THE BOBBS-MERRILL STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY

Hans Dieter Seibel

The Dynamics of Achievement: A Radical Perspective

THE BOBBS-MERRILL STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY

The Dynamics of Achievement: A Radical Perspective

Hans Dieter Seibel

THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY, INC.
INDIANAPOLIS · NEW YORK

To Christine Groß

1978 FG 1998

The Dynamics of Achievement: A Radical Perspective

1   The Myth of Achievement

Achievement is a key concept in the national ideology of the United States. Individual achievement is the source of the economy's industrial life in the opinion of professors, politicians, writers, executives, housewives, and workers of all categories. This belief is supported by the conventional wisdom of social scientists who confirm that we live in an *achieving society.* The underlying axiom, that an achieving society is, in economic terms, the most efficient type of social organization, seems beyond doubt.

Acceptance of this axiom has a number of implications. First, should not the achievement principle be a source of human gratification in our society? Second, if it is true that our economy has developed rapidly *because* of its orientation toward individual achievement, is it not obvious that preindustrial societies, among them the so-called underdeveloped countries, are underdeveloped precisely because they are *not* oriented toward achievement? And third, don't we have to watch very carefully over the omnipresence of individual achievement in our society lest we fall back into some dark ages?

The belief in the prevalence and indispensability of achievement in our, and any other, highly industrialized society not only is a myth, it is a dangerous myth. By condemning everyone to the Sisyphean task of striving forever for the unattainable, it has made many lives miserable; and by legitimizing the distribution of wealth and power at any given point in time, it has tended to make the class system immune against change.

For the sociologist, the achievement ideology has had a very negative impact on the progress of the discipline; it has prevented him from discovering a general law of socioeconomic development.

This study will disclose the ideological character of the achievement principle in our society. It will uncover the costly social and individual consequences of a false emphasis on achievement: anomy, authoritarianism, and hierarchization; alienation, crime and delinquency, psychic disorder, and suicide. By developing a general theory of socioeconomic development based on the concept of achievement, we will be able to explain the role of the achievement principle, its origins, and its fate in modern society.

2 Achieved and Nonachieved Roles: Definitions

The human species has survived through *work:* a conscious, purposive effort at transforming the environment; and all wealth ever amassed has ultimately originated from work. Work is a social process, organized in *work roles.* A work role is a bundle of specific performance instructions, directed toward the attainment of a goal, for any number of *role incumbents.*

Any society that is to survive has to solve the problem of *role allocation:* how to match roles and people. If survival is very precarious, as is frequently the case when simple technologies are used, it may even be that an ideal match has to be found.

In solving the problem of role allocation, certain *criteria* have to be used. These criteria fall into two broad categories: *achieved* and *nonachieved (ascribed)* criteria. Depending on the extent to which achieved or nonachieved criteria are used to select people for given roles, there may be predominantly *achieved roles* or predominantly *nonachieved roles.* And depending on the extent to which achieved roles or nonachieved roles prevail in a society, one may distinguish between *achieving societies* and *nonachieving societies.* While this is a convenient dichotomy for analytic purposes, it has to be stressed that concrete societies vary on a continuum in terms of the emphasis placed on achieved roles.

Criteria are *achieved* when they are directly related to the performance of a work role. Skill and dexterity for instance may be achieved criteria with regard to the role of craftsman as they are necessary components of the performance of that role. *Criteria* are *nonachieved* when they are not necessarily directly related to the performance of a work role. Sex, race, beauty, and height are nonachieved (ascribed) criteria with regard to roles like potter or teacher, as they are not directly related to the performance of these roles. Criteria are achieved or nonachieved with regard to specific roles. E.g., strength and bravery are germane to the role of warrior and nongermane to the role of judge; accordingly, they are achieved criteria in the one case and nonachieved in the other. A Ph.D. degree in classics is an achieved criterion in terms of the role of classics professor; it is a nonachieved criterion with regard to the role of a jet pilot.

Work is carried out in *achieved roles* when the criteria used in selecting role incumbents are germane to the role performance. The role of administrator for instance is an achieved role if individuals are selected on

the basis of their administrative competence; it is a *nonachieved* role if all male adults of certain families automatically become administrators.[1]

In an achieving society, individuals are assigned to work and work-related roles by virtue of their individual merits, competence, talent, etc., insofar as these are relevant to the performance of work roles. To keep such a society running smoothly, its members have to be prepared for the assignment of work roles by individual competence. They have to learn to strive for excellence in order to activate their talents and to become eligible for some of the work roles in their society. A personality disposition has to be formed that is compatible with the system of role allocation. The most important personality trait in an achieving society is thus a strong achievement motive, a high *need for achievement* (in short: *n* Ach), to be instilled through the process of socialization. Ideally, a system of role allocation based on achievement is also supported by the system of values and beliefs in that society. Thus, individual achievement is typically a high *value* in an achieving society. This value serves as a guidepost for the individual members of society and induces them to strive for achievement-related behaviors; it also allows for the ranking and differential evaluation of individuals on the basis of their achievement. The possibility of discrepancies in terms of achievement orientation between the social system (i.e., the system of role allocation), the personality system, and the value system constitutes a potential source of social disorder and conflict.

In most societies, work roles are of great importance beyond their functional relevance within the system of labor division. As work roles are usually differentially ranked, evaluated, and rewarded, they determine not only one's work activities, but also one's wealth, power, prestige, and even one's psychic gratification—in other words, one's place in the stratification system. Thus, the system of role allocation comprises the rules that allow every individual to find answers to the following questions: To what extent are my daily activities, my life chances, and my place in society dependent on my own achievements: my talents and abilities, my knowledge and my competence, my efforts and my merits? To what extent are they determined by other forces such as birth, race, religion, sex, age, or even luck?

Insofar as roles have differentially evaluated and rewarded ranks in the stratification system, they are also referred to as *statuses*.

In most societies, there is a very close fit between work roles and rewards and accordingly between the respective allocative systems. In con-

1. More rigidly, I define *achievement* as the *fulfillment of the formal performance instructions (behavior expectations) that constitute a work role:* Performance instructions are formal when there is discernible agreement in a social system that failure to follow the instructions is incompatible with role incumbency. Most of these instructions are of a technical nature. *Criteria of role allocation are achieved when germane to the fulfillment of the formal performance instructions.* These criteria are so to speak a technical promise of following the formal performance instructions. Accordingly, *roles are achieved when access is determined by criteria germane to the fulfillment of the formal performance instructions.*

temporary America for instance, the fit is so close that most people confuse *achievement,* which is a criterion of role allocation, with *success,* which is the outcome of the reward process.

3 Achievement and Development: A Theory

Two basic assumptions characterize the achievement ideology: (1) that an achievement oriented system of role allocation is the only, or the most, efficient type of socioeconomic organization; and (2) that preindustrial societies are not achievement oriented and hence not efficiently organized. Supported by some of our best-known sociologists,[2] popular textbooks inform the student that

> *Division of labor on achieved rather than hereditary status is more congenial to the development and expansion of industrial capitalism because: (a) Achievement is better adapted to specialization—a characteristic feature of industrial capitalism. When occupations are inherited and training takes place within the family, the number of specializations is limited. (b) Technological advance has been a major feature of industrial capitalism; job requirements constantly change and new jobs are continually created. It is unlikely that the technological advances that*

2. Parsons (1966:22) claims that "evolutionary change" from preindustrial to industrial society is marked by "adaptive upgrading," i.e., higher productivity, which
requires that specialized functional capacities be freed from ascription within more diffuse structural units. There is, then, a reliance upon more **generalized** *resources that are independent of their ascriptive sources.*
Following Parsons, Levy (1966:153, 171, 190) expresses the same thought: Preindustrial societies are particularistic and ascriptive; industrial societies emphasize universalism and achievement. In the same vein, Moore (1963:93–96) postulates that,
Economic development . . . requires . . . a placement system grounded on merit in performance, and that requirement is likely to come into conflict with a number of strongly supported values related to the primacy of kinship position and obligations as a moral virtue. [In industrial societies—HDS] labor recruitment must be strongly based on performance qualifications without primary regard to prior social position.
And Horowitz (1966:61), who is certainly not known for an uncritical acceptance of conventional wisdom, writes:
The traditional society is characterized by little change from generation to generation; a behavioral pattern governed almost exclusively by custom; status determined almost entirely by inheritance (ascriptive); low economic productivity; and a social organization and life style grounded on the principle of hierarchical command.
And more recently, these assumptions have been confirmed by Duncan, Featherman, and Duncan (1972:3):
In the United States, as in other contemporary industrial societies, occupation is typically an **achieved** *status (as contrasted with such an* **ascribed** *status as membership in a recognized ethnic group). That is, the conferment of status is based in some considerable measure on the role incumbent's own performance of the role rather than upon any one of a number of extrinsic considerations, such as his family's reputation or his personal attractiveness.*

have played a major role in the expansion of industrial capitalism could have developed to such an extent without an emphasis on achieved status and its accompanying ideals of initiative and acquisition.

