis of prestige

1. Giddens is not suggesting that the relationships formed in consumption are more important than those formed in the workplace. He argues that "... without dropping the conception that classes are founded ultimately in the economic structure of the capitalist market, it is still possible to regard consumption patterns as a major influence upon class structuration..." [loc.cit., p.109]

2. The most significant distributive groupings are those formed through the tendency towards community and neighbourhood segregation, a segregation which is not just based on income differentials, but also on the access to housing mortgages. [loc.cit., p.109]
are necessarily involved, while on the other hand, there are
types of social differentiation based on non-economic values
in which scales of honour or prestige are important. In
Weberian theory, 'status groups' include groups with an
economic base, indeed Weber argued that in the long term
'status groups' frequently arose on the basis of economic
distinctions. However, one of the central themes in
Weberian theory insists that 'classes' and 'status groups'
are in no sense identical; 'classes' were seen to be
stratified according to their relation to the production
and acquisition of goods, while 'status groups' were
stratified according to the principles of their consumption
of goods as represented by special 'styles of life'. Even
where 'status groups' did form on the basis of economic
distinctions, the retention of a privileged position often
depended on the status group's success in having the procedures,
or means, by which their own entry to the select group was
secured, defined as illegitimate so that their claims to
exclusiveness could be maintained. For Marx, distinctions
between the spheres of consumption and production were a
non-issue, except in so far as they represented the vestiges
of a 'false consciousness' that would ultimately disappear.
Marx argued that "... any distribution whatever of the means
of consumption is only a consequence of the distribution of
the conditions of production itself..." (Marx and Engels, 1972:
398) In 'The Housing Question', Engels argues at great length
against bourgeois solutions to the problem of housing, and
yet in so doing he appears to give at least some credence to
the arguments of his opponents. Engels points out that the
"... essence of both the big bourgeois and petty bourgeois
solutions to the "housing question" is that the worker should
own his own dwelling..." (Engels, 1950: 499). Engel's
strongest attacks are directed against Dr. Emil Sax, who
argued that worker-homeownership would insulate the worker
from some of the vicissitudes of economic life. According
to Sax, the worker-homeowner "... would become a capitalist
and be safeguarded against the dangers of unemployment...

4. loc. cit., p.937
5. see Lipset, 1968: 302
as a result of the credit which his real estate would open to him... he would thus be raised from the ranks of the propertyless into the propertied class..." [Sax, quoted in Engels, 1950: 63] Engels rejects Sax's analysis on the grounds that there is no fundamental change in the worker's relationship to the means of production simply because he owns a house. But as Bell [1976] points out, the vigour with which Engels makes his attack reflected his concern that a movement towards widespread worker-homeownership would betray the revolution, worker-homeownership "... would turn the present day workers into just such narrow minded crawling, sneaking servile fools as their great-great-grandfathers were..." [Engels, 1950: 511] In other words, any attempt by the capitalists to solve the housing problem through worker-homeownership would set back the clock, and the conditions of enslavement that characterised the feudal era in which peasants owned their own small cottages and means of production would be created anew. Once again workers would be reduced to "... intellectual and political nullity..." [loc.cit., p.500] The link with Marx and his attacks on the 'small property fanaticism' that contributed to the betrayal of the 1848-9 Paris insurrections is clear. For Marx the complete transcendence of private property in all its forms, was an essential pre-requisite to complete emancipation. Marx argued that it was "... private property [that] has made us so stupid and one-sided that an object is only ours when we have it - when it exists for us as capital, or when it is directly possessed, eaten, drunk, worn, inhabited... in short, when it is used by us..." [Marx and Engels, 1972: 73] The driving of the worker from "... hearth and home... [was]... the very first condition of their intellectual emancipation..." [Engels, 1950: 511]

Bell focuses on two apparent inconsistencies in Engels's analysis. Engels denies that the worker-homeowner is in any sense a capitalist but allows that he is 'no longer a proletarian'. He also argues that the worker who is associated with building societies belongs to the 'aristocracy of his class'. As Bell suggests, if the worker-homeowner does not
change his labour-market position there should be no difficulty for Engels here, for in essence the worker-homeowner remains a true proletarian. (Bell, 1976: 11) The worker-homeowner may have a different relationship to the sphere of consumption through being a homeowner, and this may lead to the forms of 'false-consciousness' that served to inhibit the growth of revolutionary consciousness in the case of his feudal ancestors, but he will maintain the same relationships to the means of production unless the change involves more than his relationship to the consumption of housing.

Rex and Moore's housing class model recognises the important connection housing and housing situations have with the sphere of consumption, indeed Rex argued that the conflicts of the housing market would become increasingly distinct from the struggles of the labour market "... the more home and industry became separated..." (Rex, 1968: 215) The connections with the arguments put forward by Engels (and in part foreshadowed by Marx) concerning the extension of worker homeownership as a bulwark against the growth of revolutionary consciousness are also evident in the housing class thesis. Rex and Moore argue that class-like groups emerge in the housing market with distinct and significant consequences for socio-political behaviour. But they also recognise characteristics which amount to the political orientation of owner-occupiers to a liberal-capitalist status quo, matched by the contrasting orientation of tenants to the collectivist and socialist ideology of the welfare state. Why these political orientations should be peculiar to the urban setting is also an issue worthy of consideration. The apparent strength of Rex and Moore's housing class model rests largely on the claimed links with Weberian class theory but the urban focus of the housing class model is not Weberian. Weber seems to have denied that there was a case for a distinctively 'urban' sociology and one is led to suspect that he would have been sceptical of the suggestion that class formations arise around the housing struggles of the city that challenge loyalties arising from the struggles of the labour market.
Weber argued that with the passing of feudalism, the loss of autonomy in the guild cities and the growth of the nation-state, new forces of social combination developed to supersede the commitments unique to urban communities. Weber saw the dimensions of class and status, and not those of locality, becoming the basis of community formation. [Weber (1958), in Mellow, 1975: 276] Many contemporary social scientists would agree with Weber and regard locality "... as a primitive category of only occasional relevance in a world of instant communications, near total annihilation of space, international flows of capital... impressive centralisation and control..." [loc.cit., p. 277] For Castells and Pickvance, among others, the urban question is first and foremost the product of the capitalist mode of production organised at the national and international levels. [Pickvance, 1976: 86. 117] Mellow, on the other hand, argues that local places are "... substantially the environment of our everyday lives and, as such, [are] an important basis of our experience and our consciousness of social reality..." [Mellow, 1975: 278] Similar arguments are presented by Runuman (1966), Keller (1966), and Harvey (1974). While Harvey argues that the dynamic of urbanisation is powered by an "... overriding requirement to reproduce the capitalist order..." [Harvey, 1974: 249], in which surplus comes to be extracted from the process of consumption, he believes that in the extraction process, community conflicts develop which in some measure appear to contrast with traditional work-based conflicts. In the urbanization process, he argues, "... 'consumption classes', 'distributive groupings', or even "housing classes" may be produced at the same time..." [loc. cit, p. 250] It is the urbanization process that produces new modes of consumption, new social wants and needs, and which "... concomitantly produces new distributive groupings or consumption classes which may crystallize into distinctive communities within the overall urban structure ..." [loc. cit., p. 250] An acceptance of this argument is of course, central to the housing class thesis, though Rex's emphasis is closer to Weberian theory than the Marxist themes that underpin the approach of Harvey and Castells.
Rex and Moore draw on Weber's extension of Marxist class analysis to include 'domestic property' as a potential base of power. For them, "... the central process of the city as a social unit [becomes] a class struggle over the use of houses..." (Rex and Moore, 1967: 273). Urban social interaction is not the class struggle of the labour market in miniature, the basic process underlying urban social interaction is "... a competition for scarce and desired types of housing... people are distinguished from one another by their strength in the housing market..." (Rex, 1968: 214). Housing struggles which develop in the urban setting, are not simply an extension of class struggles in the workplace, they are struggles with a measure of independence in both origin and consequence, and hence deserve separate consideration as distinctly urban phenomena. 

Rex and Moore argue persuasively that social scientists can gain an alternative understanding of the structures and processes of industrial societies by refocussing attention on housing - not only as the most important commodity that families consume, but also as the basis for the formation of class-like groups. This claim does not rest exclusively on Weber's analysis of class formation (which can be seen as according 'equal consideration' to both the ownership of 'domestic property' and the 'means of industrial production' in class formation), the housing class thesis also draws upon the ecological tradition of the Chicago theorists who were prominent in the years between the two world wars.

The Chicago tradition of Burgess, Park, and their colleagues, recognised a broad differentiation of cities into four social and cultural zones outside the city centre (a zone of transition, a zone of workingmens' houses, a middle class residential zone

---

6. Rex and Moore emphasise that while "... a man's market situation in the housing market depends in part upon his income and therefore his situation in the labour market... it is also the case that men in the same labour market situation may come to have differential degrees of access to housing and it is this which immediately determines the class conflicts of the city as distinct from those of the work place..." (Rex and Moore, 1967: 274)

7. Rex and Moore, 1967: 36
and a commuters' zone] which provided a starting point for the analysis of European and North American cities. For Rex, the general notion of 'competition for land use', and the principal processes of domination, invasion and succession outlined by Burgess and his associates, lack the 'theoretical bite' to explain why the social and cultural life of urban areas 'is as it is'. 8 [Rex, 1968 : 212]

Rex and Moore saw a necessity to modify the theory to take account of what they believe to be three important processes central to the development of the city. According to Rex and Moore, the initial settlement of the city involves "... three different groups, differentially placed with regard to possession of property [which] become segregated from one another and work out their own community style of life..." [Rex and Moore, 1967 : 8] 9

8. As Rex and Moore noted in 'Race, Community and Conflict', "... The weakness of the Chicago theory, to our mind, lies in its failure to investigate sufficiently the relationship between the culture and society of one sub-community and those of another..." [Rex and Moore, 1967 : 8]

9. Rex and Moore suggest that there are three groups involved in this settlement process: i) the upper middle class, "... characterized by the possession of property and capable of living without communal and neighbourly support..." ii) the working class, "... which finds security in communal, collective and neighbourly institutions fashioned in the course of a struggle against economic adversity..." iii) the lower-middle class groups, "... aspiring to the way of life of the upper-middle classes, but enjoying only relatively inferior social facilities including housing..." [Rex and Moore, 1967 : 8]
In the nineteenth century growth of English industrial towns, the 'captains of industry' (the upper-middle class) settled in locations with favourable access to central city facilities while the working class developed their own social sub-system in the red-brick rented cottages surrounding the factories.

Towards the end of the nineteenth, and early in the twentieth century, a third way of life began to emerge between the working and upper-middle classes. This second stage of development is "... characterised above all by the emergence of suburbia..." [Rex and Moore, 1967: 8] The growth of suburbia occurs when, "... the lower-middle classes, including white-collar people and better off artisans, forsake the centre of the city for a way of life in which... they may more closely approximate to the life of the upper-middle classes..." [loc. cit., p.8] Access to credit facilities, to mortgage finance, are crucial to those in the lower-middle class in facilitating these suburban moves.

In the third stage the working class use the political power they have been able to gain through collective action, "... to achieve their own version of the suburban move..." [Rex and Moore, 1967: 9] As a result, a new public suburbia paralleling the existing private suburbs develops, only "... distinguished by the fact that once a week a man from the council calls for the rent..." [Rex, 1968: 213-14]

HOUSING AND THE URBAN VALUE SYSTEM:
While each class with a distinctive housing situation develops a social sub-system of its own, the classes are not entirely culturally isolated, but "... participate in a socio-cultural system in which the middle class way of life enjoys high prestige and in which the move to the suburbs is a built in aspiration..." [loc. cit., p.9]

Along with those aspects and the housing market which delineates housing classes, and the behavioural consequences linked to class membership, the assumption of a societal consensus with
respect to housing values is one of the three central elements in the housing class thesis. In the words of Pahl, it is precisely because of "... these common values and common objectives that there is conflict over housing ..." [Pahl, 1970: 62] Rex and Moore's housing class model largely hinges on the assumption that this urban value system "... demands that all individuals should be motivated to compete to enter those sub-communities whose way of life is evaluated most highly..." [Rex and Moore, 1967: 11]

In 'Race, Community and Conflict', in which the housing class model is first introduced, Rex and Moore dismiss the residents of the inner city as "... social rejects and newcomers without the defensive communal institutions of the working class..." [loc. cit., p 9] Logically, in terms of their urban value system inner city residents are failures, at the back of the queue for desired types of housing. It is this claim that has led to considerable criticism of the housing class thesis. Lambert and Filkin [1970] and Couper and Brindley (1975), attack the suggestion that there is a consensus over housing values, and produce empirical evidence which suggests that many central city residents live where they live, out of choice. Rex responds to these criticisms by conceding that there may be multiple value systems but "... it is still possible even while recognising the possibility of conflicting value scales to posit that one such scale is dominant and recognised as being dominant even by those who do not accept it..." 10 [Rex, 1970: 298]

Even if we accept that one urban value system is dominant, as Rex suggests, the existence of alternative value systems as modes of adjustment to housing conflicts, or otherwise, could be seen as weakening the cogency of the housing class thesis.

10. Rex also attacks the empirical validity of cross-sectional survey data appearing to support the existence of multiple value systems concerning housing. To the extent that 'choice' is only choice in terms of economic constraints it could well be that groups who have, or feel they have, no chance of realising the urban ideal rationalise their 'deprived' position by rejecting the ideal itself as part of an adjustment process to minimise the personal sense of failure continued aspiration to the ideal would involve.
The likelihood of conflict and the intensity of conflict that arises, will in part depend on the extent to which urban residents actively pursue the goal of suburban owner-occupancy, the most desired housing situation within the dominant hierarchy of housing values. Weber argued that class situations, and hence the types of class action generated, would "... become most clearly efficacious when all other determinants or reciprocal relations... are eliminated in their significance..." [Weber, 1963: 47]

To the extent that alternative housing values are significant, the generation of housing classes, especially, 'housing classes-for-themselves', become less probable. In the Sparkbrook study Rex found that there were loyalties which cut across the lines of conflict predicted in the housing class model but these were not based on alternative housing values. 11

HOUSING CLASSES OR HOUSING STATUS GROUPS?

According to Rex, the number of housing classes that develop will depend on "... the kinds of housing available, the kinds of tenure legally recognised, and the form of housing allocation..." 12 [Rex, 1970: 296] Property-owners are divided into distinct housing classes on the basis of relatively fine distinctions in property rights [whether the dwelling is mortgaged or mortgage-free], and on the basis of their respective ranks in the hierarchy of housing values [whether they are 'legitimate' and highly valued, as in categories i) and ii), or 'illegitimate' as in the case of vi)]. Similarly, tenants are separated into four housing

11. Rex observed that "... class formation might be overlaid and distorted..." [Rex, 1970: 297] by the formation of 'immigrant colonies', or the tendency of urban residents to see housing situations in terms of a "... graded system of status groups..." [loc. cit., p.297]

12. There are seven housing classes distinguished in the Sparkbrook study:

i) The outright owners of large houses in desirable areas.
ii) Mortgage payers who "own" whole houses in desirable areas.
iii) Council tenants in Council built houses.
iv) Council tenants in slum houses awaiting demolition.
v) Tenants of private houseowners, usually in the inner ring.
vi) Houseowners who must take lodgers to meet loan repayments.
classes according to the means by which they are allocated housing, and according to their relative ranking in the housing prestige hierarchy.

Given that Rex and Moore want to argue that there is a connection between housing classes and Weberian class analysis, specifically Weber's recognition of domestic property ownership as a distinct category of property ownership, one would have expected the criteria Rex and Moore use to define housing classes to centre principally on the separation of housing situations by ownership. One might have expected that house type, means of access and the values governing housing aspirations, would have together served to reinforce a distinction that is essentially between the propertyed and the propertyless, between the owners and non-owners of domestic property. If, on the other hand, Rex and Moore want to stress the connections between Weberian 'status groups' and housing situations, rather than the generation of housing classes with market interests, then the basis upon which they distinguish the seven groups would seem to be the more appropriate one. The Weberian 'class' and the Weberian 'status group' themes are both recognised in Rex and Moore's analysis. At one point Rex extends the class analogy to include the Marxist notion of the formation of a class-for-itself, an element he claims to be "... the most important area of investigation which the concept of housing classes suggests..." [Rex, 1973: 38] This formation of classes for themselves "... minimally... must involve the development of organizational means, the affiliation of individuals to organizations... the development of social norms, values and sentiments shared between members of the class, and a degree of consciousness of kind..." [loc. cit., p.39]

In the Sparkbrook study Rex and Moore found that classes in the conscious sense that a class-for-itself implies, were far from well developed. Housing classes were "... composed in such a way that allies [from the point of view of the housing class model]... were divided amongst themselves
and potential enemies were united..." [Rex, 1968 : 218]  

To account for the relative under-development of housing class consciousness, Rex develops an argument analogous to the Marxist argument given to explain the blunting of industrial conflicts; 'classes are seen to be in a state of 'false consciousness'. Since there will be some possibility of individual mobility between housing classes, to "... the extent that individuals feel that such a move is credible, disadvantaged groups come to see the position of the privileged as legitimate and the system of class conflict tends to be transformed into a status system... potentially class conscious attitudes amongst the housing classes may therefore be blurred..." [Rex, 1968 : 215-6]

HOUSING CLASSES, URBAN VALUES AND POLITICS:

There are several important elements in the housing class model. These include the cultural values concerning housing, the formation of housing classes (together with the behavioural outcomes of class membership), those aspects of the housing market which delineate classes, and the connection of housing values to the two socio-economic systems of capitalism and socialism, as represented through the property-owning democracy and the council provided rental housing of the housing market.

The place of state intervention in the housing market in providing alternative modes of access to housing to those of the free market, relates closely to both the values governing housing aspirations and the housing classes that can be expected to emerge out of the competition for scarce and desired types of housing. Rex and Moore argue that the urban value system can be analysed in terms of degrees of commitment to two distinct and in part antagonistic socio-economic systems. The first of these socio-economic systems is the 'property-owning democracy', a system in which the individual is encouraged to own property and in particular to own his own house. Access to property in this system is secured for those who meet certain qualifying
criteria, through the social mechanism of the Free market. In this sense the 'classes' of mortgaged and mortgage-free owners have a mode of access, perhaps an 'interest' in common, but Rex prefers to distinguish between them, perhaps on the basis of a 'status' distinction.

The free market receives ideological legitimation because it is the mechanism whereby individuals conforming to the set criteria are able to obtain security and independence for their families through property ownership. Those who are able to realize this goal have succeeded in the game of 'urban leapfrog' and certain benefits accrue accordingly.

To the extent that the most desired types of housing are in

13. Rex suggests that "... owner-occupiers must have certain qualifications as regards capital, amount of income and type of income. They must also qualify in advance in terms of their style of life. They must have at least enough capital for a deposit to obtain a mortgage..." [Rex and Moore, 1967 : 36] Many of these qualifying criteria could be considered to be closely related to orthodox class, and though Rex goes to some trouble to argue that there is a strong case for distinguishing between the positions one may have in the labour and housing markets, he does not directly deal with the problem of how these two particular claims on reciprocal relations, or loyalties, interrelate when the housing class model is applied empirically.

14. Those who succeed in the game of 'urban leapfrog' have demonstrated their worth in the competition for scarce and desired housing, hence status benefits can be expected to accrue. Again, in terms of Weberian class theory, status can operate against economic class; groups with high status seek to restrict entry to their own status group by placing a negative value on the activities that originally made the acquisition of their own privileged positions possible. [see Lipset, 1963 : 302; Weber, 1963 : 54-7] Rex and Moore make provision for this process in the housing class model as well, when they argue that "... competition for the scarce resource of housing leads to the formation of groups... one group will attempt to restrict the opportunities of another by using whatever sanctions it can..." [Rex and Moore, 1967 : 16], and "... from the point of view of those about to enter the high-status sub-communities, it is important that others should be prevented from competing..." [loc. cit., p.3]
scarce supply, there is competition over housing but not all will succeed and hence there is a need for an alternative system, the welfare state, to provide a housing 'safety net'. In liberal capitalist societies certain minimum rights of shelter are endorsed and at least in principle, these rights are extended to all citizens. In the housing system of the welfare state, the criteria of 'merit' or ability to pay which in theory largely determines access to owner-occupancy, are waived in favour of the criteria of need, length of residence, age and perhaps access to powerful political groups.

Both systems, the property-owning democracy, and the welfare state, have their political champions. Rex describes the 'right-wing view' as one in which the aim is "... to extend the 'property-owning democracy' as far as possible..." [Rex and Moore, 1967: 40] For those on the right wing politically, the welfare state system is one which should be relegated to the status of the tolerated, but negatively valued 'safety net' reserved for those who do not succeed in realising the ideal of suburban owner-occupancy.

The left-wing view on the other hand, reverses the order of priority, with housing being seen as a social service to be provided for all, as of right. The aspiration to property-ownership may be devalued, even undermined, according to Rex. [loc. cit., p.40]

Within liberal capitalist societies, neither of these two housing systems is able to adequately meet the shelter needs of all citizens and hence a third system, 'landlordism' provides yet another net under the net of the welfare state. For Rex, the distinctive characteristic of the landlord system is that it has no ideological legitimation in the eyes of either the right or the left wings of the political spectrum, though clearly it is a product of the 'private enterprise' system and bears a close affinity to the ideals of the right-wing philosophy that champions that system.

At this point Rex and Moore lead into some of the implications
which the existence of two legitimate urban housing systems have for the political orientations of urban residents, and these clearly relate to national, rather than local politics. 15 Rex and Moore argue that "... those who had some hope of buying their own houses... were likely to be relatively satisfied with a party which emphasised the idea of a property-owning democracy..." (Rex and Moore, 1967: 193)

In other words, they seem to be suggesting that those who aspired to homeownership, or those who had realized this goal, would be likely to exercise a political preference for the parties of the right that championed the property-owning ideal and who could make, or had made, the achievement of their goals possible.

On the other hand, "... those who had no hope of owning property... would look to the party which was prepared to divert the greatest part of available building resources to building subsidized publicly owned rented houses..." (loc. cit., p.193) For Rex and Moore, it was this choice in essence, the choice posed by the existence of "... one party [that] favoured... private property ownership" (loc. cit., p.193) and the other party which supported the collective ideal of "... mutual aid..." (loc. cit., p.193) and co-operation, that shaped the development of political orientations in the post-war period. Rex and Moore extend the argument still further to suggest that the struggle for housing, as defined by these two opposed housing systems, "... is what the conflict between private enterprise

15. When Rex first emphasised Weber’s differentiation of the class situations of the property as a distinction that could be important for understanding urban processes [in 'Key Problems of Sociological Theory', 1961] he suggested that different relations to domestic property would be an important factor in local politics. [see Haddon, 1970: 130] In Rex and Moore’s discussion of housing classes in the Sparkbrook study, this theme is developed to a much more sophisticated degree and the discussion of the urban value system, together with the claim that housing classes are more important in shaping attitudes and behaviour than are orthodox classes can be taken as meaning that housing classes will affect orientations to both national and local politics.
and socialism means to the residents of central areas in
the city..." [loc. cit., p.194] It is perhaps fair to
suggest that in their desire to separate the housing class
thesis theoretically from orthodox class analysis, Rex and
Moore tend to over-compensate and attempt to define all
behaviour in terms of a competition for housing.

PROPERTY RELATIONS AND THE POLITICS OF "FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS"

Rex and Moore's suggestion that there is some connection
between political orientations and aspirations to one or the
other forms of access to housing bears a resemblance to the
arguments developed by Engels in his vigorous attacks on
'bourgeois' solutions to the housing question. Engels argued
that the spread of worker-homeownership would undermine
revolutionary consciousness, the proletariat would be
returned to political nullity, to the pursuit of the false
goals that kept their forefathers in chains.

The tendency of small property owners, including owners of
domestic property, to identify their interests with those
of the owners of capital, or at least their tendency not
to oppose the interests of capital, has been recognised
by many writers. Tawney [1921], Marshall [1964], MacKenzie
and Silver [1968], Ineichen [1972], Bell et. al., [1976]
Fletcher [1976], Bell [1977] and Kemeny [1977], among others,
have all recognised this tendency. Tawney argued that while
different categories of property owner may see their respective
relationships to the property they own, differently, both
rights of use and accumulation are embodied within the same
private property institution, and it is in the political
interest of the owners of capital to exploit this association
for their own purposes. Small property may be held in
reverence because it offers security, but "... the classes
who own much prize it for quite different reasons, and
laugh in their sleeve at the innocence which supposes that
anything so vulgar as the savings of the petite bourgeoisie
have, except at elections, any interest for them..."
[Tawney, 1921 : 87] In capitalist societies the fundamental
need of security is organized around property. Tawney argues
that this hunger for security is so imperious that those
who suffer most from the abuses of property, will tolerate,
even defend, the owners of capital in order to protect
themselves from what they see to be threats to their own
'property', and not just the 'property' of the capitalists.
In the 'guileless' minds of the petite bourgeoisie, property
is seen in terms of the household goods and domestic amenities
they hold so dear, and it is this which "... stampedes them
into displaying the ferocity of terrified sheep when the
cry is raised that "Property" is threatened..." [loc. cit., p.79]
While there may be few reasons to equate the desirability and
justice of property rights that guarantee security in use,
with a complementary acceptance of the justice of property
rights for accumulation and power over the labour of others,
the distinction is often lost in practice. As Kahn Freund
argues, the "... property concept can ultimately serve the
political function of creating the illusion that factual
situations are identical because they happen to be reflected
in the same legal institution..." [Kahn Freund, quoted in
Bell et al., 1976]

Tawney's arguments are directed to the petite bourgeoisie,
rather than to the owners of domestic property, as one
identifiable group that could include a great variety of
sub-groups from different 'orthodox' classes. A case can
be made for considering the petite bourgeoisie as a separate
intermediate class between the 'true' propertyless, proletariat
and the owners of monopoly capital, 16 but the 'false consciousness'
argument has a direct application to domestic property owners
as well, a point that is developed by Fletcher [1976], Bell
[1977] and Kemeny [1977].