Basic values and motivations are different in industrial and preindustrial societies. . . . Preindustrial man hardly resembles economic man at all. He has no desire to accumulate wealth for its own sake.

In nonindustrialized communities kinship is an important basis for assigning roles. . . . The factory system emphasizes assignment to jobs on the basis of achieved criteria . . . (Broom and Selznick, 1963:629,634,639).

However, these two assumptions present a paradox if the fact is taken into consideration that on any given level of technology societies tend, in the long run, to reach optimal adjustment to their environment. Thus, if the achievement model is in fact efficient, one may hypothesize that preindustrial societies become achieving societies as they adjust to their environment. Should we however find, as we will, that among preindustrial societies both achieving and nonachieving societies exist, both equally well adjusted to their environment, than the axiom of the sole efficiency of the achievement model is seriously shaken.

The issue becomes even more confused if we take into consideration that all human societies constitute a mix of both systems of role allocation:

There has never been a society without some examples of both achieved and ascribed roles, both ideally and actually, but the difference in emphasis placed on achieved as opposed to ascribed roles varies widely. . . . Those societies whose members emphasize achieved roles are always ones whose members place a major emphasis on ascribed roles as well. As a minimum there is always an important emphasis on kinship considerations in some contexts, and roles in kinship structures are on the whole ascribed roles (Levy, 1966:191).

Why is there such wide variation between societies in terms of the emphasis placed on achieved roles if achieved roles are indeed more efficient than nonachieved ones? If all societies do have examples of both, why do they not simply extend the sphere of achieved roles? In terms of past theories, these are unanswerable questions.

The basic question that such a theory has to answer is: what are the conditions under which roles are allocated by achieved criteria, and when are nonachieved criteria chosen? The choice is certainly not made at random. The theory will be briefly outlined below. It will be applied and explained in some more detail in Section Four.

In this theory, it will be suggested that the system of role allocation depends on the problematicality of a setting (cf. Propositions 1 and 2). I therefore have to define what is meant by problematical and unproblematical settings. *I define a setting as problematical when it does (or as unproblematical when it does not) pose a threat to the survival or wellbeing of a social entity.* This threat may be economic, political, military, or social.

ROLE ALLOCATION
IN UNPROBLEMATICAL SETTINGS

Let us take a setting that occurs widely in any society. Decisions have to be made all the time in which the result of a choice between alternatives is irrelevant as long as a choice is made. E.g., it does not matter whether lunch is served at twelve or one o'clock. All that matters is that those concerned know when lunch is served. The role of decision-maker (a particular type of work role) in this situation cannot be allocated on the basis of achieved criteria, because everyone could make the decision and no one is particularly suited for the role. Or in terms of our definition of achieved roles: criteria of role allocation in that situation cannot be germane to the performance instructions of the role of decision-maker. The same applies to other types of roles. In many premodern societies, farming is unproblematical. Differences in performance tend to be of minor importance. Hence, the farmer's goal is to *satisfy* rather than to *optimize.*

In normal social life the process of role-taking must be clear to everyone in every situation lest there be strife or chaos. The system of role allocation most suitable to that situation is based on nonachieved criteria such as age, sex, or family or lineage affiliation. Its effectiveness lies in the elimination of uncertainty about role incumbents; it is predictable by every member of society who will assume a certain role, and when. Thus, individuals can be trained for these roles from early childhood. Anthropologist Ralph Linton (1936:129) suggested that it is the normal state of a society in which the uncertainty arising out of the perennial search for the best man for a given role has been removed by placing the system of role allocation on a predictable, nonachievement oriented base:

> *Social systems have to be built upon the potentialities of the average individual, the person who has no special gifts or disabilities. Such individuals can be trained to occupy almost any status and to perform the associated role adequately if not brilliantly. The social ascription of a particular status, with the intensive training that such ascription makes possible, is a guarantee that the role will be performed even if the performance is mediocre.*[3]

The underlying theorem can be summarized as follows:

Proposition 1: In settings where the performance of work roles is unproblematical in the sense that differences in the quality of performance or in the degree of optimality of solutions to work problems are nonexistent or irrelevant, work roles are allocated on the basis of nonachieved criteria.

3. Ralph Linton, *The Study of Man,* copyright © 1936 by D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc. Reprinted by courtesy of the publisher.

ROLE ALLOCATION IN PROBLEMATICAL SETTINGS

Let us now consider a setting in which decisions and work activities are problematical. There are situations in which the fate of a group, sometimes even its survival, depends on the maximization of work role performance or on the optimality of decisions; where it is of vital importance that certain roles are occupied by those who are most competent. Examples of such roles may be war leaders, heart surgeons, or aircraft pilots. In such a setting, work roles are typically allocated on the basis of achieved criteria. Thus, our first proposition is complemented by a second:

Proposition 2: In settings where the performance of work roles is problematical in the sense that high quality of performance in work roles or optimality of solutions to work problems are both possible and important, work roles are allocated on the basis of achieved criteria.

A THEORY OF ACHIEVEMENT

Static hypothesis of achievement The two propositions may now be applied to societies and presented in the form of a *static hypothesis of achievement:*

Societies characterized by a predominance of unproblematical settings tend to allocate work roles on the basis of nonachieved (ascribed) criteria. Societies characterized by a predominance of problematical settings tend to allocate roles on the basis of achievement. The former may be called nonachieving, the latter achieving societies.

Once this hypothesis is accepted, one may infer from an emphasis on achieved roles that a society is characterized by a predominance of problematical settings; an emphasis on nonachieved roles leads us to conclude that a society is characterized by a predominance of nonproblematical settings.

Dynamic hypothesis of achievement From the above static hypothesis, a *dynamic hypothesis of achievement* can be derived:

Any change in the predominance of unproblematical vs. problematical settings in a society leads to a subsequent shift in the emphasis on nonachieved vs. achieved roles, and accordingly, to the emergence of a nonachieving vs. an achieving society.

A major source of such change may be seen in technological innovations from within or without.

In a historical dimension, change may thus take place in two different

phases that can be expressed in the form of two subtheorems to the dynamic hypothesis of achievement:

Modernization hypothesis. The increasing presence of problematical settings in a society leads to an increasing emphasis on achieved roles, i.e., a nonachieving society turns gradually into an achieving society.

Similar thoughts have been expressed by Linton (1936:129–130); but they were subsequently ignored by social scientists, probably because they conflicted with the basic premises of the achievement ideology:

As soon as changes within the culture or in the external environment produce maladjustments, it has to recognize and utilize these gifts [i.e., special skills and talents germane to the performance of certain roles—HDS] . . . . For this reason, societies living under new or changing conditions are usually characterized by a wealth of achievable statuses and by very broad delimitations of the competition for them.

Maturation hypothesis. The increasing presence of unproblematical settings in a society leads to an increasing emphasis on nonachieved roles, i.e., an achieving society turns gradually into a nonachieving society.

Again, Linton (1936:130) has described that process:

As social systems achieve adjustment to their settings, the social value of individual thought and initiative decreases. Thorough training of the component individuals becomes more necessary to the survival and successful functioning of society than the free expression of their individual abilities. To ensure successful training, more and more statuses are transferred from the achieved to the ascribed group, and the competition for those which remain is more and more limited. To put the same thing in different terms, individual opportunities decrease. Well-adjusted societies are, in general, characterized by a high preponderance of ascribed over achieved statuses, and increasing rigidity of the social system.

These hypotheses will subsequently be used to explain changes observed in our society and in other societies.

4 Achievement in Preindustrial Societies

From its beginning, there has been a longstanding tradition in sociology to speculate cursorily about "primitive peoples," rather than to study them seriously. As the transition from medieval estate society was seen as a change from a nonachieving to an achieving society, it was concluded by inference that all preindustrial societies, particularly preliterate ones, must

be nonachievement oriented systems. No advice came from anthropologists who concentrated mainly on kinship structures. When politically interested, they managed to detect absolute rulers in all societies. When the colonial policy of "indirect rule" was based on the assumption of universal absolutism, some ethnic groups started to revolt (e.g., the Ibo of Eastern Nigeria in the Aba riots of 1923), as previously they had never recognized any central authority. After some initial confusion among government anthropologists, it was eventually discovered that many if not most preindustrial societies were "tribes without rulers" (Middleton and Tait, 1958), i.e., segmentary rather than centralized political systems. As centralized preindustrial societies tended to emphasize nonachieved criteria in their system of status allocation, there had been little chance for the discovery of "primitive achievers."

Inspired by the Middleton-Tait discovery, a few political scientists shifted their interest from "states" to "political systems," which allowed them to include segmentary, or stateless, societies among their objects of study. (Almond and Coleman, 1960). As segmentary societies are not characterized by hereditary positions in a hierarchical order, the question arose: how do they allocate roles?

In my studies of premodern societies, I found that many, particularly the less developed, place a major emphasis on achievement in their system of role allocation. As I have done my field work in Africa, I will present the Kran of Eastern Liberia and the Ibo of Eastern Nigeria as examples of "primitive achievers." Other societies are mixed, emphasizing both types of criteria, as the Yoruba of Western Nigeria. As an example of a highly ascriptive society, I will present the Hausa of Northern Nigeria. The descriptions pertain to premodern times.

THE KRAN: "PRIMITIVE" ACHIEVERS

The Kran are a society in Eastern Liberia with a very simple technology. For their subsistence, they depend first on agriculture and second on hunting and gathering. Individual achievement is strongly emphasized, and important roles are filled by a person only as long as he is found to be the most competent. Thus, the Kran may be called an achieving society. However, as no society ever allocates all roles by achievement, the complexity of the Kran system of role allocation has to be examined in more detail.

Unproblematical settings and nonachieved roles In everyday Kran life, decisions have to be made all the time in which the outcome is irrelevant: any alternative will do equally well. For instance, it does not make any difference whether a family works today on farm A and tomorrow on farm B or vice versa, as long as the family members know when to work on which farm. According to proposition 1 (Section Three), the role of decision-maker in this situation cannot be allocated on the basis of achieved criteria, because everyone could make the decision and no one is par-

ticularly suited for the role. The nonachieved criteria chosen by the Kran, and many other societies, are kinship, age, and sex. They define unmistakenly who is in charge of unproblematical decisions. The oldest person of the smallest social unit (such units are usually kinship units) that is directly concerned makes the decision. Decisions that concern both sexes are made by men. Women make decisions according to seniority when the decisions pertain to women only.

The Kran arrive thus at a simple, formal authority system for unproblematical decisions. The largest unit subject to the authority of its eldest is the tribe (*bloa*). However, as the tribe emerges as a social reality only in the form of a war alliance between lineages, i.e., in a problematical situation, the role of the tribal eldest *(bloa dioi)* is purely ritual. The largest permanent social unit is the lineage (*tshe*), presided over by the lineage eldest (*bo klaa*). If a lineage is a residential unit inhabiting a village (*vulo*), its eldest is at the same time the village head (*vulo ba*). If a lineage is spread out, its segments (*unu*) are residential units under its eldest (*unu dioi*); they typically occupy a village section (*lũ*). In village affairs, the segments are under the authority of the eldest member of the oldest (i.e., the founder) lineage (*vulo ba*). This role is of only ritual importance as there are hardly any unproblematical decisions on that level; most unproblematical decisions in a village are made by lineage or lineage segment heads and by heads of smaller social units. A segment consists of several extended families (*buli*), each of which lives in its own compound. Every extended family is headed by its oldest male (*nyo klaa de buli*).

Unlike centralized, hierarchical societies, decision-making power in segmentary societies is strongest in the smaller, and weakest in the larger, social units. This finds its logical conclusion in the fact that the Kran do not recognize the role of eldest within the very largest unit, the alliance of tribes (*bloa dru*) which is formed only in major wars. On that level, no unproblematical decisions exist; the authority of an eldest would thus be zero.

Proposition 1 applies equally to other work roles among the Kran. Insofar as hunting, gathering, farming, basket or mat weaving, and other activities are unproblematical, they are assigned without reference to differences in competence. As anyone can perform these roles, and as differences in the quality of performance are considered irrelevant, these work roles are open to everyone. Criteria of role allocation are nonachieved as everyone, or everyone of a certain sex, assumes these roles —permanently or intermittently.

Problematical settings and achieved roles A second subsystem of role allocation is structured along the dimension of problematical decisions and activities. There are settings, in which it is of crucial importance that certain roles are occupied by the most competent members. As traditional Kran society is under constant danger of attack, the most problematical setting is the military. Hence, the prevalence of achieved criteria in the

allocation of roles is most pronounced in war and war-related activities, as suggested by proposition 2 (Section Three). The Kran consider the role of war leader (*bio*) as the one that is most important in their role system. This role is entirely problem-oriented. Its functionality is emphasized by the fact that in peace the *bio* may be a respected person but no special authority accrues to him. Rank and importance of the *bio* vary with the kind of social unit that is involved in warfare, e.g., a village or a tribe. In minor wars, the *bio* may participate in combat; in major wars, he is a strategist only. Accordingly, different weights may be assigned to his strategic abilities on the one hand and to his strength and fighting skills on the other. In any event, all criteria of selection are achieved, i.e., directly germane to the role. Age is irrelevant. What ultimately matters is a person's ability to win wars. More specific criteria are: strategic skills, self-control, bravery, strength, endurance, reconciliatory talents, and expertise in the production of medicines, charms, and arrow poisons. A man retains the *bio* role as long as he is considered the most capable. His role is activated only during war. (With the pacification of the Kran by the Monrovia government early this century, the role of *bio* has ceased to be activated.)

In major wars, the *bio* is aided by head warriors (*taa nyo*) whose roles are also achieved. Main criteria are courage, bravery, strength, and endurance.

In the economic sphere, the Kran consider as crucial two roles in which optimality or high quality of performance can be reached: the role of the "richest man" (*pa nyo*) and the role of the "gentleman" (*gaa nyo*). Both are allocated on the basis of achieved criteria. As land is plentiful and the amount of capital negligible, wealth is largely proportionate to the amount of labor someone has at his disposal. Through hard work, the richest man has been able to afford the bride-wealth for several women. As he has many wives and children, he can afford to hire large work groups (*pã*) to extend his farm. As a compensation to the work group, he has to give a big party, the lavishness of which indicates the amount of his wealth. Thus, the party is at the same time a major mechanism of redistribution: The prevention of excessive wealth is built right into the process of accumulating wealth. The richest man can retain his role only as long as he constantly proves his affluence through work parties. As in the case of the *bio*, past achievements are irrelevant; the role has to be earned anew continuously. For those farmers who decide to compete for the role of "richest man," farming becomes a problematical setting in which high quality of performance matters. Unlike the average farmer, they try to maximize their production. For them, farming becomes an achieved role as they strive for the higher status they may gain through hard work, skill in work organization and other criteria germane to the role of a "high status farmer." Hence, a dual role of farmer emerges: the role of average farmer within an unproblematical setting based on nonachieved criteria; and the role of rich farmer, within a problematical setting based on achieved criteria. The incumbents of the latter role compete for the role of "richest man."

The term "gentleman" refers to the most generous man in the village. While the richest man uses redistribution in a calculated manner to increase his wealth, the gentleman considers redistribution, generosity, and helpfulness ends in themselves. He is willing to work with and for anyone who needs help: he readily offers visitors accommodation and food, and he may help a young man pay his bride-wealth without asking for special privileges.

Further avenues to respected roles are found in a variety of associations (e.g., cooperatives), in which leaders are chosen largely on the basis of individual merit and ability.

Mixed settings Analytically, settings may be dichotomized into problematical and unproblematical ones. Social reality however is frequently mixed. Accordingly, the actual system of role allocation among the Kran is very flexible. Depending on the extent to which settings are problematical or unproblematical, criteria of role allocation may include both achieved and nonachieved roles. In such a mixed setting, a person may be chosen on the basis of both achieved and nonachieved criteria, or persons chosen from different subsystems of role allocation may contribute to the outcome. For instance, in a moderately problematical setting, the eldest may participate nominally while the *bio*'s contribution may carry more weight; the converse may be true in moderately unproblematical situations.

Social, economic, and political affairs among the Kran are characterized by two types of settings: problematical and unproblematical ones. Accordingly, the Kran allocate roles on the basis of achievement or nonachievement. As no society is ever completely achievement oriented, it is justified to call the Kran an achieving society.

THREE NIGERIAN SOCIETIES: A COMPARISON

The extent of problematical settings varies considerably between societies. A comparison of three preindustrial societies in Nigeria shows that the importance of achievement in their systems of role allocation varies accordingly.

The Ibo The Ibo are an agricultural society in Eastern Nigeria with a simple technology. While they are, economically speaking, slightly more advanced than the Kran of Liberia in that they do not rely on hunting and gathering, their economy is very unsophisticated compared with the economy of many other Nigerian societies, particularly those that are kingdoms. There are no towns, and villages are split into hamlets that consist of dispersed homesteads. There are only small local markets, and very few specialized craftsmen. Craft technology is very crude. Before the advent of the British, the Ibo had no common name and no common tradition of origin. The socio-political structure is segmentary, the largest po-

litical unit being the village group. There is no central political authority; and authority is, in principle, never vested in one individual. In each community, political functions are served by a council of elders whose decisions have to be ratified by the community. With the exception of the *osu* (cult slaves), there are no hereditary positions or strata into which a person is born: everyone is born socially equal.