Fletcher recognises domestic property as a separate dimension

16. Bechofer et. al., discuss the petite bourgeoisie in
relation to their ownership of domestic property, the
possession of modest amounts of capital and elements
of work autonomy in Parkin, F. [ed]; The Social Analysis
of property rights, but rather than arguing that the differentials in group's access to housing leads to market interests and class formation, Fletcher argues that "... domestic property is politically significant largely by virtue of its contribution to a 'false consciousness'... a consciousness that fails to realize that those who are ensnared by the precariousness of their domestic security are really in a remarkably similar situation..." (loc. cit., p.464) For Fletcher the tendency of those who realise their housing aspirations through the mechanisms of a 'property-owning democracy' to identify themselves with the private enterprise system and the right-wing parties that champion such a system, [if this process does occur] is one further aspect of a false consciousness. Those who have an interest in property which is primarily for personal use are confusing their class interests with the interests of those whose primary interest in property is for profit. As Tawney recognised to be the case with respect to the petite bourgeoisie, the owners of capital were seen to exploit the fears of the small property owners to suit their own political ends. Historically, the recognition of the persuasive, or coercive potential of ideology in this context is a Marxian one. For Marx, ownership of the productive means of a society carried with it control of the state and the mechanisms through which ideas were disseminated. In each epoch the ruling class would seek to consolidate and further their privileges by promoting an ideology which 'legitimised' the process of exploitation upon which their power was based. The twentieth century media technology which, if anything, has extended the

17. Domestic property is defined by Fletcher as "... the ownership and control of the means and relations of life-support..." (loc. cit., p.451) The owners of domestic property in this context are a diverse group including both those who own property with a mortgage and those who own substantial property (second homes, rented accommodation, fields measured in acres). There are really two categories of owner, those who are mortgaged are more or less permanently 'buying land' and those who are mortgage free, who have a 'real estate'. Those who rent are distinct from 'owners' in that they are 'landless', but have rights to personal space. (loc. cit., p.464)
powers of the dominant groups manipulating the prevailing ideology to perpetuate a status quo which serves to maintain their own favoured position in the social order. The political sponsorship of a 'property-owning democracy' by parties of the right, 18 the parties of private enterprise, becomes one further aspect in the maintenance of a status quo that is overwhelmingly structured so as to perpetuate an exploitative capitalist system. The extension of property rights through progressively wider sectors of the community, to eventually include widespread worker-homeownership, may at the same time create particular economic and status interests, but in terms of Marxist logic these would always be secondary to the struggles of the workplace because the interests "created" serve the interests of only one of the major groups in that industrial conflict - the interests of monopoly capital. If the argument is pursued that housing classes, or particular consumption classes, are of greater importance than 'orthodox' class in shaping attitudes and behaviour, then the empirical confirmation of this argument would testify to the effectiveness of the measures taken by monopoly capital to ensure that as many citizens as possible gain a 'stake' in the community and come to identify the maintenance of the property rights so gained with the preservation of the liberal capitalist order that granted them these property rights.

While the political significance of the ideology of homeownership may be one of integrating liberal capitalist societies, Bell's argument that housing becomes "... a social base to support the status quo... [rather than] "... the central source of conflict in urban areas..." [Bell, 1977 : 39-40], confuses rather than clarifies the arguments in the housing class thesis. Housing can still be a major source of conflict in urban areas, but the conflict itself is functional precisely because it is instrumental in the integration of the capitalist social order. The argument does not have to be presented in

18. Kemeny points out that the political sponsorship of homeownership is intimately associated with conservative political parties. [Kemeny, 1977 : 48]
dualistic terms - either housing is a major source of conflict, or a major source of integration in urban areas. Both are possible, though necessarily the former is ultimately subordinate to the latter, precisely because this conflict is serving an integrating function in the interests of monopoly capital. The domestic property market can be seen as essentially one further market manipulated by the owners of monopoly capital to provide surplus value. The mortgaged homeowner has more or less exclusive rights of 'use', certain rights of disposal for income, or profit, but these rights are usually subordinate to the interests of the mortgagees as the agents of monopoly capital. The bundle of rights associated with homeownership, in those cases where the homeowner makes mortgage payments, are in a sense separate from the control exercised over housing by the lending agencies who provide the owners of monopoly capital with an additional means of extracting surplus value. When the home buyer enters a mortgage contract he helps to perpetuate the monopoly control exercised by the owners of capital. Any conflicts over access to housing that develop between groups aspiring to the most desired housing situations are conflicts that serve to hinder the development of common interests and a common consciousness among those who, in one way or another, are being exploited by the owners of monopoly capital. Those who buy homes are helping to integrate the liberal capitalist economic system, and along with those who aspire to homeownership, they develop a stake in the social order and the economic system, that serves to perpetuate existing economic inequalities. If the Marxist assertion that the state serves the interest of monopoly capital is accepted, there would seem to be little grounds for modifying the argument simply because the state operates lending agencies which have a major impact on the provision of finance within the housing market. Conflicts between groups with different advantages and disadvantages in the struggle to move to the most desirable housing situations could still be seen as integrating the liberal capitalist order, irrespective of the level of state involvement. On
the other hand if the state is seen to be a separate entity which operates with some measure of independence from monopoly capital, a different theoretical approach will be required.

WEBERIAN 'CLASS' AND HOUSING CLASS RECONSIDERED:
Rex and Moore accept that there is a link between orthodox classes and housing classes, but apart from arguing that a position in the housing class is more important in the formation of attitudes and behaviour than a position in the labour market, and suggesting that those in the same labour market situation can have differential degrees of access to housing, the linkage is not developed in any rigorous theoretical sense. The strength of the housing class thesis rests largely on the assertion, originating from Weberian class analysis, that class-like groups can emerge from the housing market, and that these classes will have a significant impact on attitudes and behaviour.

The housing class thesis has been strongly criticised on a number of different grounds. In more recent writings Rex has modified many of the bolder statements concerning the explanatory potential of the housing class model that characterised the introduction to the original Sparkbrook study in 'Race, Community and Conflict'. The Sparkbrook study itself led to something of a change in emphasis from the original, almost exclusive focus on aspects of a class model, to a subsequent acknowledgement that status divisions also appear to be important. We are advised to look for the 'partial development' of housing classes and we are warned that to say "... an individual's behaviour is influenced by his involvement in a housing class is by no means to say that this is the sole pattern of social relations influencing him..." [Rex, 1971 : 294] Some of the criticisms have been directed at the model's specific assumptions which appear to oversimplify urban social processes, but there is at least one criticism of a theoretically more fundamental nature relating directly to Rex and Moore's use of the Weberian concept of 'class'.
One of the most significant criticisms levelled at the Rex and Moore housing class model, is put forward by Haddon, who argues that the term "class", as used by Rex and Moore, misrepresents the Weberian use of the term both conceptually and theoretically. Haddon insists that Weberian "class" refers to the disposal of goods under market conditions, "... not [to] using goods for personal consumption..." [Haddon, 1970: 132] In Weber’s analysis, we are told, the disposal of goods in the market is undertaken to realise income and it is this "income", "... which is the immediate source of control over life chances in the sense of a supply of goods and external living conditions..." [loc. cit., p.132]. To the extent that the use of housing is primarily one of personal consumption, housing stands as an index of already achieved life chances, and cannot be seen to be a cause of those life chances, as Rex and Moore’s analysis implies. According to Haddon, the only circumstances under which the ownership of domestic property becomes relevant as an index of class situation conferring market power, is in those limited instances in which a market exists for the disposal of domestic property for utilizable returns. Haddon argues that the circumstances under which market conditions apply are largely ignored in Rex and Moore’s Sparkbrook analysis, and this, in part, undermines the cogency of the housing class thesis. Haddon refers to one of Rex’s earlier discussions of class theory in which Rex makes a distinction between "... those who pay rent, those to whom it is paid, and those who own their own homes either outright or through mortgages..." [Rex quoted in Haddon, 1970: 130]. Haddon suggests that the omission of the category of 'those to whom rent is paid' from the

19. Similar criticisms are raised by Pahl (1970)
20. The only exception in the Sparkbrook study is the case of the lodging-house proprietor.
21. Haddon is referring to, Rex, J. 'Key Problems In Sociological Theory', 1961: 143.
Sparkbrook study is an important omission, because this group, in his view, is one of the few to which the term "class" could be legitimately applied. According to Haddon, Rex and Moore's analysis moves away from the central theoretical issues, and rather than attempting to define conflict groups, they "... categorize types of housing and the nature of legal entitlement..." [loc. cit., p.128] to housing, thus avoiding the central issue of between which groups conflict does occur. For Haddon, there are few grounds for arguing that conflict will occur "... between groups of people who are distinguished purely by their present housing situations..." [loc. cit., p.128]. Housing classes, where correctly defined, will be those groups that are differentially placed with regard to the capacity to dispose of domestic property, not those who are differentially placed with regard to use, or consumption of housing.

HOUSING RELATIONS AND MARKET DISPOSAL CAPACITY:
Haddon's criticisms can be responded to on a number of different grounds. One of the central arguments raised hinges on the relevance of the rights attached to domestic property ownership in the creation of, or contribution to, class situations as Weber defined them. A second key argument concerns the extent to which groups favourably disposed with respect to the use or consumption of domestic property enjoy a similar advantage with respect to the immediate, or future disposal of domestic property rights for income, which serves to reinforce their separation from groups disadvantaged in both respects.

Weber argued that the "... ownership of domestic buildings... [was one form of property]... that is usable for returns... [and which]... differentiate[d] the class situation of the propertied...". [Weber, 1963 : 44] The ownership of housing then, becomes one form of property which can be disposed of in the market for 'income' [a utilizable return], in much the same way as it can be argued that 'rights of use' attached to the ownership of housing, are one of the 'kinds of services', Weber referred to, that can be
offered in the 'market' in exchange for income. (loc. cit., p.44)

In the case of the landlord who rents out a house, market conditions apply from the point at which the 'rights of use' ['rights he has the power to transfer, by virtue of his owning the dwelling] are exchanged directly for income. The nearest approximation to this kind of situation in the Sparkbrook study is the housing class of the lodging-house proprietor, who retains the rights of use to part of the dwelling owned for his own purposes, but exchanges the rights of use over the remainder of the dwelling for income. The lodging house proprietor has an immediate interest in his property as an exchange value for income, and as a use value for his own benefit. He will also be concerned with both future use, and future exchange value. The absentee landlord can be distinguished from the lodging-house proprietor because he has no immediate concern with use value, though this may be a future consideration. The 'housing classes' of the mortgaged and mortgage-free homeowners are different again. We can argue, as Harvey does, that in a capitalist economy, "... an individual has a dual interest in property both as a current and future use value and as a potential or actual exchange value both now and in the future..." (Harvey, 1973 : 159). However, there will probably be little reason to dispute the assertion that the primary interest of the homeowner, is in his own immediate and future use value. Exchange value will be a consideration that sometimes comes to the fore when houses are being renovated or repaired and when they are being purchased or sold. Harvey emphasises that both land and structures, "... including houses, have historically been the single most important repository of social assets..." (Harvey, 1973 : 159) and this leads us to recognise that even when housing is being 'consumed', it may confer a future power over scarce resources in the sense that future exchange values frequently appreciate rather than depreciate in the consumption process, because housing itself is always a scarce resource. For the
mortgaged-owner, housing is a repository of wealth in the sense that equity accrues, to be ultimately realized for income at a future point of disposal, which creates future potentials for either directly productive investments, or indirectly productive investments, such as the purchase of a more expensive house. Weber recognised that the 'owners' of property would use their wealth, or property in use, for this purpose. He pointed out that 'owners' under 'pure' market conditions have a monopoly "... on the possibility of transferring property from the sphere of consumption as wealth, to the sphere of capital..." [Weber, 1968 : 927] Clearly the capacity to benefit from transfers of this nature is not confined to 'owners' in the restrictive Marxist sense, and even if it were, there is no reason to suppose that the 'monopoly' of this group would be retained under less than 'pure' market conditions. In societies in which state intervention has been important and in which property rights have been extended through homeownership to a substantial majority of the population, as in Australia and New Zealand, an interest in the pecuniary advantages of housing may well be of considerable significance. As Paterson argues of homeownership in Australia, "... Almost anyone who opts, by choice or necessity, for not being an owner/occupier, is almost invariably acting in a way which is demonstrably irrational in terms of his long term scope for maximising real wealth and income..." [Paterson, 1975 : 28] 22

Tenants are the third significant group in the housing market, and in the Sparkbrook study four separate housing classes within this group are recognised. As with those

22. Sandercock quoted the Australia Financial Review of 8 August, 1972, in which it was claimed that, "... almost everyone has been tainted by a self administered virus of greed fueled by spiralling land prices which give those who already own property steady capital gains and those who struggle to buy property an even stronger interest in ensuring that the spiral will continue..." [Sandercock, 1975 : 189]
who 'own' domestic property, tenants can be categorised in terms of exchange and use value. Harvey argues that it is primarily the different relationship with regard to exchange value which separates all owner-occupiers from tenants. Few tenants will have a vested interest in the exchange values of their property rights because usually there are none. Their only significant concern is with immediate use value, though future use value might be an important consideration in some tenancies. To distinguish between owners and tenants along these lines is less open to Haddon's criticism that housing classes should not be defined according to the nature of their 'legal entitlement' to housing, but rather in terms of their capacity to dispose of housing for income. It is essential to recognise that Haddon's criticism is an important one, but it has one significant weakness which also needs to be acknowledged. The nature of the legal entitlement to housing is important, precisely because it is a good index of the occupiers capacity to dispose of a dwelling for utilizable returns. Weber argued that "... the higher the degree of marketability [property has], the more will economic action be oriented to market situations ..." [Weber, 1968 : 113], and that class situations could be further categorised in terms of "... the "meaning" which [can] be give[n] to the use of property..." [loc. cit., p.928] Owner-occupiers, by virtue of those property rights embodied in their legal entitlement to housing, will be far more concerned with exchange value than are tenants, and this will significantly influence the "meaning" tenants and owner-occupiers can attach respectively, to the property they occupy.

If we are going to argue that housing classes must be categorised in terms of their capacity to dispose of 'income' as Haddon does, then we need to be clear about what is meant by 'income'. Weber used a comprehensive definition of income and a comprehensive definition of income is needed if the different housing classes are to be clearly distinguished. Weber understood those with the 'power of capital' to include not just the possessors of
control of the means of production, but also those who possessed power over "... economic advantages which can be used as capital goods ..." (Weber, 1968: 95), and clearly property owners who are able to transfer 'property' from the sphere of consumption as wealth, into capital, are included within this classification. While it needs to be emphasised that Weber argued that, of all types of income, "... it is particularly those from business profits... which have a dynamic, revolutionary significance for economic life..." (loc. cit., p.204), his definition includes revenues from land, investment income, money returns from mortgages and securities, indeed gains involved in almost any exercise of 'power'. (loc. cit., p.204) Even more comprehensive definitions of income are put forward by Titmuss [1962] and Harvey. Harvey's definition of income includes both "... the market value of rights exercised in consumption and the change in the value of the store of property rights..." within a specified time period. (Harvey, 1973: 53), and it can be argued that tenants and owners are further distinguished from one another in terms of their relationship to 'social' income, which in turn has a direct bearing on their respective 'life chances'. In Australia and to some extent in New Zealand, fiscal systems operate which contain massive tax incentives and interest subsidies for owner-occupied housing. Paterson argues that "... freedom from taxation of net imputed rent..." is the largest single benefit which accrues to owner-occupiers, a point which is also taken up by Kemeny [1977] 24 and Easton [1976]. We can argue then, that any comprehensive

---

23. Income in this sense includes the change in value of an individual's property rights, irrespective of whether the change has been brought about by the current addition to property, which is savings in the narrow sense or whether it has been caused by accretions to the value of the property. (Harvey, 1973: 53)

24. Kemeny, quoting the 1975 Australian 'Housing Report', estimates the wealth transfer to owner-occupiers in Australia to have been no less than $740,000,000 in 1974/5 (Kemeny, 1977: 50). A similar situation could be said to prevail in New Zealand though the income transfer benefits are less extensive than in Australia.
definition of income to categorise housing situations, will embrace all the receipts and rights of disposal of property that serve to increase an individual's life chances, his overall command over the use of society's scarce resources. In terms of a definition of this nature, there will be a rather marked separation between owner-occupiers and tenants in their respective capacities to dispose of property for income.

Haddon's criticisms were directed specifically to the way in which Rex and Moore classified their housing classes in the Sparkbrook study. It has already been argued that the nature of legal entitlement to housing is a reasonable index of capacities to dispose of property for income, but this is only one of a number of criteria Rex and Moore use to classify the different housing classes. Haddon argues that Rex and Moore have really distinguished different consumption groups in the housing market with respect to their different access to desired patterns of consumption. The counter-possibility has been raised that access to consumption has a close relationship to the capacity to dispose of domestic property for income. The rationale for this argument rests on the significant advantages the owners of domestic property, including landlords, have with respect to all the receipts and rights of property disposal which distinguish their life chances from those of tenants. Rex and Moore define four tenant housing classes, and Haddon argues that each of these groups is distinguished by differentials in access to desired styles of housing consumption [as defined by the urban value system] rather than in terms of their capacity to dispose of property for market returns. He argues that these groups are not therefore 'classes' but different consumption groups. Though the case is not a strong one, it can be argued that the different categories of tenant do have different life chances. Tenants in the private and council rental market can be separated in terms of their relationship to social income. Rents in the state or council sector may be fixed according to various 'need' criteria that
differ from those criteria used to determine rents in the private market. Council tenants are not only subsidised, they may be advantaged with respect to mortgage finance to purchase the dwellings they occupy. In some nominal sense they may even be advantaged with respect to their future capacity to dispose of property in the market. Rents may be reimbursed, in whole, or in part, to assist in a property purchase. It may be less than reasonable to suggest that council tenants have a significant interest in future exchange value but they are likely to be fully aware of their favourable position in regard to social income. In the private sector in could be argued that rent control legislation minimises the difference between private and council tenants but the scarcity of accommodation created by such controls may accentuate rather than minimise the advantages of council tenancies. In the private market conflict may arise between landlords and tenants and organisations may be formed to articulate the common market interests of each class. Harvey recognises low-income tenants in the private rental market as constituting a class in this sense. He defines a class to be "... any group that has a clearly defined common interest in the struggle to command scarce resources in society..." [Harvey, 1974: 241] Low-income tenants constitute a class because "... by virtue of their income, social status, credit worthiness, and eligibility for public assistance they are incapable of finding accommodation as homeowners or as residents in public housing..." [loc. cit., p.241]

Market interests are clearly important for low-income tenants are 'trapped' in a particular housing sub-market and they have a common interest in opposition to the 'class'

25. Nevertheless local authorities in Britain take this possibility into account and forbid tenants from selling houses [subject to penalty] for five years in cases where tenants have purchased houses from the council on favourable terms. Many local authorities offer dwellings for sale to sitting tenants generally at prices somewhat below the market price for similar dwellings in the private market. Mortgages are generally offered on more favourable terms than mortgages in the private market and a rebate of some rents paid is usually made to assist in the initial deposit needed to purchase. [See Murie, 1975 : p.131-4; Doling, 1973 : 203]
of landlords who exploit their need for housing. Significantly, status attributes and access to desired circumstances of housing consumption (eligibility for public assistance) are included within the defining criteria of this low-income tenant class. Even though Rex and Moore define different tenant housing classes more in terms of their access to consumption of housing rather than in terms of their access to market return, in some sense it could be said that access to market return and consumption largely coincide. This argument bears some resemblance to Gidden's claims about the interdependence of positions in both the market and in consumption where they together contribute to the structuring of 'orthodox' classes.

Even though Weber argued for the need to distinguish between class and status stratification conceptually, he also recognised that status advantages could be turned to market advantages and similarly that status groups were often underpinned by economic advantages realised in the market. Indeed, Weber argues with respect to the struggles of the 'propertied' and the 'propertyless', [the basic categories of all class situations] that it does not matter "... whether these two categories become effective in the competitive struggles of the consumers or of the producers..." [Weber, 1968 : 927] Some kind of relationship between the spheres of consumption and production is clearly indicated in Weber's assertion, but he does not claim that market position is reducible to status position, or that the reverse is the case. Status and class are interdependent but not identical. Similarly with the housing market, there is no reason to assume that status

26. Harvey argues that the class interest of the landlord is to obtain a minimum of a 15% return or to find a way to get out of the market. A 'rational' landlord strategy is to reduce maintenance, milk properties of value and actively dis-invest, using the money so extracted on the capital market. With the withdrawal of properties from the rental market scarcity is again produced and rents will again rise until they exceed the returns available on the capital market. [loc. cit., p.242]
attributes in this context exist in independence of the market, or that the market exists in independence of status. Housing classes, where they do exist, will have a common interest that is more than the sum of their market interests alone. To define housing classes purely in terms of their market interests ignores significant status distinctions as defined by the urban value system. In Sparkbrook, lodging-house proprietors, a distinguishable group in economic terms, were also defined in terms of their common status attribute - one of illegitimacy in the urban value system. Weber argued that the likelihood of classes forming, and the likelihood of common behavioural patterns developing, depended on the extent to which other interests, interests outside the common class interest, became more or less efficacious. To the extent that status attributes and access to desired housing consumption positions coincide with market disposal capacities, 'classes' can be expected to be readily identifiable. To the extent that the relative positions on these dimensions generate interests that are wholly, or partly contradictory, the housing 'classes' will be less readily identifiable. Cultural factors may be important. The relative salience of 'orthodox' class and status distinctions in any given society, the extent to which there is an urban consensus in housing values, the degree of separation between the consumer and producer realms, all will have a bearing on the degree to which groups will emerge with common interests. The particular cultural setting, the absence or presence of particular housing sub-markets with particular types of housing situation, will have a direct bearing on the relative salience of market or consumption factors in the formation of groups in the urban setting, and will directly colour the "meaning" residents attach to their own housing situations and to those of others. Where market factors are salient, the potential for the formation of housing classes in the Weberian sense of class will be created, where market factors are less important, less cohesive groups, or 'classes' in consumption may develop, and conflict may be absent. Rex and Moore did argue that
Sparkbrook was likely to be 'typical' of British provincial cities, but at the same time they argued that conflicts between housing classes would be more or less manifest in other settings. They did not argue that the housing class model was culturally specific, nor did they argue that the explanatory potential of the model was confined to the field of race relations. Rex argued that 'considerable variations' would follow in the patterns of housing class activity according to "... differences in the economic, political and cultural situation in different industrial countries..." [Rex, 1968 : 216]. But common to all 'urban situations', Rex argues, is that housing is a scarce resource and groups will be differentially placed in their access to this scarce resource.

In the next chapter the relevance of the theoretical issues raised concerning housing, especially those of the housing class model, will be considered in the case of New Zealand, a society in which a 'property-owning democracy' stands alongside the 'welfare state' as one of the twin foundations of the social order.
CHAPTER THREE

NEW ZEALAND: THE 'PROPERTY-OWNING DEMOCRACY'.
INTRODUCTION
In 'Race, Community and Conflict', Rex and Moore argue that in the cities of all industrial societies with a capitalist mode of production, there will be a competition over housing because housing is a scarce resource, and because the means through which housing and housing finance are allocated will exclude some but not other groups.

Rex and Moore further suggest that differences in the social and political organisation of the host society will have a bearing on the types of housing available, the way in which the different urban housing situations are ranked, and the way in which the mechanisms used to secure access to housing are structured. Whether groups that emerge from the competition over housing can be expected to generate 'essentially similar reactions' in the Weberian sense, will depend on the relative salience of those other sources of common interest which give 'meaning' to the lives of urban residents. The degree to which the spheres of home and work are seen to be separate, the extent to which the opportunity structures governing personal advancement and access to a 'housing career' are seen to be open or closed, together with the pervasiveness of the dominant social and political ideologies legitimising and encouraging homeownership; all will influence the extent to which identifiable groups with common interests are likely to arise from the housing market.