Living in very small communities, with a simple technology, and under constant danger of attack, survival is precarious for the Ibo. Their life is characterized by a preponderance of problematical settings. Hence, their system of role allocation is strongly based on achieved criteria, as suggested by our theory. In principle, all economic and political roles labeled important are achieved, involving a person's competence, aptitude, capability, etc. Personal efforts and the use of one's abilities lead to a rise in status. War leadership goes to the one who proves to be most efficient. Matters in dispute can be judged by a number of persons or councils; there is no office of the judge. One chooses whom one considers best in judging and to whom both parties agree. Thus, there is considerable social mobility—every position being, on principle, open to everyone. A person has alternative choices between various ways of gaining prestige and between various occupations. The opportunity for upward or downward mobility is almost unlimited. Mobility is not confined to the political, economic, or occupational sphere; a person may also improve his position by high performance in athletics, arts, and more recently in literature and science.

Thus, Ibo society may be characterized as an open society where roles may be attained on the basis of occupational skill, enterprise, and initiative—individual achievement being one of the highest values.

However, as the Ibo are technologically slightly more advanced and survival is somewhat less precarious than among the Kran, the prevalence of problematical situations is not quite as pronounced as among the Kran. Both societies allocate important roles on the basis of achievement. But while the Kran are very rigorous in that such role incumbency is always transient, a role being awarded to the most competent at any given time, the Ibo have introduced an element of stability through their so-called title societies which allow the translation of achieved economic wealth into permanent political status. Every free-born male member of society may buy his way into the title society and then, through additional payments, climb up the ranks of titles within the association. But while the way into and up the association is earned, the status and prestige that accrue to a title do not have to be constantly renewed through permanent efforts.

The Yoruba The Yoruba comprise a number of closely related kingdoms which, under the Oyo empire, dominated a large part of the West African coast. They are technologically very advanced, their economy being based on agriculture, highly developed crafts organized in guilds, and extensive trading. The Yoruba have the highest rate of traditional urbanization in Africa, cities and hinterland being connected through considerable

17

economic exchange and through a net of administrative channels. The Yoruba have reached a high degree of political and economic control over their environment, i.e., their existence is characterized by a predominance of unproblematical settings. This implies that economic and political processes and their outcomes are largely predictable. This predictability is rooted in their system of status allocation which is primarily based on ascription. People are born into positions and can thus be trained for them from birth on. The achievement principle, according to which the most competent is assigned to any given role, would introduce an amount of uncertainty incompatible with the stability of the economic and political system. Conforming to our theory, Yoruba society is thus highly stratified, with a layer of royal families at the top of the hierarchy; a stratum of hereditary chiefs and representatives of major territorial and associational groups (e.g., craft guilds) beneath; commoners without hereditary claims to titles below them, subdivided into two main layers of craftsmen and farmers; and slaves at the bottom. During the last 250 years, however, there has been a sharp increase of problematical settings among the Yoruba. After a series of wars against the Kingdom of Dahomey in the eighteenth century, civil war led to internal disintegration during the nineteenth century. This enabled the Hausa-Fulani in the north to penetrate into Yoruba territory and to Islamize its northern part. The Yoruba emerged from this divided into largely independent kingdoms. The introduction of problematical settings added a strong element of achievement to an otherwise ascriptive system of role allocation. As a consequence, there is some *inter*-stratum mobility. A wealthy man, for example, may be appointed to council membership and even receive a chieftaincy title which involves the crossing of strata boundaries. Moreover, there is considerable *intra*-stratum mobility, each stratum being a differentiated system of substrata. Mobility within strata is largely dependent on individual achievement, with the Ogboni society, similar to the Ibo title society, allowing the transformation of achieved roles into permanent positions. Especially during the wars of the nineteenth century, a number of other avenues were open to men of ambition: the army, crafts that produced weapons and other supplies for the armies, and agriculture which had a permanent market for full-time craftsmen. In each of these fields, a man could strive for roles on the basis of his competence and could improve his status through personal efforts. Even in the selection of a king from among several royal families, personal competence and merits matter. Thus, the life of every Yoruba is characterized by the presence of both problematical and unproblematical settings and accordingly affected by achieved as well as nonachieved criteria of role allocation.

The Hausa Technologically and organizationally, the Hausa are one of the most advanced societies of preindustrial Africa. Since the thirteenth century when the Islamic faith was adopted, the Hausa have had a highly developed system of government with a centralized bureaucracy, a well-organized tax system, and a highly qualified judiciary. Each of the eight Hausa states is administered from its capital which is the seat of the emir,

an absolute ruler. The degree of differentiation of occupational roles is most remarkable. There is an elaborate marketing structure that connects not only every village with the capital but also the empires across the Sahara with the North African coast. Crafts are very advanced, both technologically and organizationally. The nomadic Fulani who had been immigrating peacefully into Hausaland from around 1500, led a holy war (jihad) against the Hausa aristocracy in 1802, overthrew them, and set up a feudal government under Fulani emirs.

As the Hausa have exercised for centuries strong control over their environment, social, political, and economic life has been largely unproblematical for them. Interaction processes have become routinized, with most inputs and outputs predetermined and thus highly predictable. Complying with our theory, achievement as a criterion of role allocation is nonexistent:

> The Hausa system of occupational status is almost . . . wholly ascriptive in its orientation, since its units are closed descent groups between which all movement is disapproved. . . . The occupational status model . . . incorporates such ascriptive factors as descent and ethnicity (Smith, 1959:251).

The system of ascribed roles that are organized into a multitude of layers is so complex that any exact statement about the number of strata must be artificial. There are separate stratification systems for men and women. The main determinants of the male order are political rank and occupational class. The two main strata groups are chiefs and office holders on the one hand and subjects and commoners on the other, i.e., rulers and ruled. Below them is the layer of slaves. All occupational groups are ranked, with officials, Islamic teachers, and wealthy merchants at the top; and butchers, mat weavers, drummers, praise singers, and buglers at the bottom of the hierarchy.

In offices and crafts, an important distinction is between inherited (*karda*) and freely selected (*shigege*). *Karda* roles are more frequent and rank higher than the *shigege*. Despite a strong emphasis on karda, mobility is not absent in Hausa society. As polygamy and concubinage proliferate the number of those eligible for any role, there is a form of institutionalized competition: *neman sarautu,* or clientage system. A person may become the client of an officeholder hoping to be rewarded with an office in return for his loyalty and obedience. Yet, there is no room in *neman sarautu* for achievement, as mobility is allowed on the basis of servitude and respect for authority, but is denied on the basis of competence.

ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT VALUES

Our concern in describing the three societies is with the social system, or more specifically with the system of role allocation. It was mentioned earlier that ideally a social orientation toward achievement is complemented by a corresponding value and motivational orientation. In fact, it was found that

such a congruence exists in the three societies. In a recent empirical study of achievement values and motivation, LeVine (1966:78) concludes:

> The frequency of obedience and social compliance value themes in essays on success written by the students was greatest for the Hausa, followed by the Southern Yoruba and Ibo, in that order.
>
> The frequency of achievement imagery in dream reports was greatest for the Ibo, followed by the Southern Yoruba, Northern Yoruba, and Hausa, in that order.

5 Achievement and Industrialization

ACHIEVEMENT AND PROBLEMATICAL SETTINGS

The change from a premodern to a modern society during rapid industrialization implies a revolutionary overthrow of traditional patterns in almost all major spheres of social existence. Occupations and work patterns, authority relations and political structures, forms of deviant behavior and legal processes, sex and sex roles, marriage and the family, traditions of child-rearing, values and religious beliefs, settlement patterns and the total life style of most individuals—all become highly problematical. During that extended period of transition, there may be some pockets of unproblematical settings in which things continue in the old way. But outside of these niches, life is one huge problematical setting: a new society is being molded. This period is characterized by a predominance of achieved roles, as suggested by our theory.

This shift from an emphasis on nonachieved criteria to an emphasis on achieved criteria is of course not limited to periods of industrial revolution. Any society that finds itself, because of some historical circumstances, at the point of taking a fresh start, operates under equally problematical conditions and consequently becomes an achieving society:

> Our now extinct frontier offered an excellent example of this. Here the class lines of the European societies from which the frontier population had been drawn were completely discarded and individuals were given an unprecedented opportunity to find their place in the new society by their own abilities (Linton, 1936:130).

Rapidly industrializing societies and societies in similarly problematic situations place a major emphasis on achievement. For England, Germany, and other European countries, the industrial revolution necessitated a change in their system of role allocation as their preindustrial system was based on nonachieved criteria. Medieval Europe was made up of "estate societies" in which people lived and died in the same station in life into which they were born. It took a long and agonizing transformation until

that system was eventually changed to one of role allocation that is adequate to the problematic character of the industrial revolution. Social scientists, with little knowledge of alien cultures, assumed automatically that this transformation of the system of role allocation was essential to every modernization process. However, in the last chapter it was shown that many societies do emphasize achievement in their preindustrial system of role allocation. For them, all that changes is the system of work roles as many previously unknown work roles are being introduced; but their system of role allocation remains the same.