NEW ZEALAND: THE EGALITARIAN SOCIETY:
One of the more general statements that could be made about the stratification system in New Zealand is that the majority appear to believe in the existence of equality of opportunity! 1

---

1. Vellekoop (1969) and Collette (1973) describe New Zealand society in almost exclusively egalitarian terms though others, Easton (1976), for example, take a contrary view. The belief that all should be equally placed to compete for scarce rewards and resources is not the same thing as suggesting that there should be equal rewards regardless of educational achievements and occupational positions. Parkin (1971) discusses the sources of social stability in 'meritocratic' societies in some detail. The task of the dominant class is to make the rules governing the distribution of rewards seem legitimate in the eyes of all. The greater the extent to which those who stand to gain least from such rules accept the rules as being legitimate, the more stable the political order is likely to be. (see Parkin, 1971: pp. 48 - 49)
But to say that New Zealanders believe in equality of opportunity is not to deny that economic inequalities are present, nor is it to suggest that class divisions are insignificant in both political behaviour and personal relationships. It is true, nevertheless, that in New Zealand economic inequalities are less marked than in other developed countries. New Zealand is further characterised by a population which is small, urbanised, and with the exception of the Maori and Islander communities, relatively homogeneous. The rural population, though less than one-fifth of the total population, is important because New Zealand as a trading nation is heavily dependent on the export of agricultural products. Given the distinctive features of New Zealand’s social and political order it might be suggested that theories of political behaviour which have originated overseas are inappropriate for a New Zealand analysis. The evidence suggests otherwise. Milne argues strongly that New Zealand does closely approximate the Lipset liberal and capitalist model of the twentieth century referred to in the first chapter. Milne argues that New Zealand possesses to a 'high degree' the necessary 'conditions for democracy' stipulated by Lipset.

2. The relatively small income span, the lack of a hereditary aristocracy and the relatively 'open' opportunity structure are often mentioned. (see Collette, 1973, Vellekoop 1969). If New Zealand is ranked alongside other developed countries by equality of income distribution, New Zealand appears to be more equal than state socialist countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia. However, such a distribution ignores private wealth holdings. (see Davis, 1976). Furthermore, New Zealand is generally considered to be a developed society. Inkeles and Rossi (1956) compared occupational prestige data from a number of developed countries, including New Zealand, to test a theory suggesting that common functional imperatives led to similar patterns of social differentiation, regardless of cultural differences. With the exception of farmers, who enjoyed relatively higher prestige, the New Zealand pattern closely approximated the patterns of Britain, the USA, the USSR, Germany and Japan. (see Vellekoop, 1969 : 246)

3. Johnston notes that the proportion of New Zealanders living in cities and towns increased from 63 per cent in 1926, to 77 per cent in 1966. More recent figures suggest that the urban population (those living in towns of more than 1000 people) now exceeds 80 per cent of the total population (see Johnston, 1973 : 3; Facts About New Zealand, 1975 : 16)
"an open class system, economic wealth, an egalitarian value-system, a capitalist economy, literacy [and] high participation in voluntary associations..." [loc. cit., p.274] Similar arguments testifying to New Zealand's essentially egalitarian nature are presented by Vellekoop [1969], Mitchell [1969] and Jackson [1973]. Mitchell argues that "... harmony and integration are the most striking characteristics of the New Zealand social system. The welfare state, full employment, and the uniformity of the state education system have combined [in Mitchell's view] to remove, or partially neutralise, the problem of alienated, deprived or depressed groups and to create a broad uniformity..." [Mitchell, 1969: 179] Certainly extremes of economic inequality and deep social cleavages seem to be absent from New Zealand though the inequalities that do exist are perhaps, at least in part, concealed.5 Mitchell, for example, suggests that "... a distinctive working class culture has existed only in certain isolated groups such as the mining communities of the West Coast..." [loc. cit., p.192] But even if there are none, or few distinctive working class communities, and a belief in equal opportunity is central to the national self-image and character structure, this does not mean that there is a failure on the part of New Zealanders to identify themselves as belonging to social classes. Even if there

4. It was argued in Chapter One that whether people believe they have the opportunity to be socially mobile is perhaps more important than the actual opportunities to rise in the social structure, though clearly the two are linked. O'Malley and Collette's evidence suggests that New Zealanders do see the class structure as being relatively open. Their study was based on a random sample of 456 respondents, or 5 per cent of all households in four of Wellington's 26 statistical divisions.[see O'Malley and Collette, 1974: 17 - 18]

5. Poverty in New Zealand could be considered to mean exclusion from the expanded comforts, opportunities and self-respect accorded to the majority of the population. Housing as one of the central features of living standards would appear to play a large part in determining life chances and perhaps social standing in that the opportunities to purchase other things largely depend on the sums which have to be allocated to housing. Easton in a review of the limited empirical data available, concludes that the appropriate concept is one of 'relative poverty'. He uses an adjusted income index to reflect the relative costs of households in different circumstances to maintain the same standards of living. [see Easton, 1976: 128]
is not a strong class basis for two cultures, and there is no world of 'us and them',\(^6\) the available empirical evidence does suggest that most New Zealanders are able to differentiate themselves socially by their vote in a way in which is consistent with voting patterns of other democratic societies where class distinctions are much more obvious. Mitchell argues that New Zealanders do "... accept the traditional class labels of working or middle class, even if they are not used as naturally and as spontaneously as they are in Britain..." (loc. cit., p.211)\(^7\) One of the major themes in the Lipset model is that the two-party systems of liberal capitalist societies represent a democratic translation of the class struggle. Mitchell suggests, that in New Zealand class has an impact

---

6. Parkin, discussing Runciman's research, notes that even in Britain, many workers tended to see the discrepancies between themselves and others in other than class terms. They were instead likely to single out instances unrelated to class characteristics, such as 'people on night work' or 'people without children'. (Parkin, 1971: 61) Goldthorpe and Lockwood suggest that there are at least two broad ways in which individuals conceptualise class structure. These are the 'power' or 'conflict' models on the one hand and the 'prestige' or 'status' models on the other hand. It has been further suggested that the working class typically adopt the former models while the middle class adopt the latter. These models are perhaps too general, the authors further suggest that there might be three distinguishable 'working-class' models. The image traditional proletarian workers accept, may be a power model, 'deferential' traditional workers may perceive social inequality in terms of a status hierarchy, while the 'privatised' worker may have a social consciousness which more clearly approximates a 'pecuniary' model of society. (see Lockwood, 1966: 249FF)

7. To support his arguments Mitchell refers to the findings of two studies carried out in Christchurch and Wellington in 1957 and 1963. New Zealand respondents were only slightly less disposed towards placing themselves in one of the traditional class categories than were the respondents in similar British studies. Considerably more New Zealanders placed themselves in the 'middle class', and significantly, the reasons given for class placement accorded far more emphasis to income and occupation than to family background when compared with similar British studies. (see Mitchell, 1969 : 212 ; Vallekoop, 1969 : 242FF)
on voting behaviour, \(^8\) that equals the impact it is believed to have in Britain, but because New Zealand has a dominant ideology in which the rights of all New Zealanders to become 'middle class' are accepted, class conflicts tend to be less overt. We have, it can be argued, a social system in which individual efforts are emphasised, a system Mitchell refers to as a 'do-it-yourself social ladder'. [loc. cit., p.214] In a society in which individual efforts are emphasised there will be those who succeed, or see themselves as having succeeded, and there will be those who would like to succeed, but who feel for one reason or another that they have been unable to. Accordingly, Mitchell suggests that in New Zealand, there are essentially two broad class groupings that are more or less distinguishable in terms of the degree to which they are integrated into the success-oriented ethos of the community. The middle class in these terms, is that group characterised by a tendency to think in terms of 'individual effort and opportunity' and to see themselves as 'established', and as having become so through their own efforts. The working class on the other hand, 'looks up to the middle class way of life', but is less well 'integrated' into the middle class ethos, and this Mitchell suggests can be attributed to the financial and educational disadvantages of this group. Mitchell argues that education is important because it opens avenues to occupational mobility and hence to the realisation of cultural success goals.

\(^8\) Mitchell argues that class voting in New Zealand seems to be almost as prevalent as it is in supposedly class-ridden Britain. However Mitchell is not particularly clear about how this 'class' effect manifests itself in voting behaviour. He suggests that 'self interest' is a dominant concern and the picture of the electorate becomes one in which 'two massive armies' face each other across party lines in 'mutual comprehension'. Rather than a Lipset 'democratic class war', Mitchell suggests that in the New Zealand context we have a party competitive process which is a closer to 'co-existence' than to an institutionalised class struggle. There is no indication of whether the different 'class' images identified by Lockwood are applicable in New Zealand. If 'self interest' is important and working class consciousness is muted perhaps a pecuniary model has some applicability in the New Zealand context but if this is the case one could reasonably expect the electorate to be more instrumental in voting choice than New Zealand political scientists suggest it is. [see Mitchell, 1969 : p.215]
Consequently education and occupation are seen to be the two main indices of the degree to which people are well, or less well integrated into middle class society. In political terms, the expected pattern is one in which the National Party will tend to champion the cause of those who are well integrated, and who have a vested interest in the retention of a status quo which perpetuates their relative advantages, while the Labour Party will tend to champion the cause of those who are less well integrated into the middle class mainstream of social and economic life. The available empirical evidence does suggest that both education and occupation are closely related to party support but at the same time New Zealand political scientists have emphasised that both 'floating voters' and National voting manual workers are significant in the electorate. Milne estimates that about 15 to 20 per cent of New Zealand's manual workers vote for the National Party.  

9. In his 1963 Wellington study, Mitchell found odds of "... better than two to one that a voter with less than two years at secondary school would support Labour, while one with four years or more would support National..."  
(LOC. CIT., P.207) Similar close associations between occupation and voting behaviour have been found. [see Jackson, 1973; Milne, 1966; and Mitchell, 1969]  

10. If some manual workers vote for the National Party despite their assumed educational, as well as occupationally disadvantaged position, some explanation must be sought and once again it is necessary to consider the relevance of Lockwood's images of class and the findings of Nordlinger (1967) and McKenzie and Silver (1968), in their search for explanations of the substantial British working class vote for the Conservative Party. Nordlinger found that a middle class identification strongly predisposed workers to vote Conservative and middle class identifications were related to a measure of 'economic satisfaction'. Labour supporters tended to have high economic expectations which remained unfulfilled, while Conservative voters were more content with their economic well being. [Nordlinger, 1967: 52] McKenzie and Silver found that homeowners and those who saved were more likely to vote Conservative, but this was only true among those with incomes below the working class average. As in the case of Nordlinger's research the simplistic 'prosperity voter' thesis (when workers' incomes rise they will vote Conservative) was not supported, in fact the Labour supporters tended to have higher incomes than the Conservative voting workers. [see McKenzie and Silver, 1968 : 95]
who the National-voting manual workers are, or about which groups are most likely to switch between parties from one election to the next. Jackson estimates that the 'changers' are perhaps 10 per cent of the electorate, but a former Labour Prime Minister, Sir Arnold Nordmeyer, suggests the 'changer' group may be as large as 40 per cent. As Jackson acknowledges, perhaps the "... characteristics of the changers are as imprecise as their numbers..." (Jackson, 1973 : 217) 11. Whether cross Pressures are important or not is unclear. Occupation and education appear to be more important than family of origin in determining class identifications, but even when all these are controlled, there are inconsistencies in the expected patterns of political behaviour. There is every reason to believe that there are additional sources of integration into the dominant middle class culture. It is conceivable that homeownership and status consumption have a significant impact on both socio-political attitudes and behaviour in New Zealand, if only because homeownership is linked to economic satisfactions, saving patterns and middle class

11. The 'changers' [those who have voted both for the National and Labour Parties in the past] do not seem to be a distinguishable in terms of occupation, education, or sex. Younger people are slightly over-represented among the 'changers' but all age groups are present. Changers are more likely to see fewer differences between the two major parties than voters consistently supporting either party. Nordmeyer, interviewed in 1975, felt that it has become more difficult to type-cast electors and this he attributed to the growth of the middle class. He suggested that now, "... with a growing and influential middle class that middle class vote really determines who is to win the election. I'd put as high as 40 per cent the people who will be inclined to move from one party to the other between elections..." (Nordmeyer, interviewed in the NZ Listener, November 8th 1975). The Goldthorpe and Lockwood et. al., Luton findings, could conceivably have some relevance to an explanation of the 'changer' voting category in New Zealand. If 'changers' are more likely to see fewer differences between National and Labour than committed, partisan voters, it may be that a significant proportion of the New Zealand electorate adopts an instrumental approach to voting. In Goldthorpe and Lockwood's Luton sample, expressions of support for Labour were marked by a sceptical, lukewarm and above all, conditional quality, the basic condition for continued support being Labour's superior capacity to serve the economic interests of the respondent and his family. [see Goldthorpe and Lockwood et. al., 1969 : 18ff]
identification; all of which Nordlinger, and McKenzie and Silver, suggest are linked with Conservative voting.¹²
The difficulty of course, is in making the assumption that British findings are applicable within New Zealand. But even aside from the Rex and Moore thesis, in which people in particular housing situations are believed, under certain conditions, to be significantly influenced by their housing market interests, there are additional lines of potential explanation that would link homeownership with a conservative political stance. 'Stake' theory, for instance, may have some applicability. We can agree with Kemeny, that homeownership "... involves traits which give it a close affinity to a constellation of conservative beliefs, such as thrift, self-help, independence, and the private ownership of property..." [Kemeny, 1977: 48]. It should further be noted that this theme is not a new one and goes back to the arguments raised by Engels in 'The Housing Question'. Box argues that 'stake' means "... more than material well-being that may be risked (it also means) a measure of prestigious ratings, of recognition and acceptance that might be lost if one behaves in an irrational or illegal manner..." [Box, 1969: 309]
'State' is something in the way of feeling 'integrated' into the mainstream of society and it involves not only 'styles of life' but also "... aspects of property, power, prestige and acceptance..." [loc. cit., p.315] In political terms, it could be argued that those that either have, or feel they have a substantial stake, both psychological and material, in the established order will be more likely to support parties

¹² See Nordlinger (1967) and McKenzie and Silver (1968). Murie reviewing British empirical evidence, refers to the distinctions that can be made between a 'renting culture' to which long term financial planning of the type required in house purchase is 'alien', and which includes those who have attitudes to money, debt and housing that are quite different from the attitudes of homeowners. He notes that the attitudes of council house purchasers conformed more to a "... picture of home-centredness with an emphasis on economic rewards and on owner-occupation as representative of economic aspirations..." in the British survey evidence. [see Murie, 1975 : 135] Abrams also notes that working class house buyers have significantly higher satisfaction scores and a stronger sense of economic well-being than council tenants. [Abrams, 1975: 417]
of the 'right' - conservative political parties. In the New Zealand setting, Mitchell chooses to emphasise the integrative function of education rather than attributing any great significance to homeownership. He does nevertheless suggest that those who have had some success in the competition to realise the goals of cultural success will be less likely to identify their interests with the Labour Party. That homeownership is one of the cultural goals upon which New Zealanders place great emphasis is well documented. (see Housing Report, 1971 : 22) Mitchell develops his argument along the lines previously raised by Abrams (1960) and Butler and Rose (1960), all of whom have been strongly criticised for adopting an embourgeoisement thesis for which there is limited empirical support, at least in the form in which they presented it. Mitchell suggests that the

13. Marshall takes up this argument and suggests that it may well be that the link between property and the vote and the gradual extension of the franchise through widening circles of property owners, is not merely the result of economic power but is part of a 'deeper social fact' to make everyone 'part proprietors' of a civilization. The significance of property in determining social attitudes becomes enormous, "... because it is a guarantee of the right to enjoy the blessings of a civilization, it means we shall not be cast out into the social wilderness, it shows that we are solid and to be trusted to fulfil our obligations..." [Marshall, 1964 : 229]

14. Goldthorpe and Lockwood et.al., take Abrams, Butler and Rose to task for a failure to give any adequate theoretical account of what Goldthorpe et.al., refer to as the economic normative and relational aspects of the 'embourgeoisement problem'. The three stage process Goldthorpe et.al. hypothesise is mentioned in my first chapter, but it needs to be noted here that the substance of the criticisms relate not only to the inadequate theoretical framework used but also to the interpretations placed on the ownership of consumer durables among which housing is included. Goldthorpe et.al., point out that the ownership of consumer durables may increase substantially without any necessary changes to aspirations becoming, 'middle class', in any meaningful sense of the term. However, while it could be suggested that a house becomes, a 'house is a house, is a house', in the same way that a 'washing machine is a washing machine', [Lockwood, 1960 : 253], the fact remains that in their Luton investigation Goldthorpe et.al., found that there definitely was "... some relationship between particularly high earnings and house-ownership, on the one hand, and the likelihood of not voting Labour on the other..." [Goldthorpe, et.al., 1969 : 45]. Interestingly their findings contradict the low income homeownership voting association found by McKanzie and Silver.
New Zealand Labour Party may be in grave danger of losing electoral support because on the limited data available from the 1957 and 1963 studies mentioned previously it seems that while fewer and fewer voters see themselves as working class they continue to identify the Labour Party with the interests of that class. [see Mitchell, 1969 : 214]. According to Mitchell, Labour is in trouble because their traditional base "... among the unionised manual workers is being steadily eroded..." [loc. cit., p.214] Those who have supported Labour in the past are coming to be outnumbered by "... an expanding section which has been traditionally suspicious of unionism, inclined to regard Labour as a low status party and [is] more conditioned to 'respectable' patterns of life and homeownership..." [loc.cit. op.cit.] The theme of working class conservatism linked to changing consumption needs and life styles has already been referred to in some detail previously. In New Zealand, Bedggood has referred to this same phenomenon, though from a neo-Marxist, not an embourgeoisement viewpoint. According to Bedggood, in a liberal capitalist society such as New Zealand, the maintenance of political order would not be possible without the widespread acceptance of political authority and traditional values among persons of low social status. He suggests that either "... low status conservatives are constrained by the dominant ideology... or that such a state of affairs represents a genuine acceptance of the dominant culture..." [Bedggood, 1975 : 308] One of the central elements in New Zealand's dominant social and political ideology is the 'property-owning democracy' promoted by the National Party. Kemeny has suggested that this ideology, and the ideology of homeownership specifically, is one of the most powerful ideologies in

15. Milne pursues the same argument. He suggests that "... for a party whose voters are probably less likely to rate themselves as working-class than as middle-class, it is ominous that so many of them have an image of the party as 'for the working class'..." [Milne, 1966 : 286]

16. This argument is pursued in considerable detail at a later point in this chapter.
Australian social and political life (see Kemeny, 1977: 47) In New Zealand, where the great majority place an extremely high premium on the home-owning ideal, it can be suggested that the political impact is no less marked. Indeed, Donnison, has argued that it is "... no longer possible to understand what is happening in urban, industrial, bureaucratic societies without careful study of these new forms of property or rights..." (Donnison, quoted in Sandercock, 1975: 146) There is no reason to expect that the significance of new property rights is any less significant in New Zealand. Rather, it can be suggested that the strength of the aspiration to suburban owner-occupancy may be stronger than in many other developed countries. According to Bedggood, in New Zealand, the 'work ethic' of capitalism has been replaced by "... the consumer ethic of post-capitalism... the assumption is that dissatisfying work is more than compensated for by the pleasures of family-life, recreation and status consumption [in which] suburban homeownership is a folk fetish, a valued means of achieving the goals of property, freedom and privacy..." (Bedggood, 1976: 11) The belief in a 'property-owning democracy' has had, and continues to have a central role in a society in which people strive to see themselves favourably and in which it has been argued by Jackson, that the ownership of land and a house, is a step into middle class respectability. According to Professor Jackson, the individual property ownership stands alongside the welfare state as one of the central themes around which the social and political organisation of New Zealand society has crystallised.

17. In the 1971 Royal Commission Report into housing in New Zealand, it was noted that in at least one-quarter of all the submissions to the Commission, there was "... criticism of general over-emphasis in New Zealand of the blandishments of homeownership..." (Housing Report, 1971: 12) New Zealand and Australia have one of the highest rates of owner-occupancy in the world. More than two-thirds of all dwellings are owner-occupied, and in New Zealand approximately one-third of the average household's expenditure is housing expenditure. (loc.cit., p.22; Kemeny, 1977: 47) Though the proportion of homeowners who own homes without mortgages has dropped quite markedly since 1960, there are still more than a third of all owner-occupiers in this category. (see Report to the Planning Advisory Group on Social Statistics, Social Development Council, August 1974, p.146ff)
The social order is integrated because there is both an apparently strong concern for the well-being of the community represented through the welfare state, and because there is an equally marked concern with the ownership of 'individual property'. (Jackson, 1973: 13)

It is this concern with individual property which fueled many of the great political battles of the nineteenth century, became one of the prized rewards for war service, and which now stands as the "... essential element in the middle-class type dignity that characterises New Zealanders..." (loc. cit., p.13)

To the extent that those in the less privileged sectors of society aspire to owner-occupancy, and to the extent that mobility into owner-occupancy is related to a desire to be identified with the middle-class status quo, it is likely that owner-occupancy helps to stabilise the social order. In the Rex and Moore housing class thesis housing was said to be important because it led to the formation of class-like groups based on housing market and related interests. Giddens argued that 'distributive groupings', the most important of which centre on access to housing mortgages and neighbourhood differences, had a place in class structuration. There is some empirical

18. Runciman, for example, suggests that the lower middle class on low incomes are most anxious to assert their status by their means of residence. (Runciman, 1972: 136) Dean claimed that for many American families on modest incomes, home ownership represented a step into 'middle-class respectability' and he goes out to argue from his data "... that more home owners than renters designated themselves as middle-class regardless of actual socio-economic class..." (Dean, 1951: 60) However one is tempted to treat Dean's findings with caution because he used an 'interviewer assessed' measure of socio-economic class. Foote quotes a study that clearly links both satisfaction with a desire for home ownership in the first place, to class position measured by income. Upper income groups were almost twice as likely to aspire to home ownership as were welfare recipients and one is tempted to suggest that home ownership selects out only the more stable and perhaps aspiring groups on modest incomes in the first place. (see Foote, 1960: 125)
evidence to suggest that housing is important within New Zealand's class structure, though perhaps only in some specific housing sub-markets, rather than throughout the entire urban housing market. In the 1967 Porirua survey carried out by the Victoria University of Sociology and Social Work, housing was identified as one key variable in terms of which respondents distinguished different classes. Almost a quarter of the three hundred and nine respondents in the survey indicated that housing was important in their class imagery. Furthermore, housing differences were evidently more important in the class images held than were either occupation and income taken together. It may be inappropriate to generalise these findings since Porirua has an income, occupation and housing profile that appears to differ from the typical New Zealand urban setting in several important respects. In Porirua, state houses are greatly over-represented. When state rental units and those state houses purchased by former tenants are considered together, they constitute approximately half of the total Porirua housing stock compared with the more typical twelve per cent average in New Zealand's total housing stock. Perhaps in those locations such as Porirua, in which the spread of income and occupation is less marked, housing becomes more important as a visible index of class or status differences.

19. A further 27 per cent indicated that racial characteristics were important. (see J.H. Robb and M. Carr, The City of Porirua, Victoria University of Wellington, 1969 : 257 ff) It is perhaps worth noting from the 'housing class' viewpoint, that a Porirua State Tenants' Union was formed in 1976 to champion tenants interests in negotiations with the Housing Corporation.

20. In Stacey's study of Banbury, a British working-class community, she found that the residents of streets, neighbourhoods, or residential areas, tended to acquire the status of the majority of the houses in it. Three working class status groups were evident; the 'respectable', the 'ordinary', and the 'rough' [those who were the opposite of cleanliness of house, children and steadiness of job]. [see Stacey, 1960 : 100] Keller describes a similar phenomenon. She argues that people classify themselves on the basis of traits, activities and values salient to their particular environment and suggests that the closer one is to the group, and the more confined the setting, the finer the status distinctions made. [Keller, 1966 : 115]
There is some evidence to suggest that in newer sub-divisions, conflicts developed between tenured groups because of the Housing Corporation policy of introducing a 'social balance' by earmarking up to half the sections in a new sub-division for state housing. Chapple mentions that in both Te Atatu North and Birkdale, Auckland, private owners formed action committees to call for social and environmental impact reports before the Housing Corporation was permitted to proceed with the construction of state houses. Private homeowners were angered because the Housing Corporation offered minimum standards far in excess of those offered by the average private developer. [Chapple, 1975: 11]

According to Melling, each new state house included a carport, concrete paths and new fencing, and as he suggests, it is not too difficult to imagine how the heavily mortgaged homeowner felt as he 'struggled with his weekend concrete mixer' and muttered about the 'bludgers' down the road who had 'everything handed to them on a platter'. [Melling, 1975: 8] Private homeowners who felt that they had worked hard and saved, that they had earned the right to own property, were angered by the influx of better designed, better finished and better constructed state houses, which they feared would greatly lower the value of their own inferior, spec-built houses. According to Melling, there is one well known case of a Wellington private developer who sold some sections to the Housing Corporation because he was having liquidity problems. The story of the sales was circulated and the developer was unable to sell the 'executive homes' he had already built for any more than 80 per cent of their original prices. [loc. cit., op. cit.]

Public, or state housing is only one of at least four distinct housing types in the New Zealand urban housing market. Johnston recognises government-financed homes, privately-financed homes and private rental accommodation as three further types that can be distinguished in terms of both the means of access to housing and the income characteristics of occupants. Government-financed homes cater largely for those on modest to middle income groups,
privately-financed homes cater for the well paid professional, business and higher-income administrative workers, while public housing caters largely for those on lower-incomes. The intrusion of the state into the home finance field prevents the direct translation of labour market advantages into the housing market. Privately-financed housing is not exclusively occupied by high-income groups, and government-financed homes are not exclusively occupied by middle-income groups. Studies of state house suburbs have suggested that the commonly held assumption that they are occupied by only those on low incomes and with low-status occupations needs to be qualified. The private rental market is perhaps the most heterogeneous group. Private tenants will include those on lower incomes who are unable to purchase houses, who are ineligible for, or who do not wish to apply for state houses, along with a diverse group of transients requiring short-term accommodation.

Rex and Moore suggested that housing classes, when they did arise, would differ in important ways from orthodox classes formed in the labour market because labour market position would not be the sole determinant, or even the most important determinant of access to either public

21. In two thesis investigations of state housing suburbs the apparent affluence of tenants was a matter for some comment. Hunt [1970] was 'surprised' by the degree of affluence in his Palmerston North sample. He notes that "... the proportion of households owning such items as domestic appliances and television sets was generally above the Palmerston North average..." [Hunt, 1970 : 54] This, it could be argued, reflected hire-purchase commitments rather than affluence, but Jackson compared samples from both owner-occupier and state house sub-divisions and found that both the occupation and income profiles of household heads were surprisingly similar. [Jackson, [1965] quoted in Hunt, 1970 : 54]

22. Students, single person households, higher-income groups requiring temporary rental accommodation between the sale and purchase of houses and various minority groups will all be represented in the private rental market.
housing or to owner-occupancy. In New Zealand, the state has historically played a major role in housing provision, and it has been noted that the provision of housing finance is a state function that is as important, or more important than the provision of subsidised rental housing. Many who would have been unable to enter owner-occupancy within the private market which emphasises ability to pay, have become owner-occupiers because the state has tended to allocate housing finance by reference to various need criteria in addition to the usual consideration of repayment ability and credit worthiness. Those in higher incomes are in one sense disadvantaged in that, with a few exceptions, they are unable to compete for subsidised state housing loans on favourable repayment terms. One of the common criticisms of state lending policies has been directed to their failure to reward 'thrift' and 'effort' and their tendency to 'distort' the housing market through an alleged over-emphasis on the needs of low-income groups. In the Birmingham housing market, Rex and Moore described the significance of state intervention as one in which emphasis was confined largely to the provision of subsidised rental housing. In Britain, local authorities do have a role in the provision of home finance, but Rex and Moore did not discuss the implications this has for their model, in which they see the provision of public housing through the welfare state and the access to owner-occupancy through the private market as being essentially separate.

23. The Government first entered the low-cost housing field in 1894 when the Government Advances to Settlers Office was established. The State Advances Corporation [now the Housing Corporation] grew to become the biggest home lending institution in New Zealand. Government lending has been directed largely to the building of new houses. In 1962, for instance, government capital assistance financed 72 per cent of all new houses for which permits were issued, this fell to 45 per cent in 1970 and rose again to 55 per cent by 1975. More than half of all house mortgages come from non-institutional sources and a better indication of the extent of state housing assistance in the home finance market can be gained by expressing state lending as a proportion of the entire urban mortgage market. The Housing Corporations share of the market fell from 20.8 per cent in 1963 to 15.7 per cent by 1975. [see Housing Report, 1971 : 152; Thorns D. 1976 : 16; Reserve Bank Bulletin, April 1977]
In New Zealand, to a much greater degree, the thrust of state intervention has effectively extended the welfare state philosophy to incorporate both state-sponsored home ownership, and subsidised rental housing within the realm of state responsibilities.

According to Rex and Moore, the ranking of housing situations in the urban value system and the likelihood of housing classes forming, would depend on the types of housing available and the degree to which the means of housing allocation were seen to discriminate against some but not other groups. In Britain, where local authority housing constitutes about one-third of the total housing stock, this form of public housing seems to have a legitimate place and is recognised as being a more desirable housing situation than a private tenancy. [see Abrams, 1975; Murie, 1975] In Britain, the private landlord perhaps has a less legitimate place in the urban value system than he does in New Zealand, and it is possibly true that on the whole, the private tenants for whom he caters, have a higher rank in the urban value system than do state tenants. Before the growth of the concentrated state housing suburbs in Otara and Porirua and the imposition of the income bar in the 1950’s, it seems that state housing had a

24. In Britain, Rex and Moore (1967) argued that the private landlord, particularly the boarding house proprietor, who they claimed was forced to take on boarders to keep up heavy mortgage repayments, was beyond the limits of legitimacy as defined by the private enterprise and property-owning capitalist system. In New Zealand, a Workers’ Dwelling Act was passed in 1906 to provide low-cost rental housing. One of the arguments in favour of the scheme, was that "... fair wages, reflecting fair rates of production, were unable to meet the prices of consumer goods because a large part of the wages were draining into a hole created by non-producing private landlords..." [Chapple, 1975 : 11] More recently, following the expiry of the rent-control legislation of the Depression years, the image of landlords seems to have improved. In 1973, in accordance with election promises, the Third Labour Government established Rent Appeal Boards but there are no controls of the seemingly stringent character of those that are currently in force in Britain and by and large the Tenants’ Protection Society, now the Tenants’ Union, has been in a position to claim that most Rent Appeal Board decisions favour landlords rather than tenants.
much more favoured position in the urban value system. [see Chapple, 1975] Post-war affluence and the growth of the 'property-owning democracy' effectively led to a re-definition of state housing as the down-valued alternative to second-mortgage home buying. [see Myers, 1976] The application of the income bar further destroyed the image of state housing which came to be defined as the preserve of a low-income caste who were in state houses because they could not afford their own homes. Successive National Governments in the 1950's and 1960's promoted homeownership and reduced the proportion of state houses in the housing stock, and now state houses and local authority rental units constitute less than twelve per cent of all dwellings. State tenants have reacted to their low-status in a number of different ways. The high mobility in state housing estates seems to suggest that many state tenants accept the values of the urban value system and do aspire to homeownership in much the same way as do other groups in the community. Both Jackson and Hunt noted this in their own studies of state housing sub-divisions. Almost half of Hunt's Palmerston North sample intended to move out of their state houses within a five year period. The most common single reason underlying the intention to move was the desire to move into owner-occupancy. [Hunt, 1970 : 40] In the more established state housing estates a different pattern seems to have emerged. Many tenants have purchased the homes they formerly rented on extremely favourable terms. 26 In the period between 1950 and 1974 more than one-third of all the

25. The low-status of state tenants in the urban value system is well documented. [see Chapple, 1975; Thorns, 1975; Myers, 1976]

26. Of the approximately 80,000 state houses built, 26,000 have been sold and the mortgages offered were in many cases up to 95 per cent of the valuation at 3 per cent interest for up to 40 years. Deposit requirements until recently were extremely favourable, in some cases deposits of only $500 were sufficient to secure purchase. [see Niven, 1975 : 12]
state houses that had been built were sold to tenants and
the great majority of these were in established areas.
[see Niven, 1975 : 12] With the return of a Labour
Government in 1973 the sale of state houses was virtually
stopped, and sales were only permitted to continue in the
newer, more concentrated state housing estates in which
it was considered desirable to develop a balanced community
of both owner-occupied and rental housing. Whether sales
in the established areas prior to 1974 were predominantly
to those state tenants on more favourable incomes [as Murie
suggests happened in the local authority house sales policy
in Britain] is a question that needs to be considered in
some detail.

According to Murie, the evidence does not support the view
that the sale of council houses has extended owner-occupation
principally to groups who could not gain access through the
private market. Purchaser households were generally much
better off than both other council tenants, and they were
better off than many other local authority mortgagors.
Rather than extending a "... choice to a deprived group,
council house sales may be seen as adding to the privilege
of a highly selected group..." [Murie, 1975 : 127] There
is some evidence from Niven's survey of state house sales
in Wellington which suggests that the New Zealand pattern
may be similar. The average income of purchasing household
heads was equal to the average male wage at the time of the
survey, and more than half of the purchasers were skilled
or semi-skilled rather than unskilled workers. Niven gives
no indication of how the purchaser households differed from
those that remained in a rental situation, but she does
mention that slightly more than half of all applications
to purchase were turned down in the year prior to the survey.
In Britain, Murie reviewed empirical studies of council
house sales and suggested that the income advantages of
the purchasing group were reinforced by the tendency of
owner-occupiers to engage in personal relationships with
other owner-occupiers rather than with tenants. [loc.cit., p.122]27

27. This observation may have a connection with Stacey's
Banbury findings where there were separate 'respectable'
and 'rough' status groups in the working class community.
[see also Ineichen, 1972]
Whether the movement of state tenants into owner-occupancy is best interpreted as an emulation of middle-class styles of life and attitudes, or as merely an expedient adaptation to new opportunities which arise is a significant consideration. In Britain the Conservative Party argued that the possession of property [including homes] reshaped the individual and fostered psychological attributes that were conducive to the stability of society. (loc. cit. p.142) The pattern in New Zealand has all the appearances of being remarkably similar. In New Zealand, as in Britain, the political and social philosophies of the two parties, one on the 'left' and McKenzie and Silver used three measures of 'embourgeoisement' [use of saving devices, homeownership, and the presence of at least one person in non-manual employment in households headed by manual workers] and found that homeownership had by far the strongest association with voting. Owners were twice as likely to vote Conservative. (see McKenzie and Silver, 1968 : 95) Social mobility histories and trade union affiliations, unexpectedly enough, were not significantly related to voting choice. The explanation they raise suggests that the Lockwood 'deferent' and 'pecuniary' class models may be applicable. Working class Conservatives frequently described the parties in terms of their policies. A belief that the Conservatives were intrinsically better qualified, in personal terms, to lead the nation was linked to the belief that the material interests of ordinary people were best entrusted to those 'most qualified' to manage the economy. (loc. cit., p.248) Whether homeownership is incidental to conservatism, or whether the 'stake' theory has some applicability is a question that remains to be answered. If a person's housing situation is important as Rex and Moore, Giddens, and in the New Zealand setting, Bedggood and Melling appear to suggest, a further line of explanation becomes possible. If homeownership is part of a felt integration into the middle-class mainstream of the liberal-capitalist status quo and, in this regard it is worth noting Runciman's claim that a middle-class self-rating "... can be plausibly interpreted as an indication of some minimal sense of not belonging with the main body of 'ordinary' manual workers and their families..." (Runciman, 1964 : 146), then we can tentatively suggest that a house is more than a 'house, is a house, is a house'.
and one on the 'right' have shaped the historical development of the 'property-owning democracy'. Since World War Two suburban owner-occupancy has been extended to increasingly larger proportions of those from New Zealand's less privileged groups.

Political Ideology in New Zealand: Labour, National and the 'Property-Owning Democracy'.

Central to the Rex and Moore housing class thesis was the suggestion that the struggles of the urban housing market could only be understood when placed within a historical context. In the Birmingham case Rex and Moore argued that urban residents tended to see the struggle between capitalism and socialism as a 'housing struggle'. Owner-occupiers and those who had some hope of becoming owner-occupiers, were expected to be favourably inclined towards the Conservative Party, the champion of the 'property-owning democracy', while those occupying, or wishing to occupy public rental housing were expected to be favourably disposed to the 'socialist' programme of the Labour Party. Given that not all owner-occupiers are in the higher occupational and income groups (since access to owner-occupancy is not a direct application of labour market advantages) Rex and Moore are clearly not suggesting that owner-occupiers recognise a common interest with the Conservative Party purely because of their occupational positions. 28

Rex and Moore noted, with surprise, the number of Conservative Party members with 'working-class Birmingham accents', who expressed their contempt for the 'idlers'.

---

28. The existence of a statistical association between homeownership and Conservative voting was referred to in some detail in the first chapter. [see McKenzie and Silver, 1968; Goldthorpe and Lockwood, et. al., 1968, 1969; Fletcher, 1976]. In an analysis of data from a sample of 2,110 voters, Rallings found that 73.8 per cent of Conservative voters were owner-occupiers, while only 13.3 per cent were council tenants. While 75 per cent of owner-occupiers as a whole supported the Conservatives, 52 per cent of the council tenants supported Labour. [see Rallings, 1975: 23]
whom they saw as being cushioned and protected by the welfare state. These people "... were passionately concerned with respectability and with the defence of their area and their property..." (Rex and Moore, 1967 : 199) Superficially at least, the political and historical context in which the 'property-owning democracy' emerged in New Zealand, closely resembles the Birmingham pattern. Criticism of the apparent ease with which immigrant families were able to secure both state housing finance and state rental units received considerable media attention as the 1975 general election was drawing near and a beleaguered Labour Government grappled with housing problems exacerbated by one of the largest rates of immigration since the 1950's. Many indigenous New Zealanders evidently felt resentful, and the resentment was not confined to immigrants, since solo parents receiving welfare benefits were also believed to be receiving privileged access to state housing.

Rex and Moore argued that the urban housing struggle was seen to be one between capitalism and socialism, but in New Zealand an examination of the current housing programmes of the two main political parties would reveal little differences, and certainly not the extreme differences between parties of the 'right' and 'left' implied in the Birmingham case. However, viewed from a historical context, there is a clear split between the parties in their housing and social programmes. The Labour Party of the 1970's is not committed to a radical transformation of society, or even to a programme of nationalisation of industry as

29. Above all the Conservatives, "... felt that too little was being done about immigration and blamed the Labour Party [which] was seen as 'soft on immigration'... it was believed that a Labour Government would flood the country with thousands more immigrants..." (Rex and Moore, 1967 : 199). Birmingham seems to have provided a remarkable parallel with New Zealand in 1975, one of the strongest sources of resentment in Birmingham lay in what the Conservatives saw as the immigrants' misuse of housing and their ability to draw benefits. [loc. cit., op. cit.]
promoted by the Labour Party in Britain, though National Party politicians and perhaps many of the public at large would like others to believe that it is so committed. According to Shorter, the 'system' of which Labour disapproves "... is not... capitalism per se, but a free enterprise system perverted by economic and political opportunism..." [Shorter, 1974 : 159] In the modern Labour Party's housing programme, a concern with property ownership takes its place alongside a concern with the provision of state rental accommodation. Shorter quotes the late Norman Kirk, Labour Prime Minister from 1972-74, as claiming that the "...ownership of property helps to make the family independent... the ownership of the home is a simple, direct, and valuable way of extending the ownership of property... [loc. cit., p.149]

The Labour Party has perhaps become a modestly welfare-oriented liberal party, with "... largely socialist ethics and a non-socialist programme..." [loc. cit., p.160]

Whatever the Labour Party has become in the 1970's, is perhaps less important than the way the Labour Party has been perceived in the past, when the political attitudes of many of those who are now eligible to vote were in the process of forming. The urban social systems and New Zealand and the political pattern that helped to shape their development have a history just as the Birmingham growth process described by Rex and Moore has a history. The National Party in New Zealand has been described as a liberal-capitalist party, and it has been suggested that the National Party is identified with the affluent years of the 1950's and the 1960's, while the Labour Party is identified more closely with the growth of the welfare state and the philosophy of security through welfare provision that developed under the successive Labour Governments in the 1935-49 period. 30

30. This argument was put forward by Templeton and Eunson in 1969. They claimed that the National Party had successfully projected itself as the party of freedom, of private enterprise, of homeownership and against controls. Templeton and Eunson believed that the National Party "... had come to be identified loosely in the public mind as the party of the affluent years; while Labour loosely again, [had come to be identified as] the party of austerity..." [Templeton and Eunson, 1969 : 25]

The claims may have been valid at the time but it seems likely that events since 1969 have weakened these images somewhat. Whether this is, or is not the case, will make an interesting study in 1978.
In New Zealand then the welfare state had been championed by the Labour Party since the Great Depression. The 'property-owning democracy' was the National Party's answer to 'cradle to grave' socialism. The debate over the respective merits of the two competing political systems came to the fore in the 1949 election campaign. In 1949 the Labour Government was committed to continuing a subsidised state rental housing programme while the challenging National Party campaigned on the merits of extending property-ownership to all New Zealanders. Chifly argues that by 1949, the real political issue had become a "... straight-out fight between the two great forces, socialism and capitalism..." [Chifly, quoted in Sandercock, 1975: 107] In Britain, Australia and New Zealand, he argues, "... after years of scarcity and rationing, people wanted to be able to have the choice of satisfying different economic and social needs..." (loc. cit., op. cit) One of these 'needs', it seems, was the strong desire to vest individual security in the ownership of homes and plots of land. In Britain, 31 Australia and New Zealand, challenging right-wing parties campaigned on the promise to meet these needs and all won elections against incumbent Labour Governments. 32 In New Zealand, the victorious National Party, champion of a New Zealand version of the 'property-owning democracy', moved to boost homeownership and to limit access to state

31. Murie notes that in Britain the Conservative Party "... became increasingly influenced by the recreation of certain elements of economic liberalism...", and the 'property-owning democracy' slogan came to symbolize the Conservative Party's alternative to 'Labour's programme of public or social ownership'. [Murie, 1975:14]

32. In the election campaign, Mr. J. Sullivan, who was to become Minister of Labour in the new National Government, insisted that "... housing would be treated as a national emergency... all builders and those in related trades would be asked to work longer hours with overtime rates subsidised..." [see Hansard, 1952: 496, Vol. 297] According to Sullivan, no one would be able to say "... I cannot afford a home! They will say, I cannot afford not to own my home..." (loc. cit., p.496)
rental housing. A defeated Labour Party was forced to reconsider the merits of its programmes, and in 1951, after a snap election in which the National Government increased the number of seats it held, Labour dropped some of the socialist principles in the Party's constitution and moved to embrace a programme closer to the National Party's. Perhaps in 1949, the different programmes of National and Labour did represent fundamental differences in principle, but while the differences in programmes have become less evident, the political rhetoric has continued. The Hon. J. Marshall, National's Minister of Housing in the 1950's claimed in Parliament, that the "... approach to the housing question by the present Government differs from that of the opposition. The Government believes that it is better to help people to provide their own homes... [while the opposition] believe that the State should put its maximum effort into the building of state houses. That is the fundamental difference in principle between us... the Government believes that it is of greater value to the individual and to the community, for people to own their own homes, than it is for the State to build the same number of houses..." (Hansard, 1952: 486) At the time there was probably some truth in Marshall's claim. Under successive Labour Governments between 1935 and 1949 the state housing programme had accelerated, and on several

33. National attacked Labour for having 'subsidised state tenants' unnecessarily'. Rents that had been determined on the basis of the original cost of the house, were changed to place tenants on rentals which took into account 'market value'. A brief history of changes to the Tenancy Act can be found in the 1971 Royal Commission Report. (see, Housing Report, 1971: 11 - 12)

34. Sir Keith Holyoake, while Prime Minister of the National Government in 1969, attached an almost mystical quality to the private property institution. He claimed that private property "... is the greatest dynamic force there is. We believe in equality of opportunity - the opportunity for a man to make his way, to accept responsibility, to build. Part of this is ownership, for he must feel, that's my own empire, whether it's his crib, his house, his little farm, his corner shop or garage. This leads not only to the betterment of that man, but to the betterment of his neighbours, his community, his country..." (Holyoake, quoted in interview, The Case For a Property-Owning Democracy', N.Z. Listener, Vol. 62, Oct. 31, 1969).
occasions state house completions accounted for more than forty per cent of the annual additions to the housing stock. In the 1935-49 period state housing was an object of pride, the Labour Government proudly announcing that the new state houses would be of a design and standard to match the houses Ministers and their wives would have liked for themselves (Chapple, 1975: 10) Rental units were allocated according to merit or need in each case and there was no formal income bar. Tenants were able to retain occupancy for as long as they wished, and most of the rental units were built in relatively small and attractive estates in which people seemed to have been more than happy to live. With the re-imposition of the income-bar and the rising affluence of the post-war period, together with the growth of the bigger housing estates such as Otara and Porirua, the character of state housing began to change. In a society in which owner-occupancy had become the ideal, state housing fell into disrepute as the preserve of a low-income caste, increasingly characterised as ethnically and culturally out of step with the mainstream of middle class society. The creation of a low-income caste was accelerated by the emphasis successive National Governments in the post-war years placed on homeownership. National’s desire to create a 'property-owning democracy' has had a dramatic impact on the state rental market. In 1950 a new policy to encourage state tenants to buy their houses was adopted. The new Minister of Labour in the National Government, Mr. J. Sullivan, proudly proclaimed of the new policy that "... it would break the hearts of the socialists. We are going to sell those houses in order that there shall be more homeownership. The more individual titles there are, the further we will get away from socialism and communism..." (Hansard, 1950: 861) More than one-third of all the state houses built had passed to the private sector by 1974, most of them in the smaller estates in more desirable locations. In Karori, Wellington, for example, more than two-thirds of all the state houses were sold. Similar patterns developed in established subdivisions elsewhere. The remaining rental units, many
double units on single titles which could not be easily sold, either remained with those who lacked the financial capacity or the desire to own their own homes, or were made available to new tenants. The state house purchase policy effectively selected out those who were able to buy homes (generally those on higher incomes), leaving the remaining rental units to the less privileged and to newcomers. For Sullivan, the drive to encourage homeownership was a way of giving all New Zealanders, including state tenants, a stake in the community and a vested interest in the capitalist status quo. He promised to do all he could "... to see that we get homeownership, making every little worker... a capitalist, and not keeping him weighed down and leaning on a socialist policy..." (loc. cit., p. 861) 

New Zealand's Labour politicians seem to have been less concerned with the right-wing arguments and the phenomenon of 'capitalist' homeowners. Perhaps they did not take the arguments too seriously, or perhaps the Labour Party in New Zealand was moving far more quickly towards a programme and political philosophy more in tune with a liberal-capitalist and property-owning status quo. In New Zealand, state housing continued to receive some emphasis, and the building of rental units rose again when a Labour Government briefly returned to power for three years in 1957. Despite New Zealand's economic difficulties homeownership received a boost to, but Labour lost in a two-party swing of almost four per cent in 1960. Finally in 1972, twelve years later, a Labour

35. Right-wing Australian politicians were engaged in a similar campaign across the Tasman. Kemeny notes that prominent members of the Australian Labour Party appeared to accept the arguments and he quotes from a speech given by the Labour Government's Minister of Post-War Reconstruction, who declared his opposition to home ownership because he believed it "... was deliberately designed to place the workers in a position in which they would have a vested interest in capitalism..." [see Kemeny, 1977 : 48]

36. The Australian Labour Party remained in opposition for twenty three years following defeat at the hands of a right-wing coalition in 1949.
Government was once again elected, this time with a big majority, and the state housing programme which had slipped to less than one thousand annual completions under the outgoing National Government, was once again reactivated. Completions were boosted to more than three thousand on an annual basis by the end of 1975. The income bar National had used to keep waiting lists down was lifted and the state housing programme was reorganised to provide for a number of new and imaginative house designs to help rid the programme of its tarnished image. Home lending through the Housing Corporation also received high priority, but the entire housing programme became plagued with difficulties in 1974-5 following one of the biggest inflationary spirals in land and house prices in New Zealand’s history, coupled with an economic downturn which led to a substantial drop in the availability of housing finance from traditional sources. In 1975 a reorganised National Party was once more in a position to go to the electorate claiming that the housing needs of New Zealanders were not being met and that three more years of Labour

37. Housing became very much of an issue for the National offensive from late 1973 until the election in November 1975. The Speculation Tax and the Income Tax Amendments designed to tax 'unearned increments in value' from zoning or land use changes and speculation in property, were labelled as capital gains taxes which would 'destroy' the property market. The then Leader of the Opposition cast the net as widely as he could, he warned all property and house owners that the average New Zealander 'traded up' in houses several times in his life-time. When the bottom dropped out of the property market, he claimed, they would lose all their equity. He raised the 'sceptre' of a Labour Government pegging house sale prices to 'unrealistic' government valuation levels which would mean the loss of all those hard earned savings invested in homes. National promised to make rates on all owner-occupied properties deductible and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Muldoon, claimed that "... the Government's policies were leading the country into two groups - those who had state houses and those who did not..." [see Christchurch Press, October 22, 1975]. Mr. Muldoon went on to claim that National would boost homeownership and a new home ownership savings scheme was promised for state tenants who had been 'left out' because the Labour Government 'had virtually wiped out the possibility of state house tenants buying the houses they rented.' [see Christchurch Press, 12 November, 1975]
Government would mean the destruction of private enterprise and the spread of state socialism.  