ACHIEVEMENT AND RECEPTIVITY TO INDUSTRIALIZATION

One may now hypothesize that societies with a premodern emphasis on achievement have a great advantage over those societies that have to make the transition to a new system of role allocation *in addition* to the shift to a new system of work roles. Tentatively, one may thus formulate the following proposition:

Preindustrial societies characterized by an achievement oriented system of role allocation tend to be receptive to change; preindustrial societies characterized by a nonachievement oriented system of role allocation tend to be more resistant.

Receptivity to industrialization in Nigeria   I have tested this proposition in Nigeria. The three largest preindustrial societies of Nigeria differ widely in terms of their systems of role allocation as shown in the last chapter. Common sense would lead us to predict that the technologically and organizationally highly advanced Hausa and Yoruba should be very fast modernizers, while the Ibo, with their "primitive" traditional economy, should be very slow. However, using the above proposition, the prediction would be different: the Ibo with their traditional emphasis on achievement would continue to strive for higher ranking or more rewarding work roles, simply substituting new opportunities for old ones. The Yoruba, with their mixed system of role allocation, would be expected to be somewhat less receptive to change; while the Hausa, with their social contempt for individual competence and talent, would likely be resistant to change.

Using interregional mobility, intergenerational and intragenerational occupational mobility in modern employment settings and several measures of adaptation to wage labor as modernization indicators, it was concluded, on the basis of my own sample study of 509 factory workers, of a study of Wells and Warmington (1962), and of official statistics: that the Ibo modernize fastest, that the Yoruba are somewhat slower, and that the Hausa have been largely resistant to change (Seibel, 1973b). Indeed, within half a century, the Ibo have reached much higher levels of modernization than have the Yoruba for more than a full century, while the Hausa have very

successfully resisted any attempt at modernization until the civil war of 1967–1970.

Receptivity to industrialization in Liberia I have replicated this study in Liberia, under more controlled conditions, comparing the Kran, Kru, Bassa, and Grebo (they all belong linguistically and culturally to the Kru group), who traditionally emphasize achievement, with the Kpelle who are organized into a polycephalous associational state and place more emphasis on ascription. While the differences, in terms of criteria of role allocation, between these two groups are by far not as drastic as, e.g., between the Ibo and Hausa, they are pronounced enough to allow the prediction that the Kru group of societies should be more receptive to modernization than the Kpelle. Confirmation of this prediction would in fact lend considerable support to the underlying hypothesis, as the Kpelle happen to be located much closer to centers of modernization than the Kru group. Measuring receptivity to modernization by a composite index of adaptation to wage labor in a random sample of 115 Kpelle and 105 Kru-group mine workers, the latter were found to adapt much faster to wage labor than the Kpelle.[4] A replication of the study among plantation workers in Liberia confirmed these results (Seibel, 1971). The proposition that preindustrial societies that emphasize achievement are more receptive to change than those who are more ascriptive in their traditional system of status allocation has thus been repeatedly confirmed.

Achievement roles, values, and motives A preindustrial emphasis on achievement may not be the only factor that makes a society receptive to rapid industrialization, but the available evidence definitely indicates that this preindustrial achievement orientation is very important for a society's ability to cope quickly with the problems of rapid change.

A society's receptivity to industrialization may also be heightened by a preindustrial value orientation toward achievement, as expressed for instance in Max Weber's (1958) "Protestant Ethic," and by a preindustrial personality disposition toward achievement, as expressed for instance in McClelland's (1961) "need for Achievement." Receptivity to modernization is of course greatest when an orientation toward achievement is found in all three systems: the system of role allocation, the value system, and the personality system.

SOCIAL CONTROL OF ACHIEVEMENT

Ideally, the achievement-based system of role allocation of the industrial revolution allows everyone to make maximum use of his talents and to move to the top through his individual accomplishments in an atmosphere of free competition. This is the era of Horatio Alger whose heroes rise from lowly origins through hard work and some luck and climb all the way up

---

4. Using a T- and an F-test, mean scores of adaptation to wage labor were found to be significantly different beyond the .001 level.

the ladder of success. The idol of this time is the entrepreneur, a rugged individual (not always a *homo novus* though) who uses all his energy and competence restlessly and ruthlessly to find new solutions to the innumerable technical, organizational, and economic problems he encounters every day. Driven by profit-making alone, he spares no human effort, neither his own nor that of others.

This mobilization of entrepreneurial energy makes it indeed possible to find solutions to the most burning problems of the newly emerging capitalist system. Within a highly problematical situation, under conditions of almost total uncertainty, an uncompromising emphasis placed on achievement is, according to our theory, in fact the most efficient form of social organization for this plunge into the unknown.

Among "primitive" achievers, achievement-striving is normatively restrained in order to avoid the self-destruction of the system. If unrestricted, a few would end up at the top and quickly use their newly gained power to consolidate their position and establish control over all others to refrain them from endangering the position of those at the top through continued achievement-striving. Therefore, "primitive" achievers have built into their system redistribution mechanisms and more coercive means of control to assure the continued existence of an achievement system.

The newly industrializing countries of Europe and America did not introduce such controls. The industrial revolution occurred thus at extremely high social costs.

Cutthroat competition with its constant elimination of business enterprises and the concomitant displacements of labor implies an enormous waste of human and organizational potential. While this waste may be the necessary price for the thorough reorganization of society, it does at the same time point to an inherent inefficiency of the achievement principle that would make it unsuitable for a smoothly functioning society. This is thus the first paradox of the industrializing society: the contradiction between the permanent creation of new enterprises and new forms of business organization and their almost simultaneous elimination.

The waste of human potential is even more apparent in the working masses who were thrown into utter misery by the most inhumane achievement-striving of a few and were exploited most cruelly. This exploitation culminated in the United States in the era of the "Robber Barons" and the sweatshops, around 1900, and in England in the first half of the nineteenth century from which the following description is taken.

Thousands of hands were suddenly required in these places, remote from towns. . . . The small and nimble fingers of little children being by very far the most in request. . . . Many, many thousands of these little, hapless creatures were sent down into the north, being from the age of 7 to the age of 13 or 14 years old. . . . cruelties the most heart-rending were practised . . . they were harassed to the brink of death by excess of labour . . . were flogged, fettered and tortured in the most exquisite refinement of cruelty; . . . they were in many cases starved to the bone while flogged to their work and . . . even in some instances . . . were

*driven to commit suicide. . . . The profits of manufacturers were enor-
mous; but this only whetted the appetite that it should have satisfied . . .
(Fielden, in Marx, 1967:758).*

This is thus the second paradox: the contradiction between the granting
of unlimited achievement opportunities to a few and the simultaneous
deprivation of the masses of any achievement opportunities and even of
their humanity.

The third, and principal, contradiction of incipient capitalism is thus its
simultaneous efficiency and inefficiency.

6   The Decline of Achievement

FROM ACHIEVEMENT TO NONACHIEVEMENT

During the industrial revolution, a preindustrial society is transformed into
an industrial one. Subsequently, control over the new technical and eco-
nomic processes, including markets, has grown and continues to grow
today. Structurally, the trend toward mounting control is expressed in the
transition from competitive capitalism with its predominance of small com-
panies to monopoly capitalism in which fewer and fewer giant corporations,
with the support of the state, share control over larger and larger portions
of the world.

Growing control over the economy is accompanied by increasing con-
trol over the system of role allocation: Occupational role allocation by
achievement, with its built-in unpredictability of who occupies which occu-
pation at a given time, and with its resulting uncertainties, has been giving
way to an expanding emphasis on nonachieved criteria.

Examining the lives of more than six hundred of America's wealthiest men,
Sorokin (1925) found that the wealthy class is becoming a caste-like group.
A few years later, Taussig and Joslyn (1932) confirmed that inbreeding is
becoming widespread among business leaders, blocking the road to suc-
cess by individual achievement for sons of farmers and manual laborers.
Further evidence was added after the depression. In 1937, Lynd and Lynd
(1937) reexamined Middletown and reported shrinking opportunities (Hu-
ber, 1971:387). This trend continued after World War II:

*The facts indicate that rapid rise through sheer ability and industry is
much more difficult than it was a generation or two ago. Status is
harder to achieve by one's own initiative and easier to acquire through
family connections (Kluckhohn, 1949:255).*

As early as 1913, Woodrow Wilson called for laws to bring society into
line with the American Creed: to bridge the gap between the belief in equal

opportunity and the reality of restriction on ascent. And twenty-five years later, Franklin D. Roosevelt found, "that equality of opportunity as we have known it no longer exists" (cf. Huber, 1971:384).