**HOMEOWNERSHIP IN THE 'PROPERTY-OWNING DEMOCRACY': THE CASE FOR THE PAPANUI ELECTORATE STUDY.**

In linking features of New Zealand society to the housing class and embourgeoisement thesis I have attempted to qualify the extent to which either model can be considered applicable to an understanding of socio-political behaviour in New Zealand. There is a clear historical parallel between the emergence of the political ideologies of a 'property-owning democracy' and 'welfare linked housing provision' in both Britain and New Zealand. Both the British Conservative Party and the New Zealand National party promoted the growth of homeownership and introduced policies to sell state houses to tenants as part of their onslaught against 'socialist' solutions to the housing question. The evidence suggests that New Zealanders in 1950 were, and have continued to be, more responsive to the 'capitalist' solution to the housing question than they have to the 'socialist' alternative. More than one-third of all the state houses built have been sold and since 1960 the proportion of owner-occupied dwellings in New Zealand has stabilised at about two-thirds of all dwellings.

If any attempt is to be made to test propositions relating to housing derived from the embourgeoisement and housing class thesis, then it can be argued that the test situation should have a high proportion of owner-occupied dwellings, including a substantial number of former state houses in established residential settings which have been sold to their occupants. There are a number of theoretical reasons  

---

38. The Labour Government's superannuation scheme was singled out as a scheme which would permit the 'state' to buy up 'everything' and 'private enterprise' would be destroyed.

39. There is also a methodological reason. I have already noted with reference to Niven's 1975 research that the highest rate of state house sales has occurred in established urban suburbs. In order to include a reasonable number of owners of former state houses in the sample, it therefore made methodological sense to study an established suburb.
for making this assertion, and these will now be outlined.

For Rex and Moore, the class struggles of the city centred around the competition for scarce housing resources in which the ultimate goal was mortgage-free suburban homeownership. They argued that urban residents were not so much concerned with the struggle between 'capitalist' and 'socialist' political parties in the abstract - rather they were concerned with and attached meaning to the way in which this struggle came to be represented through the competition for scarce housing resources. In other words, the competition for housing as represented through the parties and their housing programmes, was believed to have both a class and a political dimension. Arguments which appear to bear some resemblance to this claim have had their advocates within the New Zealand National Party. In 1950, one of the senior Cabinet Ministers in the then National Government, The Hon. J. Sullivan proclaimed that it was his intention to promote the policy of sponsored homeownership in order to convert the working people living in state houses to the capitalist cause. Sullivan evidently believed that the simple act of owning a home led to the 'betterment' of the individual and the community in which that individual lived. Any attempt to test the National Party proposition that homeownership does lead to the development of vested interests, of a stake in the property-owning status quo, requires the selection of a test situation in which suburban homeowners and the owners of former state houses are both represented.

Chapple (1975) and Melling (1975) both suggested that the formation of action groups among the homeowners in new Auckland subdivisions was based on a common concern with the protection of property values threatened by the influx of state tenants. But does this mean, as Melling suggests, that the threat to property values was posed because state rental units were of a superior standard of construction to the spec-built homes of the owner-occupiers or does it mean that property values were threatened by the influx of a 'caste' of people not in keeping with the middle class tone of the subdivision? After all the action committees called for a 'social impact' report to ascertain whether the existing and planned facilities of the subdivision would be able to meet the increased demands they believed would be placed upon them.

It would seem that the most likely situation under which class-like groups might arise in the housing field is a situation in which
housing-market interests and status interests tend to coincide. In this regard, and with reference to the Haddon criticisms that housing classes, as Rex and Moore defined them, represented status groups rather than groups defined in terms of their market interests, I argued that tenure did represent a relatively accurate index of both housing market and status interests. My argument was extended to incorporate the differentiation of groups within the state and council housing markets. Ineichen found that tenure differences in a council housing estate corresponded to differences in the pattern of social relationships, and Murie suggested that the council house sales policy introduced by the British Conservative Party selected out tenants who were in receipt of relatively higher incomes than those tenants who did not purchase their rental units. In this particular case, the owner-occupier is relatively advantaged with respect to 'income', in the comprehensive sense in which Titmuss, Harvey and Weber defined it. The owner-occupier has an interest in future exchange value which is not shared by the tenant, and his advantage with respect to income receipts are further reinforced by changes in the value of his property rights and by the appreciation in the value of the dwelling he occupies. To the extent that the state house sales policy introduced by the National Party reinforced the existing income differences between tenants, and Niven's findings suggest this may be the case, class like groups may have developed in state housing sub-divisions. The findings of the Porirua survey, referred to earlier, in which housing was one feature recognised by Porirua residents in the images they held of social classes, would tend to support this interpretation. If there is any tendency to group differentiation, either on the basis of market or status interests in which an emulation of middle class life styles might conceivably have a place in the distinctions made, the phenomenon will be an intra-class phenomenon, in that all residents will have had, and probably continue
to have a similar relationship to the labour market. 40
The setting in which the existence of this phenomenon could be confirmed or disconfirmed would necessarily be one in which opportunities for the emulation of the middle class exist and in which both rented and owner-occupied state houses are present. In other words, the chosen location should include a mixture of different types of houses, occupied by groups in different income and occupational categories, in relatively close proximity to each other. For want of a better term, the dominant character of the chosen locality should be 'middle class' and in this regard, it should be noted that a link between voting behaviour and the tendency of all residents to gravitate towards the behavioural norms of the dominant group within a locality, has some currency. (see Foldars, 1968; Greenstein and Wolfinger, 1968) Runciman, among others, has argued that the immediate context of social experiences, rather than the relatively abstract notions of class divisions at the societal level, may be important in attitude formation and hence in behavioural outcomes. The suggestion that locality may be important has already been recognised in relation to housing and the way in which the struggle between 'socialism' and 'capitalism' may come to be represented through a competition for scarce housing resources.

I have argued that housing may conceivably be related to the emulation of middle class life styles particularly in the case of the affluent manual owner-occupier. However, Lockwood argued that to the extent that the movement into owner-occupancy is a rational economic move, no necessary emulation of middle class life styles need be implied. While it can be argued in support of Bedggood's suggestion, that for many, dissatisfying work experiences may be more than compensated for by the

40. Access to state housing in New Zealand has been closely regulated by the income bar, and if some tenants are relatively affluent as Hunt (1970) suggests, this may mean, that since entering state houses, some tenants have not only become owner-occupiers but have experienced increases in real disposable incomes.
'pleasures' of family life, recreation and status consumption in which suburban homeownership is a folk fetish, the place of homeownership in New Zealand society should be interpreted cautiously. If all New Zealanders, including many of relatively low status, expect to own homes as a matter of course, the implication is that tenure alone may be less significant in any claims to belong to an exclusive group with common status interests, than is the case in Britain, even if market interests are held in common. If owner-occupancy is seen to be normative, not only for the middle class, but also for many manual workers, and if virtually everyone can, or could until recently expect to enter owner-occupancy with the initial assistance of a state loan, then factors apart from tenure may be of relatively greater significance in class structuration or group formation. Locality is one of these factors, but the mode of access to housing, the size and the age of a house may well be important. Rex and Moore distinguished between several housing classes and these classes were defined in terms of a number of characteristics other than tenure. In New Zealand, the owner of a former state house, for instance, even if he is mortgage free, will probably rank lower in any hierarchy of housing values than the owner of the privately financed dream home who will be lucky if he is able to refinance a short-term mortgage when it comes up for renewal in two or three years. However, to the extent that housing is a scarce resource and to the extent that access to suburban owner-occupancy is competitive, as it may be for many in manual occupations who do not have the financial resources of the non-manual employee who takes owner-occupancy for granted, the

41. Myers [1976] has argued that state housing in New Zealand is the down-valued alternative to second-mortgage home buying. This interpretation is supported by Thorns [1976] and Chapple [1975]. If there are no long term but still 'respectable' alternatives to home-buying, even leasehold land is negatively valued, then perhaps homeownership is seen to be 'normative' for all but the most deprived socially and economically. In Britain on the other hand, while council housing estates may be perceived negatively, they are perhaps an almost acceptable alternative to homeownership for a much greater proportion of the population than in New Zealand, even if the ultimate goal is suburban owner-occupancy.
meaning attached to homeownership may have class and political dimensions. In this regard, the locality in which the propositions from both the housing class and embourgeoisement thesis are to be tested empirically should include a significant proportion of 'private' owner-occupiers in manual occupations, in addition to those who have purchased their state houses.

There is only one further significant feature of the test locality I want to mention and that is the question of the degree to which the spheres of home and work are separated physically from each other. Rex and Moore argued that housing interests would become more salient the more home and industry become separated, not just physically, but also in the 'meaning' an urban resident can attach to his positions in the sphere of production and consumption respectively. From the embourgeoisement perspective, suburban owner-occupancy is held to be important to affluent manual workers who are physically separated from traditional and supportive working class social networks. Goldthorpe and Lockwood call this the 'privatisation' phase of the embourgeoisement process. The manual worker who owns a home in a new sub-division would lead a home-centred and family-centred life, if the thesis holds. If it is true that there are no 'working class' communities in New Zealand, the best empirical approximation to a test of the thesis will require a locality in which manual workers are largely commuters and at least in the main physically separated in their home life from the places of work, or the immediate vicinity of their place of work. The Papanui electorate in which I have put some of the propositions from both theses to the test meets many of these requirements for a test locality in so far as this was possible given the limited resources available.

SOME POSSIBILITIES EXPLORED : THE PAPANUI ELECTORATE STUDY.
Christchurch is a major commercial centre servicing a large and highly productive agricultural hinterland. While there are a few older, small settlements on the
main transport routes the growth patterns of the city have largely conformed with the concentric zone pattern originally put forward by Burgess and his associates in the 1930's. On the periphery of the expanding inner city commercial zone, the competition for land use has been intense. Many of the oldest elements of the housing stock have been converted into private rental accommodation but the developing pattern is one in which the great majority of the older houses on the periphery of the inner city have given way to light commercial use. More than one quarter of the residential population in the inner city moved out in the five year period preceding the 1971 Census. Surrounding the commercial zone and separated by a major transport route is a mixed zone of detached residential dwellings and medium to high density apartment units. To the north of the city this mixed residential zone, which includes a high proportion of rented dwellings, gradually gives way to a substantial, almost exclusively owner-occupied dormitory suburb of government financed dwellings. In the north-west there is a high concentration of both new and medium aged privately financed dwellings.

The Papanui electorate extends across all four zones and includes two older townships located on Papanui Road which links the inner city with the main highway to the north. Both of these smaller townships are surrounded by small mixed residential zones in which rental accommodation rivals private owner-occupancy as the predominant land use. In addition, on the extreme inner boundary of the electorate there is a patch of relatively older two-storeyed houses, many of which have been converted into rental accommodation. Bordering this region is another small pocket of homes built in the 1920's and occupied by many in professional and business occupations. In the north-east, bordering the

42. Medium aged houses in this context, are those between 35 and 45 years old, while older homes are 46 years old or more.
Papanui township, and to the north-west there is considerable
evidence of the activities of the 1935-49 Labour Governments.
In this period, successive Labour administrations bought
up much of the land into which private sub-divisions were
expanding and built small clusters of state rental houses
in what have now become relatively attractive surroundings.
The resulting pattern is highly mixed. There are small
cul-de-sacs of former state houses that have been sold
to tenants and there are streets of double unit state
rentals that continue to be occupied by those tenants,
who for one reason or another, have been unable to buy
homes. Many of this latter group have only moved into
the units they now occupy comparatively recently.
Surrounding the small clusters of state houses in the
north-west are many privately financed dwellings built
in the 1920's and the 1930's, along with smaller blocks
of housing built for a comparatively affluent group in
the last decade. To the north there is the large
government financed suburb previously mentioned.
Almost all of these houses are owner-occupied, and
although some construction is still continuing, the
great majority of houses were built in the late 1950's
and during the 1960's. On the north-east perimeter
of the government-financed sub-division there are a
few streets of older state rental flats and a small
number of brand new state rental units built in the
1973-5 period by the Third Labour Government. Many
of the state rental units which have been bought by
former tenants, particularly those in the north-west,
are conspicuous and easily distinguished from the
remaining rental units. State houses which have been
purchased typically include fences, garages, showpiece
gardens and a great number have been altered structurally.
Although there are small blocks of streets which appear
to be occupied by many of the least affluent state
tenants, taken as a whole the Papanui electorate is
essentially established and, for want of a better term,
'middle-class'. Since 1969, when the Papanui electorate

43. built in the early 1950's.
was first formed, a National M.P. has been returned with comfortable majorities. In 1972 the swing to Labour in Papanui was slightly less than the country-wide average and the sitting member retained a majority of more than 1700 votes, which left Papanui outside of even the 'long-shot' marginal category. In 1975 the Papanui seat was greatly consolidated for National and only subsequent boundary changes have rendered the seat extremely marginal. The sitting member has on several occasions claimed to have something of a following among the ordinary 'working people' of his electorate and has stated his intention to stand again despite the boundary changes that have weakened his position considerably.

I mentioned earlier that the government-financed subdivision was a dormitory suburb, but there are two large factories in the immediate vicinity of the Papanui township. One of these factories employs several hundred workers, many of whom are skilled and in receipt of incomes well in excess of the average male wage. Clearly to the extent that these workers represented in my sample, the investigation is not an ideal setting for a test of the embourgeoisement thesis because the factory in question has a militant union and a persistent and continuing record of industrial action. There is one other factory which largely depends on the availability of married women in the vicinity to provide labour. Apart from these two factories, the majority of the employment opportunities are provided in the two industrial towns of Kaiapoi and Belfast several miles to the north and in the light industrial zones on the opposite side of Christchurch city, several miles to the south and south-east.

The major problem with which I was confronted in attempting to best represent at least four distinct 'housing types'

44. There were a number of strikes in December 1975 and both Christchurch daily papers made great play of the fact that because of bonuses some skilled workers were earning as much as $10,000 per annum.
and some kind of approximation of the conditions for testing the embourgeoisement thesis was a sampling problem. Goldthorpe and Lockwood in their Luton research outlined a number of 'ideal' conditions for a test of the embourgeoisement thesis which I could not hope to approximate with the available resources.

In line with the arguments I had developed concerning the respective characteristics of state tenants and state tenants who had bought houses, I was keen to approximate these two groups as a first priority. With the assistance of the Housing Corporation I was able to select random samples from the Corporation's records so as to represent both the state tenant category and the category of former state tenants who had purchased state houses. My second priority was

45. Goldthorpe and Lockwood et. al. argued that ideally the setting would include the following: i) Affluence:— personal and family incomes comparable to many white-collar employees. ii) Economic security:— good prospects of continued highly-paid employment. iii) Physical mobility:— a high incidence of migration away from community of origin. iv) Consumption-mindedness:— a high motivation to attain extensive ownership of consumer durables and house purchase. v) Work setting:— to be characterized by industrial harmony, progressive employment policies and an advanced technology. vi) Community setting:— absence of tightly-knit kinship networks, a high degree of mixing within residential localities of individuals and families of differing status, occupation and so forth, together with a high rate of economic growth without long-standing traditions of industrial working-class life. Significantly Goldthorpe and Lockwood’s research locality fell short on many of these criteria as the authors themselves acknowledge. The Luton region was characterised by housing estates that were typically, 'working class' rather than socially heterogeneous, trade union links turned out to be quite strong and there was some evidence of a developed community structure. (see Goldthorpe et. al., 1968 : 30-34)
to obtain representative samples of 'private' tenants and owner-occupiers. The most accurate available lists of private tenants and owner-occupied dwellings I was able to gain access to were those held by the Municipal Electricity Department. However, there was no satisfactory way of separating houses financed privately from those financed by the different government agencies involved with home lending, and I had no alternative but to combine these groups to form what I have termed the 'private' owner category. In attempting to meet some of the criteria needed to approximate conditions for a test of the embourgeoisement thesis, it could perhaps be argued that tenure provided a useful index, in that owner-occupiers in skilled or unskilled manual occupations, living in a suburban location and possibly living in a home and family-centred existence met some of the criteria required. I have already argued that Papanui, though a very mixed residential suburb [which in itself provides opportunity for the emulation of 'middle class' lifestyles] was, taken as a whole, a 'middle class' electorate, with for want of a better term, 'middle class' residential suburbs. Furthermore Hunt had found what he termed a 'surprising degree of affluence' in one Palmerston North state housing estate, and Jackson compared the income profiles of owner-occupied and state housing sub-divisions, which confirmed a pattern of similarity rather than difference. On the question of employment security I was perhaps too easily persuaded by national statistics which confirmed that, as measured by the registered unemployed, New Zealand's unemployment at the end of 1975 was well below one percent of the total labour force. The absence of a

46. Tenants in private rental accommodation as compared with tenants in state rental accommodation.
47. A summary of the sampling procedures is included in the appendices.
48. New Zealand has typically had much lower proportions unemployed than other 'developed' societies, but when the 1976 Census results became available and more than 20,000 people indicated their employment status as 'unemployed', I did wonder whether it might have been advisable to have included a question on past experiences of unemployment.
long-standing tradition of working-class life, superficially at least, did not seem to be problematic. I have already argued that such communities are non-existent in New Zealand, with the possible exception of declining mining communities on the West Coast. However, I had some reservations about the residential area in the immediate vicinity of the Papanui township. I was aware of the existence of the Papanui Workingmens' Club and I knew that in a residential setting, which for the most part had been established more than thirty years earlier, there was likely to be some kind of organised social networks. The Papanui Hotel, for instance, was a meeting place for many of the working people in the immediate vicinity and though the Papanui Labour Party was weak and badly organised, regular meetings were held in the Papanui Church Hall and I took this to indicate that much of the Labour Party's support was possibly concentrated in the vicinity of the township. However, given that many of the small blocks of state housing were near to the Papanui township, and that still a majority of the units were rented, it was also possible that the dwellings were characterised by a relatively high turnover which, it could be suggested, would tend to disrupt community formation. While one of the factories had a record of industrial strife, as part of the management policy of encouraging a 'team' identity the social club was responsible for a number of activities including the organisation of sports teams.

Taken as a whole I was perhaps in a position to claim that I had been able to represent some of the conditions required for a test of elements within both the housing class and embourgeoisement thesis. With respect to the former I had a ready made electorate which to some extent represented at least four distinguishable housing situations in terms of the characteristics of the occupants, tenure and mode of access differences, location within the electorate and the age of the dwellings occupied. Perhaps more importantly, I had a setting in which suburban owner-occupancy was not the
preserve of those favourably located in the labour market, or so it appeared, and I was in a position to test whether common housing situations had 'meaning' for them over and above occupational differences. However, given that there was little evidence of any organisations that could conceivably articulate these common interests I expected to find at least some evidence of essentially status differences, not housing classes in the fully fledged, or even partly developed sense. 49 To the extent that status differences were conceivable, there was a link to the embourgeoisement thesis. In this regard I was at least in a position to be able to assert that the empirical investigation followed two years of almost unparalleled prosperity. Furthermore, I carried out the study at a time when the retention of living standards was very much under threat, at a time when the fortunes of the Labour Party gave every appearance of being on the wane, yet before the measures which have subsequently severely reduced the living standards of all working people had had time to take effect. 50

49. I have already expressed my reservations about the 'meaning' of homeownership in a cultural setting in which owner-occupancy may be seen as the norm, something which for many is taken for granted. Significantly at the time I was carrying out the survey the Christchurch Mayor had called a meeting at the request of the Ratepayers' Association but the meeting was cancelled because of an apparent 'lack of interest'. There was of course the Homeowners' Union, the Tenants' Protection Association and a Merivale Precinct Society, which conceivably could have been significant in crystallizing housing interests but the significance of all three groups is probably localised and only one member of a group such as these turned up in my sample.

50. If Templeton and Eunson were correct in their claim that the Labour Party is identified with austerity while the National Party is identified with 'good times' then the 1975 election became one in which, for many, their own economic wellbeing depended on which way they casted their votes. In one sense they were faced with the choice between a promise to 'right the economy first' [so that the good times could return] and the somewhat discredited alternative of 'borrow and hope'. At least these were the alternatives as the sophisticated National Party election machine had defined them. Needless to say I was not prepared to base the study purely on one election so in the survey I included a measure of electoral behaviour in three elections, together with a question to elicit the reasons for voting one way or another in the most recent two of these.
Chapter Four: Research Design, Hypotheses and Findings.
Introduction

Of the original 240 addresses in the four samples, contact was made with 219 occupants and interviews were completed with the heads of 202 households. The structured interview schedule took between twenty and thirty minutes to complete. Interviews were carried out during a three month period between February and April 1976.

The sampling frame employed was designed to allow for the test of hypotheses derived from both the embourgeoisement and housing class theses, in addition to hypotheses drawn

1. Two hundred and one cases (83 per cent of the original sample) were used in the data analysis. One completed 'state owner' interview was excluded from the data analysis because there was a clear mis-match between the length of residence recorded in the interview and the dates of sale for all former state houses kindly supplied by the Housing Corporation. Of the 201 heads-of-households interviewed, twenty-two per cent were female (44) and the remainder were male. Female heads-of-households were concentrated in the two rental samples, in particular the state rental sample. In the case of households made up of groups of young people flatting together, the head-of-household was taken to be the eldest occupant - male or female.
from the more traditional explanations of voting behaviour. 2

THE THEORETICAL BASES FOR THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES.
The three sets of hypotheses upon which data analysis was based, were derived, respectively, from the Lipset socio-economic status model of political party support in economically developed societies, the embourgeoisement thesis as reformulated by Goldthorpe et al. for their Luton 'affluent' worker studies, and the Rex and Moore housing class model.

Lipset it will be recalled, argued that the most impressive single fact about political support in economically developed democracies, is that in virtually every case, the lower-income groups vote mainly for parties of the left, while higher-income groups vote mainly for parties of the right. However, Milne (1966) 2.

The quota sampling procedure adopted allowed for comparisons between respondents in four different housing situations. In the 'private' sample there were two housing groups classified in terms of tenure - those in private rental accommodation and those in owner-occupied housing. No distinction was recognised between those who had entered owner-occupancy by way of a state mortgage and those who had entered owner-occupancy with mortgages from private (or non-state) institutions. An adequate recognition of this distinction would not only have required a still larger sample but also access to suitable lists of the two populations. In the case of state mortgages, the Housing Corporation had such lists available, but to come up with an adequate yet still representative sample of private mortgagors gave every indication of presenting problems which outweighed the possible advantages of recognising this distinction. In the 'state' sample there were two groups, again classified in terms of tenure. State owners were those who had purchased their state houses, and state tenants were those who continued to rent units through the Housing Corporation. Details of purchase dates were made available by the Housing Corporation, and to confirm that all respondents were indeed former state tenants, purchase dates were cross checked against the length of residence gauged by the questionnaire. Only one case was excluded on this basis. The use of the quota sampling technique did ensure that there were sufficient numbers of respondents within each of the four housing groups to permit inter-group comparisons, but before analysis could proceed, each of the four categories were statistically adjusted using the S.P.S.S. weight procedure to bring the sampling fractions for each category into line with the actual proportions of each housing group within the Papanui electorate (calculated from the 1971 Census data). Consequently while the data analysis was based on 104 cases from the private sample (48 tenants and 55 owners) and 97 cases from the state sample (48 tenants and 49 owners), the levels of significance and the measures of association within each table have been adjusted within the computer programme to allow for the over-representation of state and private tenants and the under-representation of private homeowners in sampling.
suggests that education, followed by occupation, are the two best indicators of party support in New Zealand, and for this reason both those measures were included, along with income, in order to test the validity of the socio-economic status explanation of voting behaviour (hypotheses 1-3).

Lipset qualifies his model of party support by referring to a 'need' for status which is represented by the desire of men to see themselves favourably and to arrange their impressions of the environment in ways which maximise their sense of being superior to others. Empirical evidence for the operation of this phenomenon is provided by what Lipset has termed the 'class identification' studies. Thus, the fourth hypothesis attempts to gauge whether 'subjective' class identification, like the more traditional "objective" measures of S.E.S., is a good predictor of voting behaviour.

**Hypotheses testing a "class" or socio-economic status model of political behaviour.**

**Hypothesis 1**: Respondents with three or more years secondary education are more likely than respondents with less than three years education to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party in the three most recent general elections.

**Hypothesis 2**: Non-manual workers are more likely than manual workers to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party.

**Hypothesis 3**: Respondents currently in receipt of gross annual incomes in excess of $6,000 are more likely than respondents with incomes of less than $6,000 to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party.

**Hypothesis 4**: Respondents placing themselves in the middle class are more likely than respondents placing themselves in the working class to have voted consistently for parties other than the Labour Party.
Testing these four hypotheses, as will be demonstrated, showed that self-assigned class, and not the more traditionally accepted "objective" measures of socio-economic status, is the single best predictor of support for the two major political parties in New Zealand, as measured by voting patterns. Occupation, rather than education or income, was the next best predictor of support.

Given the importance of the self-assigned class measure, it became necessary to know whether self-assigned class ratings could be directly attributed to the influence of each of the three "objective" measures of socio-economic status (hypotheses 5-7).

Hypotheses testing the association between self-assigned class position and 'objective' measures of socio-economic status.

Hypothesis 5 : Non-manual workers are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are manual workers.

Hypothesis 6 : Respondents with three or more years secondary education are more likely to see themselves as belonging to the middle class than are respondents with less than three years secondary education.

Hypothesis 7 : Respondents in receipt of incomes exceeding $6,000 are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are respondents with incomes below $6,000.

However, Lipset did not argue that class identifications would necessarily reflect the influence of "objective" measures of socio-economic status, since he suggested that class identifications may in part account for the deviations in the patterns of political behaviour expected according to a socio-economic explanation. The test of hypotheses 5-7 did show limited support for the view that class identifications reflect the "objective" measures of socio-economic status, but the levels of support in all three cases were weak, and this strongly suggested that there was a need for alternative hypotheses to see whether self-assigned class ratings were in part influenced by factors associated with either the embourgeoisement thesis, or the housing class model.
As has been noted previously, a central argument within the embourgeoisement thesis is that changes in the consumption patterns of manual workers have helped to blur the lines of distinction between manual and non-manual workers. Many manual workers are believed to have achieved relatively high incomes and living standards which have led them to assume a way of life which is more characteristically middle class. Goldthorpe et al. suggest that embourgeoisement would necessarily be a three stage process beginning with the privatisation of the affluent worker, progressing through a stage of aspiration in which middle class standards of behaviour are adopted, and finally reaching the stage of assimilation marked by acceptance into middle class primary networks.

The move to homeownership in suburban locations will be closely linked with the first stages and will also be linked to the second and third stages, if suburban homeownership means a move to a middle class neighbourhood in which the possibility of emulating a middle class life style and being accepted by neighbours of different occupational backgrounds is created.

Themes present within the embourgeoisement thesis are taken up in New Zealand by Mitchell (1969), Jackson (1973) and Bedggod (1976). The theories of each of these three authors suggest that suburban homeownership is part of what it means to belong to the mainstream of 'respectable' middle class society (hypothesis 8). Since a significant proportion of New Zealand homeowners are manual workers, these authors are implicitly suggesting that the embourgeoisement process is a prevalent pattern in our property-owning democracy (hypothesis 9). However, even if it can be demonstrated that manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being middle class, the operation of the other two "objective" measures of socio-economic status (education and income)  

3. More than two-thirds of the residential dwellings in New Zealand's housing stock are owner-occupied. Allowing for the computer programme weighting of the samples, almost one-third of the owner-occupier households in Papanui (31 per cent) are headed by manual workers.
cannot be lightly discounted. While occupation was the single best predictor of class identification among the three "objective" measures of socio-economic status, manual homeowners who place themselves in the middle class may be both better educated and in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants (hypotheses 10 and 11).

Hypotheses testing the embourgeoisement thesis.

**Hypothesis 8**: Respondents in the homeownership housing situation are more likely than tenants to place themselves in the middle class.

**Hypothesis 9**: Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to place themselves in the middle class.

**Hypothesis 10**: Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to have had three or more years secondary education.

**Hypothesis 11**: Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to be in receipt of incomes exceeding $6,000.

Furthermore, if it can be demonstrated that manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to place themselves in the middle class, then a test of the political dimension of the embourgeoisement thesis, which is also present in the theories of Milne (1966), Mitchell (1969) and Bedggood (1976), is required. Milne and Mitchell both insist that the Labour Party is in danger of losing political support because many of the party's traditional supporters (presumably mainly manual workers) continue to see the Labour Party as being 'for the working class', while they themselves are becoming less union-conscious and more conditioned to a 'respectable' middle class style of life in which suburban homeownership is prominent (hypothesis 12). 4

**Hypothesis 12**: Manual homeowners are less likely than manual tenants to have voted consistently for the Labour Party.

4. According to Bedggood (1976), the spheres of work and consumption may be becoming increasingly separate and many may feel that dissatisfying work is more than compensated for by the pleasures of home life associated with status consumption in which suburban homeownership is a folk fetish, a cherished means of achieving the goals of property, freedom and privacy.
In the Goldthorpe et al. [1968] and Nordlinger [1967] tests of the embourgeoisement thesis, economic affluence was operationalised by the use of several measures of which homeownership was but one. Though the ownership of the most important consumer durable of all (a house) is emphasised in embourgeoisement theory as an index of 'affluence', housing costs in New Zealand constitute a significant proportion of household expenditure, especially for home-buying households who have entered the child-rearing stage of the family life cycle. Since many of the manual homeowners headed households at the child-rearing stages of the family life cycle, I decided to test two further hypotheses based on subjective measures of affluence to see whether manual homeowners, who were typically in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants, did in fact see themselves as being 'affluent' [hypotheses 13 and 14].

Hypothesis 13 : Manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to see their financial standing relative to others in the neighbourhood as being 'above average'.

Hypothesis 14 : Manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to have perceived improvements in their general standard of living over the previous five year period.

The embourgeoisement thesis may have some validity in New Zealand but why should it be assumed without qualification, that suburban homeownership on the part of manual workers leads to a middle class identification? In his discussion of "distributive groupings", Giddens [1973] argued that different groups arising from the sphere of consumption would be differentiated both by their access to housing mortgages and by their physical location in different neighbourhoods. In New Zealand, Johnston [1973] puts forward a similar argument, but while he emphasises that groups in the housing market will be differentiated by their neighbourhood location, their access to housing mortgages, and by tenure, he does not take the argument as far as Giddens who suggested that these "distributive groupings" would be an important factor in class structuration.
It will be recalled that neighbourhood location, mode of access to housing, type of housing and tenure, all had a place in the formation of the "housing classes" identified by Rex and Moore. The housing class model moves from the Weberian distinction between categories of property ownership to posit the formation of class-like groups with common positions and common interests in the housing market. Rex and Moore further suggest that these "housing classes" are of first importance in determining interests, life styles, and indeed a person's position in the urban social structure. The relationship between "housing classes" and classes in the labour market is never made entirely clear, but there is the strong suggestion that housing classes operate against the loyalties of classes in the labour market. 5 Rex and Moore argue that urban residents with the same labour market position may have different positions in the housing market and they further suggest that housing classes will become increasingly salient as home and industry become more and more separate. Any apparent similarity with propositions put forward by the embourgeoisement thesis is qualified by a recognition of different modes of access and locality as two further components which serve to differentiate "housing classes". While aspects of status are linked to the model through the hierarchy of housing values in which suburban homeownership is held up as the ultimate goal, the emphasis is upon the competition for housing as a scarce resource in which groups are differentially placed with regard to housing access. Group formation is based on interests in the housing market and not upon the consumption of housing per se, though the two elements are clearly closely related. For Rex and Moore there are essentially two primary housing markets, the state and the private, the first of which is characterised by criteria of access which emphasise 'need' and the second of which is characterised by criteria of access which emphasise 'ability to pay'. There is the strong suggestion that those who accept the rules of the competition for

5. Rex and Moore noted the presence of manual workers greatly concerned with their property values, at Conservative Party meetings in Birmingham.
homeownership within the property-owning democracy (the private housing market) will tend to identify their interests with the liberal capitalist status quo and the parties of the 'right', which champion homeownership as an extension of a property-owning political system. In the state market on the other hand, residents are assumed to equate their interests with a socialist political system which sees the provision of housing, in particular subsidised rental housing, as a state responsibility.

For Rex and Moore then, it is a competition for scarce housing in which groups have different access to housing, which gives meaning to the political struggle between capitalism and socialism. A similar theme received historical recognition in New Zealand in the claims of the Hon. J. Sullivan and Sir Keith Holyoake. To the extent that modes of access to housing are important in New Zealand, it may be less than satisfactory to suggest that the suburban homeownership of manual workers is linked with a middle class identification. In other words, if the housing class thesis is correct, housing access (state-determined versus private market access) should be a more important source of class identification than tenure (hypotheses 15 and 16), and perhaps even political behaviour, as Rex and Moore implied (hypotheses 17-19).

HYPOTHESIS TESTING THE HOUSING CLASS THESIS.

Hypothesis 15 : Respondents in the private housing market are more likely than respondents in the state housing market to place themselves in the middle class.

Hypothesis 16 : Respondents in the homeownership housing situation, irrespective of whether they are in the 'private' or 'state' markets, are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are tenants in either of the two markets.

Hypothesis 17 : Respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to have consistently supported parties other than Labour.

Hypothesis 18 : Respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to vote consistently other than Labour, irrespective of tenure.
Hypothesis 19: Manual homeowners in the private market are less likely than manual homeowners in the state market to be consistent supporters of the Labour Party.

HYPOTHESES TO TEST THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC EXPLANATION OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR: FINDINGS.

In line with the theoretical thrust of the arguments put forward by Lipset (1967) and taken up in New Zealand by Milne (1966), the hypothesis to be tested in the first table is that non-manual workers are more likely than manual workers to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party in the three most recent general elections.

TABLE ONE: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY OCCUPATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[N = 105]</td>
<td>[N = 58]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $v = .31$ 6  
Gamma = .41  $p < .01$

The differences between the two samples are quite clear from Table 1, and hence the Milne hypothesis with respect to occupation is quite strongly supported. Non-manual workers were almost three times more likely than manual workers to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party in the three most recent general elections. Conversely, non-manual workers were only half as likely as manual workers to have consistently supported the Labour Party in these three

6. Cramer's $v$ is a Chi square based measure of association suitable for tables in which either the independent or dependent variable, or both, have more than two possible values. When $v = 0$ there is no relationship between the two variables, when $v = 1$ there is a perfect relationship between the variables, positive or negative as the case may be.
elections. Taking the association a step further, if we assume that occupation and voting behaviour are ordinal rather than nominal measures, a Gamma of +1.0 would have meant that as occupation 'increased' the likelihood of not voting Labour either 'increased' or remained the same. In this sense Gamma can be a more useful summary statistic than Cramer's v because directionality is assumed, and a Gamma of .41 in Table 1 means that the relationship is in the expected direction. Since there is only one chance in one hundred that the differences between samples occurred by chance, we can reject the null hypothesis that the two variables are not associated. From the 'mixed vote' category it can be seen that more than one-third of the manual sample voted for a party other than the Labour Party in at least one of the three general elections, compared with slightly less than one quarter of the non-manual sample who voted for Labour at least once in three elections. It is perhaps also worth noting that to qualify for the 'mixed vote' category, respondents had to have registered at least one Labour vote in three elections. Since the 'consistently other than Labour' category includes respondents who, for

---

7. 'Consistently Labour' and 'consistently non-Labour' in most cases were based on the votes registered in three elections. Fourteen tenants were too young to vote in 1969, and 4 of these were still too young to vote in 1972. Respondents who had voted for Labour in 1972 and 1975 were coded consistently Labour if they had been ineligible in 1969 but indicated that they would have voted Labour. The same procedure was adopted in the coding of the consistently non-Labour category. Four tenants who had been ineligible to vote in 1969 and 1972 were excluded from the analysis and in the case of abstentions in one of three elections (4 cases), respondents were asked the way they would have voted and coded accordingly. Where respondents had abstained in two out of three elections, they were coded as 'mixed vote' (2 cases), and one respondent who refused to answer any of the three voting questions was naturally enough excluded from the analysis.
example, voted National twice and Values once, the 'mixed vote' category is not strictly speaking a completely adequate measure of 'changers', or swinging voters. 8

The support for the hypothesis is in accordance with the findings of Milne (1966) in that occupation is quite closely related to voting behaviour.

TABLE TWO: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY NO. OF YEARS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LESS THAN 3 YEARS</th>
<th>3 YEARS OR MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100%

([N = 72] [N = 119])

Cramer's v = .25  Gamma = .42 p < .01

The hypothesis to be tested in Table 2, based on Milne's contention that there is a close relationship between education and voting behaviour, is that respondents with three or more years secondary education are more likely than respondents with less than three years secondary education to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party in the three most recent general elections. The significance of the difference between samples in Table 2 confirms that the hypothesis is correct and the relationship is in the expected direction with Gamma being .42. Cramer's v is not particularly high, but this may in part be attributable to the relatively small percentage difference between samples in the 'mixed vote' category. Table 2 is an added check

8. One possible explanation of the relatively high proportions of both samples in the 'mixed vote' category (which I have already pointed out slightly under-represents the true 'changer' category) is that both the 1972 and 1975 general elections were marked by uncharacteristic two party swings of considerable magnitude.
on Table 1 because respondents in the residual occupational
category (students, and those who are retired) are included
in the distribution. Respondents with more than three years
secondary education were almost twice as likely as respondents
with less than three years secondary education to have
consistently supported parties other than Labour. Conversely,
they were only half as likely as respondents with less than
three years secondary education to have been consistent
Labour supporters. The proportions in the 'mixed vote'
category do not differ appreciably from those in Table 1.
The probability of this distribution occurring by chance
is only one in one hundred, so the null hypothesis [that
years of education and the likelihood of not voting Labour
are unrelated], is rejected. Thus, the data offers some
support to the Milne findings that education and voting
behaviour are closely related.

TABLE THREE: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY INCOME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LESS THAN $6000</th>
<th>$6000 OR MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100%
[N = 95] [N = 96]

Cramer's v = .23 Gamma = .13  p < .01

The hypothesis to be tested in Table 3, derived directly from
the Lipset model, is that respondents currently in receipt
of gross annual incomes in excess of $6000 are more likely
than respondents with incomes of less than $6000 to have
consistently supported parties other than Labour in the three
most recent general elections. With all due respect to Lipset,
there are nonetheless qualifications that need to be considered
in a test of this hypothesis. Milne has argued that in New
Zealand occupation and education are important determinants
of political behaviour, not income. Perhaps, as in Britain,
while occupation and education are both generally considered
as being reasonably valid indicators of class position, income,
especially when measured in the narrow sense of weekly or annual
income, is a much weaker measure of economic position (see Parkin, 1971).

Even though the Lipset hypothesis appears to be supported by the data in Table 3 there are at least three indications in the table that immediately alert us to the possibility that the level of significance may not be quite what it seems. Firstly, the Gamma is very low, which suggests the relationship is barely directional and secondly, the degree of association upon which the level of significance is based is probably greatly influenced by the substantial percentage difference between samples in the 'mixed vote' category. Finally, since respondents with incomes currently in excess of $6000 are over-represented in relation to those with incomes of less than $6000, in both the 'consistent Labour' and 'consistently other than Labour' categories, the hypothesis appears to be in need of revision. Those in receipt of higher incomes appear to have more stable voting histories, so the hypothesis which would more accurately account for the distribution in Table 3 would be that respondents with incomes in excess of $6000 were more likely than respondents with incomes below $6000 to be consistent supporters of the Labour Party or to be consistently anti-Labour, as measured by their voting histories.

TABLE FOUR: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY SELF-RATED CLASS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>WORKING CLASS</th>
<th>MIDDLE CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 82) [N = 106]

Cramer's v = .42   Gamma = .67   Somer's D = .50  p < .01

The hypothesis to be tested in Table 4 takes into account the "subjective" dimension of socio-economic status or class
position. To locate a person "objectively" on the three
dimensions of education, occupation and income is one
thing but to assume that the same person necessarily
identifies with class position "objectively" defined,
is quite another. Lipset suggested that the desire
for status would lead some people to identify themselves
with the middle class position, and hence this phenomenon
could in part account for deviations in the voting patterns
expected from the "objective" class model. Thus, the
hypothesis to be tested is that respondents placing
themselves in the middle class are more likely than
respondents placing themselves in the working class to
have voted consistently for parties other than Labour.
The hypothesis is supported and the relationship is both
strong and clearly directional, but this need not necessarily
mean at this stage of analysis that the "objective" measures
are less salient to the explanation of voting behaviour than
this subjective measure, because class placements are likely
to reflect "objective" class position to a considerable
degree.

The Somer's D at .50, is a slightly stronger directional
measure than Gamma and can be interpreted to mean that as
class rank 'increases' there is a relatively strong tendency
for the likelihood of consistently voting other than Labour
to 'increase'. Respondents ranking themselves as middle

9. As I have noted previously Gamma means that as the
independent variable 'increases' the dependent variable
remains the same or 'increases'. The values each variable
can take must be at least 'ordinal'. Whether the values
can be considered to be 'ordinal' depends heavily on the
theoretical justification for ranking the categories in
some particular order. Somer's D is a slightly stronger
directional measure than Gamma because it means that as
the independent variable 'increases' the dependent
variable definitely does increase rather than either
increasing or remaining the same. Both Gamma and
Somer's D have a predictive application. A Gamma
of .30 for example means that the original estimate
of error is reduced by 30 per cent.
class were seven times as likely as respondents ranking themselves as working class to have consistently voted for parties other than the Labour Party. Conversely, they were only half as likely as respondents ranking themselves working class to have consistently supported the Labour Party. They were also only half as likely as respondents ranking themselves working class to have fallen within the 'mixed vote' category. The probability of this distribution having occurred by chance is less than one chance in one hundred.

Of the four hypotheses tested, the fourth (self-rated class) is the most strongly associated with voting behaviour. Since the number of respondents who saw themselves as belonging to the middle class exceeds the number of respondents who were either not gainfully employed or were non-manual workers, there were evidently some manual workers who saw themselves as being 'middle class'. As noted previously, this need not necessarily be taken to mean the Lipset model is not supported, since Lipset emphasised the deviations that could be expected from the model in societies with an 'open' class structure and in which social mobility is common. However, the Milne and Lipset arguments will be more strongly supported if self-assessments of social class can be shown to be largely a function of socio-economic status measured "objectively", in which case there should be strong associations between self-rated class position and measures of occupation, education, and perhaps, given Milne’s qualifications to the Lipset model’s New Zealand application, to a lesser extent, income.¹⁰ Accordingly, in the next section I have first attempted to establish how closely self-assessment of social class are related to the "objective" measures of socio-economic status, and I have then moved on to second-order measures including tenure, and tenure

¹⁰. Income needs to be included, since despite Milne’s qualifications to the Lipset model, Mitchell [1969] refers to two New Zealand studies in which the reasons for middle class identification emphasised occupation and income rather than family background.
in combination with other variables, which may be helpful in any attempt to "explain" additional sources of class identification in the Papanui sample.

TABLE FIVE: SELF-RATED CLASS BY OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[N = 105]</td>
<td>[N = 58]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{PHI} = .43 \quad \text{Gamma} = -.65 \quad p < .01
\]

In accordance with the Mitchell arguments, the hypothesis to be tested in Table 5 is that non-manual workers are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are manual workers. There is a strong, statistically significant relationship between occupation and self-rated class, but the hypothesis is not supported in the form in which it is stated because there is also a strong tendency for many manual workers (57 per cent) to place themselves in the middle class. 11 The measure of association (phi) is high, but Gamma is strongly negative at -.65. In other words, the hypothesis more readily supported by the table is that manual workers are more likely than non-manual workers to see themselves as belonging to the working class; in fact, 12

11. Since eighty-eight per cent (84) of all respondents who saw themselves as being middle class had not been consistent supporters of the Labour Party, it would appear that a significant number of manual workers did vote for parties other than Labour, as is confirmed at a later point.

12. Phi is a similar measure to Cramer's v except that it applies only to 2x2 tables in which each variable has two categories.
as the table suggests, three times more likely. The percentage difference between those in the two samples seeing themselves as middle class is real but less significant. That more than half of the manual workers see themselves as middle class is of course significant for the theoretical thrust of this thesis, but before directly testing the significance of this finding further, there is a need for two additional hypotheses testing the link between self-rated class and the "objective" measures of socio-economic status.

**TABLE SIX: SELF-RATED CLASS BY EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LESS THAN 3 YEARS SECONDARY</th>
<th>3 YEARS OR MORE SECONDARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 72)</td>
<td>(N = 119)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .31     Gamma = .61     p < .01

The Hypothesis to be tested in Table 6 is that respondents with three or more years secondary education are more likely to see themselves as belonging to the middle class than are respondents with less than three years secondary education. Once again the two variables are closely associated and the difference between samples is statistically significant, but as in the case of Table 5, Gamma is strongly negative. Therefore the hypothesis more readily supported from the table is not the one stated, but one which maintains that respondents with less than three years secondary education are more likely to see themselves as belonging to the working class than are respondents with three or more years secondary education. As can be seen from Table 6, they are more than twice as likely as respondents with three or more years secondary education to see themselves as belonging to the working class. Nevertheless, it is important to note that fifty-three per cent of those with less than three years secondary education see themselves as belonging to the middle class. Thus, the findings do not lend a great deal of support to Mitchell's argument that education is the single most
important mechanism integrating people into the 'middle class mainstream' of New Zealand society. Occupation and education are related to self-rated class, and there is limited support for both hypotheses (5 and 6), but the deviations from the expected pattern are massive with more than half of the manual workers and more than half of the respondents with less than three years secondary education placing themselves in the middle class.

**TABLE SEVEN: SELF-RATED CLASS BY INCOME.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>LESS THAN $6000</th>
<th>$6000 OR MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%       100%

(N = 95)   (N = 96)

Cramer's $v = .07$ Gamma = -.17 $p = .05$

The hypothesis to be tested in Table 7 is that respondents in receipt of incomes exceeding $6000 were more likely to have placed themselves in the middle class than respondents with incomes below $6000. Both the measure of association and the directional measure, Gamma, are very weak. There is at least one chance in twenty that the difference between samples is attributable to chance factors. There are two weak trends indicated in the percentage differences. Respondents in receipt of $6000 or more are perhaps slightly more likely than those in receipt of incomes below $6000 to rank themselves middle class. Respondents with incomes below $6000 are perhaps slightly more likely to place themselves in the working class than respondents in receipt of higher incomes. The weak associations suggest that income may not be that closely associated with education, occupation or self-rated class, all of which were quite closely associated with voting behaviour. To the extent that income is associated with both education and occupation the distribution is perhaps little more than a relatively weak, and not very satisfactory reflection of the operation of these variables.
Thus in Tables 5-7 there is limited support for the view that class identifications reflect two of the "objective" measures of socio-economic status but the level of support is not that great and strongly suggests the need to proceed with alternative hypotheses which consider the possibility that class identifications are in part attributable to factors associated with both the embourgeoisement thesis and the housing class model.

HYPOTHESES TESTING THE 'HOUSING CLASS' AND EMBOURGEOISMENT ALTERNATIVES: FINDINGS.
The test of hypotheses 1 to 4 confirmed that occupation, education, and to a much lesser extent income, are associated with voting behaviour. However, self-rated class was more strongly associated with voting behaviour than any of the "objective" measures and, more significantly, the test of hypotheses 5 to 7 suggests that the deviations from a socio-economic explanation of middle class identification based on these "objective" measures are so great that an alternative explanation is required.

In this section the hypotheses put forward attempt to test whether housing situations - ranked first in terms of tenure and secondly in terms of mode of access - were associated with self-rated class and voting behaviour when each of the "objective" class measures are used as controls.

TABLE EIGHT: SELF-RATED CLASS BY TENURE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TENANTS</th>
<th>HOMEOWNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 97)</td>
<td>(N = 104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .17        Gamma = .21   p < .05

The hypothesis to be tested in Table 8 is based on the theories of Mitchell [1969], Jackson [1973] and Bedggood [1976]. All three suggest that suburban homeownership is part of what it
means to belong to the mainstream of 'respectable' middle class society. Thus it is hypothesised that respondents in the homeownership situation are more likely than tenants to place themselves in the middle class.

It is clear from the table that homeowners are slightly more likely than tenants to place themselves in the middle class, but while the hypothesis is supported, the association between the two variables is weak and the difference between samples is only just statistically significant. If homeownership is nothing more than an index of achieved life chances, then the association between tenure and class identification would have been as strong, or stronger than any of the associations demonstrated in the test of hypotheses 5-7, particularly if homeownership contributes to class structuration by reinforcing middle class identification on the part of well educated non-manual workers in receipt of high incomes. Evidently tenure is not a good index of either education or occupation - categorising tenure against class identification appears to obscure the relationship demonstrated in the test of hypotheses 5 and 6.

In other words, Table 8 could be taken to indicate that there is some support for the Rex and Moore contention that homeownership is not merely a direct translation of advantages in the labour market. If tenure is related to class identification, as Mitchell, Jackson and Bedggood suggest, then the distribution in Table 8 may indicate that tenure acts against socio-economic status, but whether or not this is the case can only be deduced from a distribution in which the Table 8 relationship is tested using the "objective" S.E.S. measure. Table 5 implies that manual workers owning homes are the group most likely to be affected, as Bedggood (1976) suggests will be the case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100% 100% 100%  
(N = 42) (N = 67) (N = 28) (N = 24)  

Cramer's $v = .33$ Gamma = -.52 $p < .01$

Thus, the hypothesis to be tested in Table 9 is that manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as belonging to the middle class. The categories non-manual owner and non-manual tenant are included to provide a comparison group.

It is immediately evident from the table that the percentage differences in self-assessed class between the two non-manual categories are less significant than the percentage differences between manual owners and manual tenants. Manual owners are almost one-third as likely again to see themselves as being 'middle class', compared with manual tenants. On the other hand there are no significant differences between the non-manual tenant and owner samples.