CRITERIA OF OCCUPATIONAL ROLE ALLOCATION

Some sociologists (Lipset and Bendix, 1959; Blau and Duncan, 1967) have tried to save the image of America as an achieving society by showing that there still is considerable social mobility. But mobility figures do not allow any inference to achievement. Even ascriptive Hausa society has considerable mobility. As long as the occupational structure changes, e.g., through automation, there will be mobility. Crucial here is not the *amount* but the *criteria* of mobility: are they achieved or nonachieved? These criteria will now be examined in detail.

Technical competence   Technical skills, acquired through formal education or through some form of "training on the job," are primary achieved criteria in that they are germane to the performance of work roles. There is no doubt that a very large number of occupational roles in industrial societies require a considerable amount of skill in their performance. However, this does not make an achieving society, as it does not indicate whether people are given certain work roles *because* they have the required skills or for other reasons, acquiring the skills later. This question would be easy to decide if the functionalist school of stratification were right in all its assumptions: that there are functionally necessary work roles that require specific skills; that talents for the learning of these skills are scarce; that the activation of the talents and the acquisition of the skills through training require sacrifices, and that differential occupational prestige and rewards are but incentives for this activation. In that case, one could practically infer from the presence of skills in a work role that the possession of these skills *must* have been decisive for the allocation of the role. However, talents are not scarce, and the number of those trained or trainable for any occupational role exceeds the opportunities by far. Our industrial system has become so efficient that it can train almost everyone for any occupational role. In other words: as industry has shifted from a highly problematical to an unproblematical setting, technical skills as criteria of role allocation have lost much of the functional relevance they would have in a problematical setting. The industrial system is built upon the potential of the mediocre, not of the person with rare skills. The American stratification system, instead of being the outcome of differential achievement, provides a mechanism for limiting, at the outset, the number of those who are allowed to achieve. Moreover, the concept of the activation of one's talents as a sacrifice is "a direct reflection of the rationalizations, offered by the more fortunate members of a society, of the rightness of their occupancy of privileged positions" (Tumin, 1953).

Education Skill and competence as criteria of role allocation present a difficult problem: they are socially invisible and cannot be easily measured. Instead, a substitute has been generally adopted: education—one of the most powerful determinants of occupational mobility. To what extent is education an achieved criterion, i.e., directly related to the performance of a work role? Most education in the United States is of a general nature; it is more of an initiation rite than a preparation for any specific job. Its irrelevance has become an object for radical critique among the young, who are appalled by the triviality of much of the mass higher education. As H. P. Miller, director of Census Bureau population studies, puts it:

> With a high school diploma, you can drive a bus for a transcontinental bus company. Without it, you're lucky to get a job with the podunk transit company (Rosenthal, 1971).

Thus, most education is not directly germane to specific occupations. Some argue that a general education enables the student to cope with rapid change. But technological change affects only a few in any radical manner; and I do not see that the accumulation of bits and pieces of knowledge is necessarily superior to specialized training with its emphasis on the development of a certain problem-solving capacity in a narrow field.

However, general education may improve one's competence, problem-solving capacity, adaptability, etc., in a diffuse way. Such an education is being offered to an exceedingly large number of Americans; and if present trends continue, almost every American will get a college education by the end of this century. Thus, a general college education can no longer serve as a basis of differential work-role allocation. It is interesting to note that college education no longer promises a job. Since there are far more qualified candidates with college credentials than positions, another screening device is being used: only a degree from a prestigious school can now promise a job.

But what about those who do have a specialized education? Many, if not most, work in jobs they have *not* been trained for. This is even true for the highly specialized as Dalton (1959:162) found in a study of 226 managers: the formal duties of at least 62 percent were unrelated to their specialized education.

Hence, education is to a large extent a nonachieved criterion in that it is not directly related to work role performance. In an economy that is increasingly dominated by huge bureaucracies, a certain educational level is almost like an innate quality. The choice of education as a criterion simplifies the selection process enormously and carries an element of predictability into the role allocation system. As industrial and governmental bureaucracies represent generally unproblematical settings in a mature industrial economy, they function much better with a largely predetermined selection system than with the uncertainties of a system that relies on achieved criteria.

Career beginnings Mobility on a scale of prestige-ranked occupational roles may be influenced by previously held occupational roles: based either on successful occupational accomplishments or on fixed promotional schedules varying by occupational class. The first occupational role in a career has found particular interest among sociologists. They established in several nationwide studies that it is a major determinant of occupational mobility. Inherently it is neither achievement nor nonachievement oriented. A satirical interpretation is given in the Peter principle: Promotions based on successful performance in a preceding job tend to be continued to the level of incompetence from which there is no further rise.

Normative orientations There is increasing evidence that normative orientations, i.e., the "right" attitudes, beliefs, values, are of considerable importance. Competence may be difficult to see; conformity with the boss's opinions is more likely to find attention. Acquiring the skills of a particular job is important *after* promotion; what is crucial *before* is the internalization of the normative orientations and behavior patterns of the occupational *group.* Coates and Pellegrin (1956:121–126) found that career progress results from anticipatory socialization, not from native ability, hard work, and other types of merit:

> *Occupational placement and early career experiences lead individuals to adopt attitudes, values and behavior patterns which function as important positive or negative influences in subsequent career progress and occupational mobility.*

This may also explain, in part, the importance of formal education as a determinant of mobility. Particularly at high school and college, a person learns to think, dress, and behave "right," though he may not necessarily show it so long as he goes to school. In his previously mentioned study, Dalton (1959:163) concludes: "The total experience of going to college may be more important for the executive than the technical courses he takes."

Social orientations and skills Social skills, "the art of handling people," may for theoretical reasons be the most central category of criteria. The allocation of a role is not automatic; even in the technologically most advanced company it is never completely computerized. It is always the outcome of a decision-making process. The art of influencing the decision maker is therefore more likely to pay off than any other criterion. Even skills may be acquired, not because of their usefulness in the performance of a work role, but because they might influence the decision maker.

The importance of social skills is no secret. In a management poll of 1946, *Fortune* asked executives which qualities they rated as having contributed most to their success. A majority checked "ability to handle people." A replication of the study some eight years later by Wald and Doty confirmed these results: skill in human relations was considered most important in the careers of the respondents, particularly: "ability to get along with people," "social poise," "consideration of others," and "tact in per-

sonal dealings." "Capacity to analyze facts" and "to understand and correctly solve problems" ranked only second in importance. The importance of human relations is not limited to executives, it reaches down through the white collar ranks to the factory worker. The emphasis in worker evaluation has shifted from efficiency in terms of output per time unit to human relations with fellow workers, subordinates, and superiors. In Menninger's words:

> The difference between success and failure depends on knowing how to get along with other people. About 80 percent of the people fired from their jobs are dismissed because they don't know how to get along with the people they work with or for (Huber, 1971:273-274).

Biological criteria Criteria of role allocation may be more or less germane to role performance; and at the same time it may be methodologically more or less difficult to determine their germaneness. However, there is one set of criteria which is clearly nonachieved: race, ethnicity, sex, and age. Even though they are unrelated to job performance they are major determinants of occupational role allocation. Some outspoken minorities have been protesting against ascriptive role allocation, particularly against race and sex discrimination; the "silent majority," however, has always been firmly behind these practices.

Social membership There is a class of criteria which is as nonachieved, and frequently as inflexible and irreversible, as is the biological: kinship, class membership, property ownership, religion, and family status. Another class of criteria may be added that is equally unrelated to occupational role performance but more easily reversible: membership in parties, trade unions, and other voluntary associations.

Motivation Of all personality dispositions, need for Achievement (n Ach) would seem to be most strongly related to role performance. If functionalist stratification theorists are right with their analysis of our society, then persons high in n Ach should be more likely to activate their talents through performance-related training and move ahead of their fellows low in n Ach. The best researched area is the educational field. However, the relationship between n Ach and *scholastic performance* is consistently found to be inconclusive, inadequate, and erratic. Lavin (1965:77) concludes in his comprehensive survey of the field:

> We find that the results of studies using projective measures of achievement motivation are very inconsistent. . . . In general, the research does not indicate that achievement motivation is strikingly related to academic performance.

The results of studies on n Ach and *occupational performance* are similarly negative. Reviewing the literature, Brown (1965:470–471) reports:

> There are some statistically significant relations with job performance but these are not large enough to have practical significance. . . . The work with the achievement motive done to date does not enable us

either to create to motive or to select for it. . . . The point of maximal leverage at present is social structure rather than psychology.

Is there at least a relationship between achievement motivation and occupational mobility? Lipset and Bendix (1959:247) found no evidence. More recently, Featherman (1972:139) has reconfirmed this:

No support appears for the hypothesis that achievement orientations are highly relevant to the status attainment processes in our population.

Role allocation as a random process   Very frequently, especially among the lower classes, the selection of a job tends to be a random choice. As a result of poverty, lack of education, absence of vocational advice, and a lack of opportunity to explore fully the available job opportunities, individuals of working-class background are while attending school likely to have vague job plans for the future and to take the first available job they can find when they leave school (Lipset and Bendix, 1959:198). More recently, the inflation of high school and college degrees and the deflation of employment opportunities has forced more and more persons into random choices, regardless of class background. If one is lucky enough to come across a job opening, and does not grab it, the opportunity may not come again.

SOCIAL INVISIBILITY OF ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement component of criteria of role allocation cannot be directly measured. This may be of no importance at times like the industrial revolution when new systems of roles and of role allocation are to be worked out. However, once the new economy is firmly established and smoothly running, the measurement problem becomes crucial. How can occupational roles and the remuneration and power that go with them be allocated by achievement when achievement cannot be measured? It is this social invisibility of achievement that is in part responsible for the inefficiency of achievement as an allocative principle.

Similarly invisible is the achievement component of *occupational roles*. Even around 1900, when Frederick W. Taylor tried to measure individual achievement in simple manual jobs, workers objected against it as a poorly disguised pseudoscientific "management device." "Whose time does the stop watch keep?" the United Automobile Workers union asked its members. "It ticks off the needs and interests of the boss, not of the fellow who has to do the work out in the shop" (Miller and Form, 1964:653). Today, as our economy has become a highly complex system of social production that does not rely on any single human input, achievement can no longer be measured on an individual basis:

Modern economic society can only be understood as an effort, wholly successful, to synthesize by organization a group personality far superior for its purposes to a natural person (Galbraith, 1967:60).

Our present industrial economy is so highly productive because it represents one huge cooperative effort, with all individuals caught in a web of interdependent relations. Its output can never be attributed to achievement in any single occupational role. Individual achievement may still be present in the manner of brave soldiers in armies; but the success of modern armies depends very little on brave soldiers.

The efficiency of this cooperative effort lies in the degree of predetermination and predictability of industrial processes. Production is organized around routinized and systematized ways of doing things. Production programs and fixed schedules have replaced individual initiative. Such a system not only does not need the individual achiever; its smooth functioning would even be upset by achievement-oriented role allocation. Such a system of role allocation would carry the uncertainties and unpredictabilities, which have been eliminated by technological progress, right back into the industrial process. Hence, in a technologically highly efficient industrial economy, achievement is an inefficient principle of role and reward allocation.

At this point, however, our theory calls for a qualification. Our economy has not reached *complete* control over its environment; scarcity has not yet been abolished. Some areas, particularly those that specialize in science and progress, still operate in problematical settings under conditions of uncertainty. Wherever such problematical settings occur, achievement is likely to continue to exist.

The ongoing changes open up new possibilities. It is the very decrease in functional relevance of achieved criteria that permits the activation of a fuller human potential, particularly the ability to relate to others meaningfully in closely knit groups. This is reflected in the sequence of organizational theories. During the first decade of this century, Taylorism aimed at the maximization of achievement alone. A generation later, when America had matured industrially, the human relations school discovered the importance of social and normative orientations. More recently, a new being has arisen in social science literature: organization man, or bureaucratic man. Through his social ethic, he identifies fully with the group and larger organization in which he works. As he still carries the birthmarks of the capitalistic order, his qualities are still impure. Instead of finding his individuality in the organization, he loses it—ceasing to exist as an individual.

7 The Achievement Ideology

An ideology is a set of statements that are not open to disproof by empirical evidence and that are designed to shape social reality: change a given state of society, consolidate it, protect it against alternatives or deny its historical relativity.

According to the achievement ideology, America *actually* is and *ideally* ought to be an achieving society. The basic argument runs as follows: equality of opportunity at the start gives every member of society the same chance. Placement in the social hierarchy and, correspondingly, allocation of rewards, are competitively organized.[5] Success is only a matter of individual merit, i.e., based on achievement. Hence, everyone deserves his place in society: those at the top because of their hard work and talent, those at the bottom because of their lack of ambition, ability, and effort. The blame for failure is solely on the individual, and so is the responsibility for success. The present order is thus optimal; any deviation would violate the principle of "just" placement by individual achievement.

The functionalist school of sociology has endorsed the ideology in its stratification theory which is analogous to price theory: the prestige and remuneration of an occupational role are the *price* of achievement. This price is determined by the supply of scarce talents needed in an occupation and by the demand determined by the functional importance of the occupation. The price of achievement serves as an incentive: it motivates the individual to mobilize, through personal efforts, his scarce talents. Any attempt to change the criteria of role allocation would interfere with the interplay of talent supply and demand on the free market and would endanger the optimal distribution of the members of society over the functionally important positions. But functionalist stratification theory is wrong in its basic assumptions and hence in its conclusions. Functionally indispensable roles cannot be singled out, and talents are not scarce. Particularly the present college generation is painfully aware of that: for every vacancy, there are dozens if not hundreds of candidates. To judge from the number of job applications I receive every week, there is a similar gross imbalance between qualified candidates and available slots even in highly specialized, talent-intensive work roles like that of university professor.

The achievement ideology is not open to disproof. It is obvious that for most individuals, actual equality of opportunity does not exist. Moreover, it has been shown that achieved criteria are of very little importance in the American system of occupational role allocation. Today America is not an achieving society. Quoting from the *American Banker*, Merton (1968:224) reports:

> *Only a few of us that share the common lot are destined to accumulate great wealth, or achieve conspicuous stations. The number of such stations and the chances for such accumulations* **never did correspond, and never will,** *to the number of energetic, ambitious and capable men which is hopeful of achieving them. This unpalatable truth the literature of success abhors.*

5. In a model achieving society, achievement serves four allocative functions: (1) a recruitment function (allocation of an occupational role); (2) a mobility function (allocation of a higher or lower ranking occupational role relative to the previous role or relative to father's occupation); (3) an authority function (allocation of formal authority as accruing to an occupational role); (4) a distributive function (allocation of remunerative rewards as accruing to an occupational role).

The achievement ideology is designed to shape reality. It represents an internally consistent scheme that explains and justifies the class structure in its status quo. It legitimizes the social hierarchy, its privileges and deprivations. The achievement ideology is thus a legitimation principle for many types of oppression and exploitation.

Throughout her history, America has had a class for her dregs and a class for her rich. It is probably the general acceptance throughout the nation of the achievement ideology as a central part of the American Creed that has saved the country from any form of class struggle:

> *Americans of all national origins, classes, regions, creeds, and colors, have something in common: a social* **ethos**, *a political creed. It is difficult to avoid the judgment that this American Creed is the cement in the structure of this great and disparate nation. . . . So, by the logic of the unique American history, it has developed that the rich and secure, out of pride and conservatism, and the poor and insecure, out of dire need, have come to profess the identical social ideals (Myrdal, 1962:3,13).*

But why cannot those millions of Americans who do not benefit from the achievement ideology see through it? Believers are never converted by facts, and what is obvious to the outsider may not be obvious at all to the insider. Besides, there are a number of reasons which make it very difficult to recognize the ideological character of the belief in equality and achievement: the absence of a feudal past; continuously high rates of social mobility; steady increases in educational opportunities; selected patterns of business careers that were well publicized in the success literature; minorities on whose shoulders the children of previous generations of immigrants could rise; and most important, the combination of relative wealth and mass production of consumer goods which minimizes differences in visible standards of living. When the carrot assumes a certain size and quality, it is convenient to ignore the stick.

The achievement *principle* explains the emergence of a new class structure around the time of the industrial revolution. The achievement *ideology* explains the preservation of this class structure into the age of industrial maturity as if history had stopped for a century.

8 The Achievement Conflict: A Contradiction of Capitalism

THE ANARCHY OF CAPITALIST ROLE ALLOCATION

Technologically and economically, our society has made the transition from a situation of highly problematical to unproblematical settings; accordingly, there has been a shift from role allocation by achieved to non-

achieved criteria, as suggested by our theory. However, this shift has not been a change from one strict principle of role allocation to another. Instead of substituting a set of well-defined and institutionally sanctioned nonachieved criteria for the achieved ones, the present system of role allocation is characterized by a state of anarchy. A multitude of criteria is being used in an almost infinite number of combinations; and the weight that each criterion carries may vary, because of the arbitrariness of many decisions about role allocation, from one time to another.

A clearly defined new system of role allocation would require a corresponding new ideology which would have to be nonachievement oriented, for instance a social ethic instead of an achievement ethic. But the anarchy of capitalist role allocation makes the preservation of the achievement ideology possible despite the actual changes in the system of role allocation. As the achievement ideology legitimizes the present class structure with all its actual role occupancies, there are of course very strong vested interests in maintaining that ideology. As it is much easier to uphold the achievement ideology when definitions of allocative criteria are hazy rather than clear, there is simultaneously a vested interest in the anarchical state of role allocation.