The next table is a check on the previous relationship. If manual owners are better educated than manual tenants, then in conformity with the theories of Milne and Mitchell it could be suggested that the distribution in Table 8 is a spurious reflection of the association between education and class identification rather than between tenure and class identification in the case of manual workers.
TABLE TEN: EDUCATION BY TENURE/OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 OR MORE YEARS SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN THREE YEARS SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 42)</td>
<td>(N = 67)</td>
<td>(N = 28)</td>
<td>(N = 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramér's $v = .19$</td>
<td>Gamma = .19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potentially there were a number of different ways in which education and the variable which combines tenure and occupation might have been associated. The descriptive data collected on both the state and private samples were inconsistent. State owners were younger than state tenants on average, while private tenants were typically younger than private owners. The hypothesis I put forward to be tested in Table 10 was that manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to have had three or more years secondary education. If manual owners were not only more likely to place themselves in the middle class, to be in receipt of higher incomes, and were also better educated, then the likelihood that they would be less consistent in their support of the Labour Party than manual tenants would tend to be further strengthened. However the hypothesis that manual owners were better educated than manual tenants was not supported, as can be seen from Table 10. Manual tenants were almost one third more likely again than manual owners to have had three or more years secondary education. There were no significant differences between the non-manual owner and tenant samples. When non-manual owners and tenants are compared with manual owners they are almost half as likely again to have had three or more...

13. While state owners were younger than state tenants and typically better educated the situation in the private housing market was reversed and private tenants were younger than private owners and typically better educated. However while the age and education differences in the private sample were significant they were not in the state sample.
years secondary education.

TABLE ELEVEN: INCOME BY TENURE/OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6000 OR MORE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN $6000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[N = 42] [N = 67] [N = 28] [N = 24]

Cramer's v = .33 Gamma = -.52 p < .01

The primary hypothesis to be tested in Table 11 is that manual owners were more likely to be in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants, and this hypothesis was supported in the table. Manual owners were almost half as likely again to be in receipt of incomes exceeding $6000 when compared with manual tenants. There were no differences of any significance between non-manual owners and non-manual tenants. Thus, there are several findings of interest in Tables 9-11. While Mitchell (1969) argues that homeownership in the suburbs is part of what it means to be middle class, he emphasised that education, rather than homeownership, is the primary mode of integration into the mainstream of middle class society. Tables 10 and 11 give some support for the Mitchell argument but the relationships implied in the three tables are complex rather than simple. Non-manual workers, whether homeowners or tenants, are half as likely again, compared with manual owners, to have had three or more years secondary education but the difference between non-manual workers and manual tenants is less marked [see Table 10].

While it could be suggested that educational differences reinforce the occupational differences between manual and non-manual workers and perhaps act against the integration of manual homeowners into the mainstream of middle class society, support for Mitchell's 'education hypothesis' seems to be less forthcoming when manual owners and tenants are compared.
There is the suggestion in Tables 9 and 10 that homeownership is more important than education in the class identifications of manual workers since, even though manual tenants are typically better educated than manual owners, manual tenants are less likely than manual owners to place themselves in the middle class. Furthermore, Table 11 indicates that manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to be in receipt of higher incomes. However, the implications for the embourgeoisement thesis are not straightforward. Manual homeowners are more likely to see themselves as middle class, compared with manual tenants, but the relationship is not very strong. Furthermore, even though manual owners are more likely to see themselves as middle class, and are also more likely to be in receipt of higher incomes, can middle class identifications be attributed to the supposed "affluence" of this group? Table 7 suggested that income and class identification were not strongly related, so can it therefore be assumed that manual workers on higher incomes who own the most important consumer durable of all [a house] place themselves in the middle class because they are "affluent" and, even if this is the case, does this mean that they are "bourgeois" politically?

The embourgeoisement thesis contends that "affluent" manual workers [those in receipt of higher incomes and who are owner-occupiers living home-centred lives] will be less likely to vote for the Labour Party and more likely to vote for parties of the 'right'. Both Milne (1966) and Mitchell (1969) put forward this embourgeoisement theme in New Zealand, when they predict dire consequences for the Labour Party, which is seen as being "for the working class", while many of the party's traditional supporters see themselves as being middle class. In other words, they are suggesting that a middle class identification is inconsistent with Labour voting. As growing numbers of manual workers adopt middle class lifestyles and buy their own homes, the assumption is that Labour's support will progressively decline. Thus in Table 12 I have tested the hypothesis that manual homeowners are less likely than manual tenants to have voted consistently for the Labour Party.
### TABLE TWELVE: VOTE IN 3 ELECTIONS BY TENURE/OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[N = 36]</td>
<td>[N = 64]</td>
<td>[N = 26]</td>
<td>[N = 24]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $\nu = \gamma = .44 \quad p < .01$

As can be seen from inspection of the table, there is equally as much support for the alternative hypothesis - that manual owners were more likely than manual tenants to have consistently supported the Labour Party rather than to have opposed it. In other words, manual owners were more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being middle class (Table 9) but seeing themselves as middle class does not translate into a lower likelihood of consistent Labour voting.

There is little support for the "affluence" hypothesis in Table 12, at least in its political manifestation, suggesting that either the embourgeoisement thesis is inadequate, or that operationalising the concept of economic affluence by means of worker homeownership is unsatisfactory, even though manual homeowners were typically in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants. Nordlinger (1967), and Goldthorpe et.al. in the Luton study employed several measures of affluence in addition to income and homeownership, and two of the Goldthorpe et.al. measures were incorporated into my questionnaire. Income and homeownership may not be good measures of economic affluence because they take no account of the financial commitments linked with housing costs and the different stages of the family life cycle. In the Papanui sample almost all manual homeowners headed family households at the child rearing stage of the family life cycle, but less than two-thirds of the manual tenants headed households in the child rearing stage. Consequently, the measure of financial position 'relative to others', used by Goldthorpe et.al., is likely
to have been a more accurate index of the relative 'affluence' of manual workers in the Papanui sample. In accordance with the differences in income between manual owners and tenants, I put forward the hypothesis that manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to see their financial standing relative to others in the neighbourhood as being 'above average'.

TABLE THIRTEEN: RELATIVE FINANCIAL STANDING BY TENURE/OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE AVERAGE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW AVERAGE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[N = 42]</td>
<td>[N = 67]</td>
<td>[N = 28]</td>
<td>[N = 24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $v = .29$  Gamma $= .34$  $p < .01$

The hypothesis is clearly not supported from the distribution in Table 13. Manual tenants were almost twice as likely as were manual owners to see their relative financial standing as being 'above average', while manual owners were significantly more likely than all other groups, including manual tenants, to see their relative financial standing as being no better than average. Non-manual owners were almost three times more likely than manual owners to have seen their relative financial standing as being 'above average' (Gamma is fairly weak at .34, which suggests that there is a moderate tendency for perceived financial standing to increase as the independent variable 'increases' in the direction of the non-manual owner).

One further approach to studying economic affluence is to test the hypothesis that manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to have perceived improvements in their general standard of living over the previous five year period.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) This question, and the 'relative financial standing' question, involved slight reformulation of Goldthorpe et. al., questions used to measure these same dimensions. (see Goldthorpe et. al., 1968 : 46)
TABLE FOURTEEN: PERCEIVED STANDARD OF LIVING CHANGES BY TENURE/OCCUPATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL TENANT</th>
<th>NON-MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTNATIAL IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 42)</td>
<td>(N = 67)</td>
<td>(N = 28)</td>
<td>(N = 24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $v = .11$  
Gamma = -.10  
p < .01

The hypothesis once again is not supported. Manual owners were more likely than any other of the groups to have believed that there had been no improvement in their standard of living in the previous five year period. They were also less likely than manual tenants to have believed that there have been at least some improvements, and more likely to have believed that there have been no improvements in their standard of living. The degree of association and directionality of the distribution is slight even if the distribution is statistically significant.

If manual homeowners are less well educated than manual tenants, less likely than manual tenants to see their relative financial standing as being "above average", but more likely than manual tenants to be consistent Labour Party supporters, why are they more likely than manual tenants to place themselves in the middle class? If the theoretical thrust of the housing class thesis is valid in New Zealand, and the importance Johnston (1973) attributes to the mode of access to housing and the physical location of housing in particular neighbourhoods suggests that it is, then class identifications may be less closely linked with tenure than with modes of access to housing and the meanings occupants attach to their housing situations as a consequence. On the other hand, if the theories of Jackson (1973), Mitchell (1969) and to some extent, Bedggood (1976) are correct, there will still be an association between homeownership and class identification even when mode of access is controlled.

Thus, the first of these hypotheses, to be tested in Table 15,
is that respondents in the private housing market are more likely than respondents in the state housing market to place themselves in the middle class.

**TABLE FIFTEEN: SELF-RATED CLASS BY HOUSING SITUATION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATE SAMPLE</th>
<th>PRIVATE SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 97)</td>
<td>(N = 104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Phi = .23 \quad \Gamma = .66 \quad \text{Somer’s D} = .37 \quad p < .01 \]

The hypothesis is supported by the distribution in the table. Respondents in the private housing situation are almost twice as likely as respondents in the state housing situation to see themselves as middle class and, conversely, respondents in the private housing situation are only half as likely as respondents in the state housing situation to see themselves as working class.

If on the other hand, the theories of Jackson (1973), Mitchell (1969), Bedggood (1976) and Sir Keith Holyoake (1969) are valid, then the relationship between class identification and tenure will persist when mode of access is controlled.

**TABLE SIXTEEN: SELF-RATED CLASS BY HOUSING SITUATION/TENURE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TENANT</th>
<th>PRIVATE TENANT</th>
<th>STATE HOMEOWNER</th>
<th>PRIVATE HOMEOWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE CLASS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CLASS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 48)</td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
<td>(N = 55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Cramer’s v} = .23 \quad \Gamma = .20 \quad p < .01 \]

Thus, the hypothesis to be tested in Table 16 is that respondents in the homeownership housing situation, irrespective of whether they are in the 'private' or 'state' markets, are more likely
to place themselves in the middle class than are tenants in either of the two housing markets.

The hypothesis as it stands has two assumptions directly taken from the theories of Jackson [1973], the Hon. J. Sullivan [1950] and Sir Keith Holyoake, National's Prime Minister in 1969. Firstly, if tenure is important as one aspect of what it means to be 'middle class', which is at least partly independent of the means of egress into owner-occupancy, then homeowners will interpret homeownership to mean that they have a stake in the middle class mainstream.

Secondly if homeownership per se is important as part of what it means to be middle class, then there should also be significant differences between samples which vary independently of the two modes of access to housing. In Table 16 it can be seen that there are statistically significant differences between the samples, the measure of association is real but not very strong and Gamma, though in the right direction, is weak. The obvious housing group that is out of phase (if we assume housing situation is a variable having ordinal values) is the state owner group. Private tenants were almost half as likely again, compared with state owners, to place themselves in the middle class. However, while the percentage differences between private tenants seeing themselves as middle class and private owners seeing themselves as middle class are slight, the percentage difference between state owners and state tenants seeing themselves as middle class is a little more marked. To the extent that middle class identification on the part of state owners translates into a greater likelihood of not voting consistently Labour, then there is some limited support for the theory of the Hon. J. Sullivan, but the significance of differences within the state sample must also be qualified in terms of the respective modes of access

15. The ranking of the independent variable from state tenant at the 'low' end to private homeowner at the 'high' end reflects this assumption. State homeowners, it is assumed from this hypothesis, will feel that they have overcome the stigma which I have claimed to be attached to the occupancy of a state rental house.
which differentiate between the state and private housing situations. Private homeowners are half as likely again, compared with state owners, to see themselves as middle class and the percentage difference between the two housing situations is slightly more marked than the percentage differences in self-rated class between the state owner and state tenant samples. There is a relatively strong indication that a more meaningful way to categorise the table would be to recognise that while tenants and owners within the private housing situation have a great deal in common, there are significant differences both between the private and state housing situations and between owners and tenants within the latter. In other words, the distribution within Table 16 indicates that there is a need for a separate analysis of owners and tenants within the state sample. [This analysis is included in an appendix].

There is some support in the distribution of data in Tables 15 and 16 for the suggestion that class identifications are more closely linked with modes of access to housing than with tenure. The relationship implied in Table 15 is much stronger than the relationship between class identification and tenure which appears in Table 8. In the discussion of Table 8 I suggested that to the extent that the "objective" measures of socio-economic status are salient in determining self-assigned class placements then homeownership may only be relevant to class identifications in those specific instances implied in Tables 9 and 16. Since many homeowners are manual workers and many tenants are non-manual workers, tenure may not be a particularly strong index of socio-economic status "objectively" measured. The distributions of data in both Tables 15 and 16 suggest that mode of access to housing may have an impact on class identifications which at least in part is independent of socio-economic status.

The next hypothesis seeks to test the logical political extension of the housing class theme discussed by Rex and Moore and is perhaps relevant to an understanding of the link between class identification and housing identified in the Robb and Carr Porirua survey [1969]. Rex and Moore
suggested that those served by, or aspiring to homeownership within the private market, would tend to identify their interests with parties of the 'right' which champion the property-owning democracy, while the residents of public rental estates would tend to support the parties of the left promoting a 'social service' approach to housing access. Thus, it is hypothesised that respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to have consistently supported parties other than Labour.

**TABLE SEVENTEEN: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY MODE OF ACCESS TO HOUSING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATE %</th>
<th>PRIVATE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 97\] \[N = 104\]

Cramer's v = .23 Gamma = .65 Somer's D = .46 \(p < .01\)

The hypothesis is strongly supported. Respondents in the private market are almost five times more likely than respondents in the state market to have consistently voted for parties other than Labour. Conversely, respondents in the state market were twice as likely as respondents in the private market to be consistent Labour supporters. The relationship is clearly directional, as indicated by the Gamma of .65 and the Somer's D of .46. Again, if we assume mode of access (the independent variable) to have ordinal values, with 'private' being higher than state, then as mode of access 'increases' so does the likelihood of not voting Labour. In Tables 9 and 16 it was shown that manual homeowners and owners within the state market were more likely than manual tenants and state tenants respectively.
to place themselves in the middle class.\textsuperscript{16} If mode of access is important in political terms, rather than class identification through homeownership, then it should also be true that respondents in the private market are more likely to vote consistently other than Labour, compared with respondents in the state market, irrespective of tenure. A test of this hypothesis is provided in Table 18.

### TABLE EIGHTEEN: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY MODE OF ACCESS TO HOUSING BY TENURE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATE TENANT</th>
<th>STATE OWNER</th>
<th>PRIVATE TENANT</th>
<th>PRIVATE OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 48)</td>
<td>(N = 48)</td>
<td>(N = 38)</td>
<td>(N = 54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $v = .23$  Gamma = .17  $p < .01$

The hypothesis is quite strongly supported in Table 18. Respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to consistently support parties other than Labour, even though half of the state owner sample placed themselves in the middle class as shown in Table 16. The similarities in the voting behaviour of

---

\textsuperscript{16} Manual homeowners and state homeowners are not quite the same thing, particularly given the theoretical contexts within which each group is being compared with manual tenants and state tenants respectively. Not all the state homeowners were manual workers and many manual homeowners were not in the state market. While many state tenants were manual workers the majority were welfare recipients and if the local context of experience has any relevance to attitudes and behaviour, as I suggest it has in the comparison of state tenants and state owners included in an appendix, there are sound reasons for making the distinction I have made.
respondents in each of the markets respectively outweigh
the differences between owners and tenants within each
market. Private owners were almost five times more likely
and private tenants were three times more likely than
either state owners or state tenants, to have voted
consistently for parties other than Labour. The phenomenon
of state owners seeing themselves as middle class does not
translate into any significant tendency to a lower likelihood
of Labour voting, as the theory of the Hon. J. Sullivan
suggested it might. In the case of state owners there is
no evidence to suggest that a middle class identification
is inconsistent with Labour voting as Milne (1966) and
Mitchell (1969) contended would be the case.

The only qualifications to the support for the hypothesis
implied in the table are that private owners are more likely
than private tenants to have consistently supported parties
other than Labour and private tenants are more likely than
any other group to fall within the 'mixed vote' category.
It is however possible, that manual homeowners, hidden in
the private owner category of Table 18, do register a lower
likelihood of Labour voting than respondents in the state
market and, if this is the case the tendency may be
consistent with the middle class identifications of manual
homeowners, though evidently not for those in the state
market. Occupation was the "objective" measure of socio-
economic status most closely associated with vote in the
test of hypotheses 1-3. The test of hypothesis 19 provides
a check on the contention that modes of access to housing
are not entirely a spurious reflection of the operation of
socio-economic status, since manual homeowners were typically
less well educated than manual tenants and income did not
appear to be closely associated with voting behaviour.

Thus, it is hypothesised than manual homeowners in the
private market are less likely than manual homeowners in
the state market to be consistent supporters of the Labour
Party.
TABLE NINETEEN: VOTE IN THREE ELECTIONS BY MODE OF ACCESS TO HOUSING BY MANUAL HOMEOWNERSHIP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STATE MANUAL OWNER</th>
<th>PRIVATE MANUAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY NON-LABOUR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED VOTE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENTLY LABOUR</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 43)</td>
<td>(N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's v = .28  Gamma = -.54  Somer's D = -.35  p = .01

The distribution in Table 19 offers some support for the hypothesis as stated. 'Private' homeowners are less than half as likely as 'state' manual homeowners to have consistently supported the Labour Party. The direction of Gamma and Somer's D imply that the more appropriate way to state the hypothesis is to say that manual homeowners in the state sample are more likely than manual homeowners in the private sample to be consistent supporters of the Labour Party. The Table does not imply that manual homeowners in the private sample are significantly more likely than manual homeowners in the state sample to have consistently supported other than Labour, but the high proportion of the former group in the 'mixed vote' category suggests that manual homeowners in the private sample are more likely to be 'changers'.

17. There is admittedly, a weak tendency in this direction but the case numbers are small, too small to make any clear statement on the basis of the percentage difference.
Summary of results:

Hypothesis 1 : Non-manual workers are more likely than manual workers to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party.
  Hypothesis quite strongly supported.

Hypothesis 2 : Respondents with three or more years secondary education are more likely than respondents with less than three years secondary education to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party.
  Hypothesis quite strongly supported.

Hypothesis 3 : Respondents currently in receipt of gross annual incomes in excess of $6,000 are more likely than respondents with incomes of less than $6,000 to have consistently supported parties other than the Labour Party.
  Hypothesis supported only moderately; alternative hypothesis suggested.

Hypothesis 4 : Respondents placing themselves in the middle class are more likely than respondents placing themselves in the working class to have voted consistently for parties other than the Labour Party.
  Hypothesis strongly supported.

Hypothesis 5 : Non-manual workers are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are manual workers.
  Hypothesis supported only moderately; alternative hypothesis suggested.
Hypothesis 6 : Respondents with three or more years of secondary education are more likely to see themselves as belonging to the middle class than respondents with less than three years secondary education.

Hypothesis supported only moderately; alternative hypothesis suggested.

Hypothesis 7 : Respondents in receipt of incomes exceeding $6,000 are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than are respondents with incomes below $6,000.

Hypothesis only weakly supported.

Hypothesis 8 : Respondents in the homeownership housing situation are more likely than tenants to place themselves in the middle class.

Hypothesis supported only moderately.

Hypothesis 9 : Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to place themselves in the middle class.

Hypothesis supported only moderately.

Hypothesis 10 : Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to have had three or more years secondary education.

Hypothesis rejected.

Hypothesis 11 : Manual homeowners are more likely than manual tenants to be in receipt of incomes exceeding $6,000.

Hypothesis quite strongly supported.

Hypothesis 12 : Manual homeowners are less likely than manual tenants to have voted consistently for the Labour Party.

Hypothesis rejected: alternative hypothesis suggested.
Hypothesis 13 : Manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to see their financial standing relative to others in the neighbourhood as being 'above average'.
   Hypothesis rejected.

Hypothesis 14 : Manual owners are more likely than manual tenants to have perceived improvements in their general standard of living over the previous five year period.
   Hypothesis rejected.

Hypothesis 15 : Respondents in the private housing market are more likely than respondents in the state housing market to place themselves in the middle class.
   Hypothesis quite strongly supported.

Hypothesis 16 : Respondents in the homeownership housing situation, irrespective of whether they are in the private or state markets, are more likely to place themselves in the middle class than tenants in either of these two markets.
   Hypothesis rejected: alternative hypothesis suggested.

Hypothesis 17 : Respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to have consistently supported parties other than Labour.
   Hypothesis strongly supported.

Hypothesis 18 : Respondents in the private market are more likely than respondents in the state market to vote consistently other than Labour, irrespective of tenure.
   Hypothesis quite strongly supported.
Hypothesis 19: Manual homeowners in the private market are less likely than manual homeowners in the state market to be consistent supporters of the Labour Party.

Hypothesis quite strongly supported.
Conclusion.

CLASS IDENTIFICATION AND VOTING BEHAVIOUR IN PAPANUI: THE EVIDENCE ASSESSED.

As will be recalled from the arguments presented in the first and second chapters, the claim that the spheres of production and consumption are becoming increasingly separate is central to the ongoing debate about the changing nature of socio-political behaviour in contemporary liberal-capitalist societies. Some theorists inspired by Marx's political analysis emphasise that persisting contrasts in the work and social relationships of manual and non-manual workers continue to be salient in the shaping of socio-political attitudes and behaviour, while others suggest that changes in the consumption patterns of some manual workers have created 'class marginals', whose attitudes and behaviour are allegedly less constrained by their subordinate position in the labour market. While Seymour Martin Lipset (1967) argues that class conflicts have become institutionalised in the two-party political systems of modern economically developed democracies (we have a 'democratic translation of the class struggle'), he acknowledges the existence of significant deviations in the patterns of political behaviour expected from a class, or socio-economic status explanation of party support.

In New Zealand, the Lipset model of party support has been applied by Milne (1966), and themes present within the embourgeoisement thesis receive recognition in the writings of Jackson (1973), Mitchell (1969) and Bedggood (1976). While Lipset suggests that the single most impressive fact about party support in the modern two-party democratic state is that lower-income groups vote mainly for parties of the left while higher-income groups vote mainly for parties of the right, Milne and Mitchell argue that education and occupation are the two "objective" measures of socio-economic status most closely associated with party support in New Zealand.

The initial data analysis from the Papanui study offers limited support for the theories of Milne and Mitchell.
Of the three "objective" measures of class position, occupation was the most closely associated with party support. Non-manual workers were three times more likely than manual workers to be consistent supporters of parties other than the Labour Party. However, education [operationalised by years of secondary education] was somewhat less closely associated with party support than occupation and there was little evidence to suggest that respondents in receipt of higher incomes are significantly more likely than respondents in receipt of lower incomes to consistently support parties other than Labour. Milne and Mitchell appear to have applied the Lipset model correctly to New Zealand in downplaying the significance of income differences and party support.

One of the most significant findings of the Papanui study was that self-rated class proved to be much more closely associated with party support than any of the three "objective" measures of class position. Since the association between party support and self-rated class could not be simply attributed to the association of self-rated class with the three "objective" measures of class position, the need to test additional hypotheses to 'explain' different class identifications was clearly required. Well over half of the respondents in manual occupations and more than half of the respondents with less than three years secondary education saw themselves as being middle class, which suggested that a middle class identification may in part be linked with attributes associated with both the embourgeoisement and housing class theses.

Since class identifications were not that strongly associated with education, several criticisms of the Milne and Mitchell theories of the role of education in the integration of the middle class mainstream of society can be offered. For Milne and Mitchell, education is believed to be the primary mechanism of integration into the middle class mainstream of New Zealand society because it is essentially through educational achievements that the opportunities of occupational mobility and hence higher incomes are opened up. Milne and Mitchell link education to
an identification with the middle class mainstream of New Zealand society because they assume that educational achievements imply both aspiration to, and attainment of, the success goals of middle class culture. Educational achievements may imply aspiration to the success goals of the middle class mainstream of society but educational achievement was not a necessary condition of middle class identification, and from the Papanui study it appears that educational achievement will not always be a sufficient condition of middle class identification since almost one-fifth of the respondents with three or more years secondary education did not see themselves as being 'middle class'. Logically, occupation could be expected to be more closely associated with a middle class identification because in one sense education is little more than one mechanism through which access to occupational mobility can be realised but, as has already been noted, while the great majority of non-manual workers saw themselves as being middle class, so did more than half of the manual workers in the Papanui study. Middle class identification was closely associated with not voting Labour, but these middle class identifications were not simply a spurious reflection of occupational and educational differences.

Some of the alternative theories offered to 'explain' identifications with the middle class mainstream of society in New Zealand have a close affinity with the embourgeoisement thesis. The Hon. J. Sullivan, Sir Keith Holyoake, Professor Jackson, Bedggood and Mitchell suggest that suburban homeownership is part of what it means to belong to the 'respectable' middle class mainstream of New Zealand society. According to Jackson, the suburban home is an essential ingredient in the middle class respectability which characterises New Zealanders, and Bedggood suggests that for many, dissatisfying work may be more than compensated for by status consumption in which the pleasures of home life and the folk fetish of suburban owner-occupancy figure prominently. Since the suburban homeowners referred to include many manual workers, the increasing separation of the spheres of home and industry (consumption and production)
would seem to be one of the important assumptions underpinning the theories of all five authors. Though middle class identifications and homeownership were associated in the Papanui study, the association was not a particularly strong one. If self-rated class position was nothing more than a spurious reflection of socio-economic status or 'class' "objectively" defined, and access to homeownership was purely a translation of advantages in the labour market, a much stronger association between class identification and tenure could have been expected. The data analysis suggested that manual and non-manual workers were present in significant numbers among both the rental and owner-occupier populations, but while tenure did not seem to be significantly associated with the middle class identifications of non-manual workers, manual workers who "owned" homes were more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being middle class.

As I suggested in the concluding section of the previous chapter, in a property owning democracy in which almost three in every four household heads "owns" the dwelling they occupy, access to suburban homeownership may be taken for granted, except perhaps in the case of manual workers. Since the manual workers in owner-occupied dwellings were typically less well educated than manual tenants, there is a strong suggestion that owner-occupancy for manual workers may be a more important factor in explaining the tendency of this group to identify with the middle class than their educational position, the reverse of what we might have inferred from the theories of Milne and Mitchell. The difference in the likelihood of middle class identification on the part of manual homeowners and manual tenants was of almost equal significance to the difference between manual and non-manual workers when the class identification/tenure relationship was controlled by occupation. There was little evidence to suggest that manual homeowners were more likely than manual tenants to place themselves in the middle class because they were 'affluent' as the embourgeoisement thesis would have it. Manual homeowners were in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants.
but their financial commitments appear to have been greater. Manual homeowners were only half as likely as manual tenants to see their financial standing relative to others in the neighbourhood as being "above average", and they were significantly more likely than non-manual tenants, non-manual owners, and manual tenants to have perceived no improvements in their standard of living over the previous five year period.

The embourgeoisement thesis is only supported to the extent that manual homeowners were more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being "middle class", but their middle class identification could hardly be attributable to their "affluence". The Papanui study therefore, offers only limited support to the theories of Sullivan, Jackson, Holyoake, Bedggood and Mitchell.

According to Runciman [1964], a middle class identification on the part of manual workers can be taken to mean that in some minimal sense, this particular group feels detached from the mainstream of the working class. To the extent that middle class identifications on the part of manual homeowners in the Papanui study mean at least this much, there is a limited degree of support for the embourgeoisement thesis, certainly more than Goldthorpe et al. suggested was likely to be the case following their Luton study. There were some indications from comments made in the interviews that homeownership was perceived to be an aspect of middle class status. Some comments, from state tenants in particular, were extremely negative and referred to manual homeowners as 'those two-bob Tories who really haven't got two pennies to rub together but like to feel that they have'. One state tenant living adjacent to a government sub-division of owner-occupied dwellings criticised the homeowners for 'looking down on her', since after all, the only difference she could see between their situation and hers was that they were paying off a government mortgage while she was paying rent to the government.

The embourgeoisement thesis as presented by Butler and Rose [1960] and as criticised by Goldthorpe et al. has a logical
political extension. 'Affluent' manual workers who "own" the most important consumer durable of all - a house - are not only claimed to be more likely to see themselves as middle class; they are also claimed to be less likely to support the Labour Party. This theme is taken up by both Milne and Mitchell and applied within New Zealand. Both authors appear to accept the Templeton and Eunson thesis that the National Party is the party of the middle class status quo, but they take the argument further than Templeton and Eunson and suggest that the future of the Labour Party is in jeopardy because while most people are believed to identify the Labour Party with the interests of the 'working class' (those less well integrated into the middle class mainstream of society), an increasing number of Labour's traditional supporters are believed to be coming to see themselves as middle class. The assumption that a middle class identification on the part of manual workers is inconsistent with support of the Labour Party is implicit within the arguments of both authors, but there is little evidence from the Papanui study to suggest that manual homeowners, who were more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being 'middle class', are any more likely to be politically 'bourgeois'. While manual homeowners were more likely than manual tenants to see themselves as being middle class, seeing themselves as middle class did not translate into a lower likelihood of consistent Labour voting and yet, subject to certain qualifications, it should have translated into a lower likelihood of Labour voting if the embourgeoisement thesis has any validity, even if manual homeowners are not "affluent".

The housing class thesis differs from the embourgeoisement thesis in that the competition for housing as a scarce resource and modes of access to housing that lead to "market" interests are emphasised, rather than "affluence" and the sphere of consumption, but in some important respects the differences between the two theses appear to be those of degree rather than kind. Giddens (1973) emphasised that "distributive groupings", characterised by different access to housing mortgages and a different physical location in
the city, were an important component of class structuration. Johnston (1973) presents a similar argument in New Zealand, though there is no explicit mention of the role of the different groups in the housing market and the ways in which they might cut across, or reinforce the loyalties of class forged in the labour market. While Rex and Moore acknowledge that "housing classes" are in some way related to classes in the labour market, they fail to clearly specify the terms of this relationship and this failure leaves a crucial weakness in the housing class model, which when pursued suggests that the housing class and embourgeoisement theses are not so dissimilar after all.

It will be recalled that in their presentation of the housing class thesis, Rex and Moore suggest that those who accept the rules of the competition for homeownership within the 'property-owning democracy' [the private housing market] will tend to identify their interests with the liberal capitalist status quo and the parties of the 'right' supporting homeownership as an extension of the property-owning political system. Urban residents who secure access to housing through the state market, on the other hand, are believed to support parties of the 'left' which have emphasised a 'social service' policy towards housing, including the provision of rental dwellings. We are told that this is what the struggle between capitalism and socialism means to urban residents engaged in the competition for the scarce resource of housing. That the loyalties of the competition for housing cut across the lines of class division in the labour market is clear. Rex and Moore noted the presence of working class Birmingham residents at meetings of the Conservative Party and these manual homeowners, as they appear to have been, were greatly concerned with the protection of their property values. Furthermore, it is suggested that "housing classes" will become more salient as home and industry become more separate, in other words a distinction is recognised between the spheres of production and consumption which presumably, in some measure, refers to the respective positions in each sphere in which manual workers find themselves. If urban residents
including many manual workers, aspire to property ownership in the private market and accept the values of the liberal capitalist system, what else can they be but "bourgeois" in a similar sense to that intended within the embourgeoisement thesis? While the embourgeoisement thesis emphasises 'affluence' and the consumption of housing, the housing class model emphasises modes of access to housing and the interests in the housing market which attend access by one or the other modes. Even then, the groups in the competition for housing, which presumably include many 'affluent' manual workers, are ultimately competing for the most desirable form of housing consumption, which Rex and Moore suggest is suburban owner-occupancy. Rex and Moore were unable to find any fully-fledged "housing classes", and they raise the possibility that in those urban settings in which the privileged position of those who have succeeded in the housing competition is seen to be legitimate, "housing classes" may be replaced by a hierarchy of 'status groups'. Again, to the extent that manual workers are present in the competition, and to the extent that they identify their interests with the liberal capitalist status quo when they are competing to enter suburban homeownership, what else could the formation of 'status groups' and the coincidence of interests with the liberal capitalist status quo involve but aspiration to and the emulation of middle class lifestyles, in short, a middle class identification as embodied within the embourgeoisement thesis?

The findings of the Papanui study offer some evidence which tentatively suggests that the mode of access to housing is relevant to both the class identifications and voting behaviour of manual workers, but not non-manual workers. Respondents in the private housing market are almost twice as likely as respondents in the state housing market to see themselves as middle class, and this association in some measure cuts across the tenure distinction, since 'private' tenants were more likely than both tenants and homeowners in the state market and almost as likely as 'private' homeowners to see themselves as middle class.
However, if mode of access was the only factor of importance there would have been no reason to expect 'state' homeowners to be significantly more likely than state tenants to see themselves as being middle class. Perhaps Rex and Moore did not consider the implications of suburban homeownership within the context of the state market, and instead assumed that suburban homeownership was confined to the 'property owning democracy' in the 'private' market. However, while state owners who were predominantly manual workers were more likely than state tenants to see themselves as middle class, their class identifications did not translate into a significantly lower likelihood of Labour voting. Mode of access to housing was closely associated with voting despite the phenomenon of middle class identification on the part of many state homeowners and even a few state tenants. Respondents in the private market are almost five times more likely than respondents in the state market to have consistently supported parties other than Labour. Even though this relationship may in some measure be a spurious reflection of the "objective" class measures, it was demonstrated that manual homeowners in the private housing market were only half as likely as manual homeowners in the state housing market to have consistently supported the Labour Party. Over two-thirds of the 'private' manual homeowners had not voted consistently for the Labour Party, though rather than meaning that they voted consistently other than Labour, this generally meant that they had far less stable voting histories and had voted for the Labour Party and one of the other parties (in nearly all cases the National Party) during the course of three elections. On the other hand, two-thirds of the state manual owners were consistent Labour supporters.

Middle class identifications within the state and private housing markets may well have meant different things as the difference in voting behaviour suggests. State owners who were almost all manual workers, were more "affluent" than state tenants in both "subjective" and "objective" terms, they were typically younger and better educated than state tenants, and they were more likely to see work relationships in consensus terms, but even though
they were more likely than state tenants to see themselves as middle class, they were not significantly less likely to be consistent Labour supporters. The reasons for their voting behaviour did not differ appreciably from those given by state tenants and gave rise to an interesting 'inconsistency'. While state owners were more likely to see themselves as "middle class" they were almost as likely as state tenants to have given 'class' reasons for their voting choice. 'My family has always been Labour' and even the suggestion that 'the Labour Party is the party of the working man', was often mentioned. It may be that a middle class identification in the state sample means little more than a claim to 'respectability' in the sense recognised by Stacey in the Banbury study. Perhaps, as Keller suggested in a similar observation, people do classify themselves on the basis of traits, activities, and values salient to their particular environment. When the setting is confined, finer status gradations may be made.

Manual homeowners in the private housing market, on the other hand, were quite different. They were typically older than manual tenants, less well educated, and although they were typically in receipt of higher incomes than manual tenants, they were not "affluent" in the subjective sense (measured by their self-ratings of standard of living changes and financial standing relative to others in the neighbourhood). Perhaps in their case, middle class identifications have the meaning Mitchell chose to attribute to such an identification i.e., they may have felt integrated into the middle class mainstream of society, they may have felt that they had worked and saved, that they had succeeded by their own efforts and hence they may have felt 'established'. In seeking security for their families through owner-occupancy, they may have seen their personal advancement and that of their family in 'individualistic' rather than work-centred and collective terms. In Marxist terminology, we might tentatively suggest that they felt they had something to 'secure and fortify', and the reasons given for their voting behaviour would tend to suggest that this was the case. Some spoke of the 'freedom of the individual', the 'messing up' of the economy (by Labour), the 'tendency of the Labour
Party to be too easily swayed by the demands of pressure groups'. Others stressed the 'lack of difference' between the parties, and still others spoke about the need for 'effective political leadership'. Even for those who did vote Labour, there is the suggestion that their voting behaviour was instrumental rather than class-linked, for while a small number gave class reasons the majority gave reasons which emphasised that the support they offered one party or the other was above all conditional, in much the same sense as Goldthorpe et al. found in their Luton study.

The Papanui study was based on only one limited population and the selection of this particular locality was made to represent conditions under which both the embourgeoisement and housing class theses might have conceivably had some relevance to political attitudes and behaviour. In New Zealand we may well have a diluted version of the 'democratic translation of the class struggle'. If the Papanui findings can be generalised, the variations in voting patterns from an orthodox class model may be attributable to the structural complexity of New Zealand society. Marx recognised that there would be deviations from his model of political behaviour (though he believed these would ultimately disappear). Weber emphasised that the likelihood of class behaviour would depend on the extent to which the connections between the causes and consequences of economic subordination were more or less transparent. Lipset acknowledged that in structurally complex societies, individuals may well be subjected to a variety of pressures and experiences with different and conflicting political consequences. The relationship between the "objective" and "subjective" aspects of class is perhaps destined to bedevil sociologists and political scientists for the foreseeable future. There will always be some, in particular within the less privileged strata of society, who define their position in the class structure in ways which do not accord with the "objective" criteria of some sociologically preconceived stratification system whether Marxist or Weberian in origin. The Papanui Findings suggest that in some sense people do attach meanings to the way in which they are housed, and in some specific instances these meanings do appear to be associated with their class identifications and the way they behave politically.
APPENDIX 1
TO THE HOUSEHOLDER:

Survey of Households in Papanui

As part of a research programme in Papanui the Psychology and Sociology Department is undertaking a household survey. All addresses have been drawn by random techniques; thus the selection of your address is by chance alone.

In addition to the collection of statistical information on length of occupancy, ages, family structure, tenancies and ownership, the survey will compile data on a number of general social and political attitudes.

All questionnaires will be treated in strict confidence. Access to the questionnaires is restricted to the three people conducting the research programme and all findings will be presented in the form of broad patterns and trends summarising the responses of large numbers of people thereby ensuring the protection of information offered voluntarily by individuals in the questionnaire.

It is likely that an interviewer will call within the next few days. Your co-operation in answering the questionnaire would be greatly appreciated. It is expected that the interview will take approximately ten to fifteen minutes.

Yours sincerely,

G.K. Thorns
Teaching Fellow in Sociology
PAPANUI HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

First of all, I would like to ask you a few questions concerning your housing situation.

1. How long have you lived here in this house/flat?
   - less than one year
   - one to three years
   - four to six years
   - seven to ten years
   - more than ten years

2. How long do you think you will stay here?
   - less than one year
   - one to three years
   - four to six years
   - seven to ten years
   - more than ten years

3.[a] Do you rent or own this house/flat?
   - rent
   - own
   - other
   - specify

3.[b] Do you think that people who own their own homes are any different from tenants/people in rented dwellings?
   - yes
   - no

If YES, in what ways do you think they differ? [specify]

If the respondent rents dwelling:

4.[a] Have you owned a house/Flat/dwelling of any description in the last five years?
   - yes
   - no
4. (b)  Do you expect to buy or build a house/dwelling in the next three years or so?

   yes ☐   no ☐

4. (c)  If yes to 4 (b) - what measures have you taken towards buying or building a home?

   specify ____________________________

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

If the respondent owns dwelling/house:

5. (a)  Do you think that your outlook on life has changed in any significant way since becoming a homeowner?

   yes ☐   no ☐

   If yes - in what ways? specify ____________________________

   ____________________________

5. (b)  Do you, for example, vote differently in local and national elections now that you own a home?

   yes ☐   no ☐

   If yes - [specify] what changes occurred? ____________________________

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

Now I would like to know a few details about yourself and other people in this household.

6.  How many people live here altogether. [i.e. normally, excluding visitors.]

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

   ____________________________

7.  How many children under 18 years?

8.  How many are adults? [over 18 years]

9.  Now, more directly concerning yourself. Which of the statements on this card best describes your working status?

   [1] working in paid employment full time ☐

   [2] working in paid employment full time and keeping house ☐

   [3] working part time only ☐

   [4] working part time and keeping house ☐

   [5] keeping house only with no paid employment ☐

   [cont'd]....
9. (cont'd)

[6] retired
[7] other [specify]

If the respondent is working in paid employment:

10. Could you tell me the type of job you do and the nature of your work within it? (probe includes size of work unit)

11. Now I would like your views on two aspects of all work relationships in general. Some people say that a firm is like a football side - because, good teamwork means success and is to everyone's advantages. Others say that teamwork in industry is impossible because employers and employees are on different sides of the fence. Which of these two views would you agree with more?

[1] 1st view □
[2] 2nd view □

12. Of those people you work with how many would you call "personal friends" rather than just "work mates"

[0] none □ [3] three □

13. What clubs and organizations do you belong to - do you belong to any of the following?

[0] don't belong to any at all □
[1] trade union/professional association □
[2] working men's club □
[3] political party □
[4] parent/teachers' association □
[5] tenant or ratepayers' association □
[6] church or church group □
[7] sports club □
[8] W.E.A. □
[9] service clubs (Jaycees etc.) □
[10] any others? □
14. How regularly do you attend the meetings of those to which you belong? [three most regularly attended].
   a) club/organization 1
   b) club organization 2
   c) club/organization 3


15. From the card, could you tell me which age group you fall into?
   [6] 70 years or more

16. How much full time education did you complete before entering the workforce?
   [1] left school by end of form 3  [2] left school by end of form 4

17. (a) Do you have any general educational or trade qualifications

17. (b) If yes, what are these? ________________________________

18. Which of the following categories comes closest to your income?
   a) household income, b) household heads' income
   [1] less than $3,000  [2] less than $60.00 a week
   [cont'd]...
B. [cont'd]

- $3,001 - 4,000
- 4,001 - 5,000
- 5,001 - 6,000
- 6,001 - 7,000 [120.00 to $140.00 weekly]
- 7,001 - 8,000
- 8,001 - 9,000
- 9,001 - 10,000
- 10,001 - 11,000
- 11,001 - 12,000
- 12,001 - 13,000
- 13,001 - 14,000
- more than 14,000

19. Would you say that in relation to the average family your family/household is financially:

- much better off than others
- above average
- about the same as most
- not as well off as most
- very badly off

20. Which of the following ways of putting aside money does your household/family use?

- post office/bank accounts
- building society shares
- company stocks and shares
- life insurance policies
- medical insurance
- house/fire insurance
- motor vehicle insurance
- personal effects insurance
- other - please specify
21. Has your standard of living risen over the last five years? [make sure no confusion cost of living]

[1] a great deal? □
[2] quite a lot? □
[3] not very much? □
[4] not at all □

22. Which of the following leisure activities would take up more than five hours of your spare time in the average week? [including weekends]

[1] gardening □
[2] reading □
[3] sports □
[4] television □
[5] household repairs □
[6] visiting friends □
[7] hotel □

23. Are there any other activities you spend a lot of your spare time doing? yes □ no □

if yes, specify _____________________________

24. How often do you see your neighbours to speak to?

[1] several times a week □
[2] usually at least once a week □
[3] less often than that □

25.(a) Do you go over and see them or do they come over to see you for a cup of tea for example yes □ no □

25.(b) If yes, how often would that be?

[1] several times a week □
[2] usually about once a week □
[3] less often than once a week □

25.(c) Are there any neighbours you don’t get on with? Why is that do you think? yes □ no □

If yes, specify ______________________________
Now finally I want your views on a number of general issues including some political ones.

26. New Zealand society is made up of a number of social groups. Some people call these groups social classes. If you HAD to say which of these classes you belonged to, which would it be?

   [1] upper 
   [2] middle 
   [3] lower 
   [4] working

27. Which of these classes would you say that most of the people that live around here belong to?

   [1] upper 
   [2] middle 
   [3] lower 
   [4] working

28. Which of the major political parties do you think best represents the interests of homeowners?

   [1] National 
   [2] Labour 
   [3] Values 
   [4] Social Credit 
   [0] None of these

29. Which of the major political parties do you think best represents the interests of tenants?

   [1] National 
   [2] Labour 
   [3] Values 
   [4] Social Credit 
   [5] None of these

30. Would you agree that "on the whole", tenants get a better deal than they deserve from central and local government"?

   [1] strongly agree 
   [2] agree 
   [3] neither agree nor disagree 
   [4] disagree 
   [5] strongly disagree
31. Which political party did you vote for in the 1969 General Election?

(1) National □
(2) Labour □
(3) Other □
(4) Social Credit □
(0) Didn't vote □

32. - in the 1972 General Election?

(1) National □
(2) Labour □
(3) Values □
(4) Social Credit □
(0) Didn't vote □
(5) Other □

33. - in the 1975 General Election?

(1) National □
(2) Labour □
(3) Values □
(4) Social Credit □
(0) Didn't vote □
(5) Other □

34. - in the local body elections of 1974?

(2) Labour □
(1) Citizens □
(3) Values □
(4) Other □
(0) Didn't vote □

35. What were your main reasons for voting the way you did in 1972 and 1975?

1972 [specify]: ________________________________
1975 [specify]: ________________________________

36. Respondent: (1) male □
(2) female □

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION
APPENDIX II
It has already been established (Table 16) that state owners were significantly more likely than state tenants to see themselves as belonging to the middle class. In seeking an explanation for this, a number of variables which could conceivably be related to self-rated class placement were cross-tabulated against tenure (see Table 1).

**TABLE ONE**: STATE SAMPLE ONLY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>HOMEOWNER</th>
<th>TENANT</th>
<th>STATISTICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq. Percent</td>
<td>Freq. Percent</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OR MORE YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>20 42</td>
<td>13 27</td>
<td>N.SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS ANNUAL INCOME $6000 OR MORE</td>
<td>25 52</td>
<td>7 15</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR ATTENDANCE VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>44 82</td>
<td>35 63</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD HEAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN REGULAR FULL-TIME PAID EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>47 98</td>
<td>23 48</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keeping in mind that 24 (50 percent) of all state owners saw themselves as being middle class compared with 15 (30%) of state tenants, the data contained in Table 1 is at least suggestive. The educational differences between homeowners and tenant were statistically insignificant, but owners were slightly better educated. The income differences between tenants and owners are largely attributable to the fourth characteristic in Table 1 were less likely to be in full-time paid employment in the first place, and slightly more than half were welfare recipients of one form or another. (see Table 2 for further details).
### TABLE TWO: TENURE BY OCCUPATION OF STATE SAMPLE RESPONDENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMEOWNER</th>
<th></th>
<th>TENANT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUAL²</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL³</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-MANUAL¹</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's v = .44 p < .01

It is probable that welfare beneficiaries are more likely to see themselves as working class than are those in paid employment, and that this accounts for the difference in class ratings between tenants and owners.

---

1. The measure of household or family income included in the questionnaire reinforced this pattern. Twenty-five percent (12) of the owner-occupier households had total incomes in excess of $10,000 compared with only 5 or 10 percent of the renter households.

2. Of the 41 homeowners in manual occupations, 23 were in skilled or semi-skilled jobs.

3. 'Residual' includes all those respondents who were not in paid employment - for example, sickness beneficiaries, retired people, widows and widowers, those unemployed, and those receiving the domestic purposes benefit.
A relatively complex quota sampling technique was used for the Papanui study which required the drawing of four separate random samples within each of the four separate housing situations identified. The main advantage of the procedure used was that while it was a comparatively easy matter to statistically weight each sample with the computer programme to allow for comparisons between housing situations, at the same time an adequate number of cases within each of less numerous housing situations (state tenants and state homeowners) was obtained for intergroup comparisons and meaningful generalisations about the characteristics of each particular group. The Housing Corporation assisted with the addresses required of both state tenants and state homeowners and the Municipal Electricity Department files were used for the two 'private' market samples. All new tenants are required to pay a deposit to the M.E.D. before power supplies can continue and each deposit is recorded with the particular file for each address. The major difficulty with the procedure used was that it required a listing of each individual street within the Papanui electorate boundaries to permit the numbering of each of the four populations. The addresses from the listing of the two state populations had to be checked off against the listings for the two private populations to avoid the possibility of duplication. The usual random number table procedure was used for the selection of the initial case within each sample. The total numbers in each housing situation from the listings were used to calculate the different proportions of each housing situation within the electorate and then compared with the 1971 Census data to determine the statistical weighting in the computer programme required to adjust each housing situation to the actual proportion of that housing type within the electorate. The number of dwellings in the state sample did not constitute the relatively high proportion that I had expected and together state rental units and rental units which had been purchased by state tenants made up slightly less than ten percent of all dwellings in the electorate.

The introductory letters sent to each address were followed up by an initial visit to the address and if the head of household was present the interview was completed.
Arrangements for a return visit were necessary in almost half of the cases. Where contact could not be made on the first visit with any household member the address was visited on two further occasions. The response rate as previously noted was quite high and respondents showed a high degree of interest and co-operation in the survey. No provision for substitution was made in the sampling procedure and the addresses for which schedules were not completed were primarily those with which no contact could be made with the occupants after the three visits allowed for. One case was excluded because the occupant was not a state homeowner but someone who had purchased the dwelling from the former state owner and there were six refusals.
Coding of Occupations and Income.
An occupational prestige and ranking scale designed by Peter Davis [see An Occupational Ranking Scale for New Zealand, Department of Psychology and Sociology, University of Canterbury, 1974], was used for the coding of occupation. The author had some reservations about the validity of this instrument to provide an accurate measure of "class position" as such, but it was noted that Goldthorpe et.al. used a similar scale for all three of their affluent worker studies. Their scale of occupational rankings was based on the Hall-Jones prestige scale of occupations [see Goldthorpe et.al., The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour, University Press, Cambridge, 1968 : p.193].

The median income of household heads in the Papanui sample was $6,000, an income which was slightly greater than the $5,200 average earned by males on the ordinary time earnings plus overtime recorded in the Labour Department’s April 1976 survey. High and low income categories used in the hypothesis of this study took these findings into account.
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