Hence, there continues to be a discrepancy between the achievement ideology and the actual system of role allocation: according to the ideology, we live in an achieving society; in reality, we do not. This discrepancy will be referred to in short as the *achievement conflict.*

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACHIEVEMENT CONFLICT

The achievement conflict has far-reaching consequences for both society and its members. On the social system level, three consequences will be discussed: anomy, authoritarianism, and hierarchization; on the personality system level: alienation, deviance, mental disorder, and suicide.

Anomy   Anomy (lit. "lawlessness") as a structural condition of society results from a discrepancy between the value system, i.e., the achievement ideology, on the one hand, and the actual process of role allocation which structures the capacities of individuals to act in accord with values, on the other hand. Role allocation in contemporary America is anomical: it deviates squarely from the noble ideals of society. The result is also known as "rat race," the crazy run for goals that cannot be reached through the means and opportunities offered by society. *Structured strain* is a central characteristic of an anomical situation like the achievement conflict. Structured strain leads in turn to alienation, crime, and various forms of mental pathology as well as suicide.

Authoritarianism   Authoritarianism is defined here as a command system that is not legitimated by the value system of a society. Societies under the achievement conflict tend to authoritarianism on several accounts. Because of the discrepancy between the achievement ideology and the actual system

of role allocation, individuals in command roles are likely to have attained these roles in ways that are at variance with the value system: they have not "achieved" their roles as required by the achievement ideology. Hence, their occupancy is not legitimated and thus authoritarian. Similarly, their decisions to hire or promote individuals are not legitimized by the achievement ideology; such decisions are by definition authoritarian. Moreover, as a group consensus through democratic procedures is hard to reach under conditions of anomy, authoritarian decision-making structures tend to be more efficient. Thus command systems, as found particularly in our complex organizations, tend to be authoritarian under conditions of achievement conflict.

Hierarchization   Societies characterized by the achievement conflict tend to form increasingly elaborate status hierarchies. When individuals are to be evaluated and rewards to be determined, the emphasis tends to be more on the position in the status hierarchy than on specific achievements. Status in the hierarchy is legitimized by the achievement ideology which claims that status has been "earned" through actual achievements. Because of the absence or invisibility of true achievement which could indicate and justify one's status, status symbols are used as a substitute.

PERSONALITY CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACHIEVEMENT CONFLICT

Alienation   Societies in a state of anomy, as caused by the achievement conflict, produce alienated individuals. As the actual process of occupational role allocation fails to follow the achievement norm everyone has been taught to believe in, the individual subjectively experiences *normlessness,* the first of five dimensions of alienation. The intensity of this experience is heightened by the anarchy of capitalist role allocation.

Because of this anarchy, the individual is unable to understand what is going on in role allocation. As outcomes cannot be predicted, role and reward allocation become unintelligible, or meaningless—hence the experience of *meaninglessness.*

Due to the anarchy of role allocation, the individual has no power over his career; he may activate certain skills and talents but cannot be sure that this effort will be rewarded. He experiences *powerlessness.*

Individuals are integrated into society or groups by sharing a common normative system. The achievement-conflict experience that the shared normative system in fact does not guide actual social processes makes such a system meaningless in a given social context. Hence, the normative system ceases to maintain its integrative function, and disintegration, experienced as *subjective isolation,* results. This is paralleled by *social isolation,* the cleavage between those who are in positions of command and those in positions of compliance.

Believing in the achievement ideology and trying to live up to one's achievement aspirations leads to constant frustration. As the achievement

ideology is fully internalized, one is unlikely to blame the system—such a sociological notion, as "blaming the system," is alien to most people. Hence, one ends up blaming oneself, and so do one's "relevant others": wife, children, friends. Man becomes alienated from his inner self: first in his occupational life, then in his private life. *Self-estrangement* becomes the dominant experience of man in an achievement-conflict ridden society.

Social deviance   A latent disposition to deviant behavior is created by the subjective experience of normlessness, a dimension of alienation. The achievement ideology promises occupational roles and rewards to everyone who deserves them; but the actual social system reserves the opportunity of living up to one's aspirations for only a few. And as society defines goals as more important than means, illegal means—crime and delinquency—are employed to reach out for goals that cannot be attained legally.

> *It is when a system of cultural values extols, virtually above all else, certain* **common** *success-goals* **for the population at large** *while the social structure rigorously restricts or completely closes access to approved modes of reaching these goals* **for a considerable part of the same population,** *that deviant behavior ensues on a large scale (Merton, 1968:200).*

The newspapers are full of incidences every day where deviant shortcuts for success have been uncovered.

Mental disorder   As self-estrangement is one of the personality consequences of the achievement conflict, one may expect increased incidences of mental disorder as a pathological expression of self-estrangement.

While the emphasis on achievement is universal in American society, opportunities are differentially distributed by class. The achievement conflict affects the lower classes more than the upper classes. One may therefore expect higher rates of mental illness among lower classes. Kleiner and Parker (1963:193) found in their review of numerous empirical studies that there is in fact an excess of treated schizophrenia and total (both treated and untreated) psychoses in the lower status groups. Explaining this finding, they reported and documented that discrepancies between aspirations (as instilled by the achievement ideology) and occupational attainment lead to mental disorder and that such discrepancies were more pronounced among persons of lower-class background.

However, they found that such attainment-aspiration discrepancies are not limited to the lower classes. Throughout society, frustrated aspirations are a cause of mental illness.

One of their findings throws some light on the impact of the present educational inflation. When higher education—usually *believed* to be an achieved criterion of role allocation—does not lead to higher occupational attainment, it tends to lead to schizophrenia. The educational inflation, which is not accompanied by a simultaneous increase in high-ranking occupational roles, thus heightens the subjective experience of the achievement conflict.

These results were confirmed by a study on mental health in its prepatho-

logical stage among automobile workers. The most significant factor was found to be the opportunity the work offers for use of the worker's abilities and for associated feelings of interest, sense of accomplishment, personal growth, and self-respect. Kornhauser (1965:268–276) concludes:

> *Our major interpretation is that poorer mental health occurs whenever conditions of work and life lead to continuing frustration by failing to offer means for perceived progress toward attainment of strongly desired goals . . . The unsatisfactory mental health of working people consists in no small measure of their dwarfed desires and deadened initiative, reduction of their goals and restriction of their efforts to a point where life is relatively empty. . . . Industrial workers, like all the rest of us, are caught on the horns of a dilemma: if they want* **too much** *relative to what they are prepared to strive for with some degree of success, the result is defeat and frustration; if they want* **too little,** *the consequence is a drab existence devoid of color, exhilaration, and self-esteem.*

Kornhauser emphasizes that his is a *general* theory of incongruence: Poor mental health is due to a discrepancy between value orientations instilled by the cultural system and the actual opportunities made available by the social system, reflected in, but not caused by, a conflict between motivations and individual circumstances.

Suicide   The most extreme consequence of the achievement conflict is suicide. "Egoistic" suicide is typical for an achieving society (as a consequence of the isolation of the lone achiever from his social group); "anomic" suicide is characteristic of a society under the achievement conflict, as Durkheim found out. Anomic suicide is added to, rather than replaced by, egoistic suicide.

> *Anomy . . . is a regular and special factor in suicide in our modern societies; one of the springs from which the annual contingent feeds (Durkheim, 1966:258).*

The postulated tendency toward suicide as a result of the achievement conflict has been reexamined by Breed (1963:188):

> *New Orleans white male suicides showed substantial problems with work, . . . low-achievement performances promote suicide in good times or bad . . . anomy is the focus.*

CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACHIEVEMENT CONFLICT IN INDUSTRY

I have examined the impact of the achievement conflict in two empirical studies among white-collar employees: one in Liberia and one in Germany and the United States. In each country two companies were studied. Research in Liberia was done in 1968–1969, using participant observation,

standardized interview and questionnaire techniques; research in Germany and the United States was done in 1970, using standardized questionnaires.

Organizational climate Liberia offered quasi-experimental conditions. The two companies studied were alike in every respect (both being iron-ore mining companies, located in the rain forest belt, relatively isolated, and run by expatriate engineers and managers with African labor) except one: company one tended to allocate roles and rewards by achievement, company two did not. This observed difference[6] was reflected in the perception of the employees: company one was regarded by 60.5 percent as an achievement system and by 19.7 percent as a nonachievement system; company two was regarded by 18.8 percent as an achievement system and by 40.8 percent as a nonachievement system (19.8 and 40.4 percent respectively as a mixed system). As the employees in both companies believed equally strongly in achievement as a value, company two was characterized to a significantly higher degree by the achievement conflict than was company one. It was predicted as a social consequence of the achievement conflict that social tensions, an anomy indicator operationalized as rating of organizational climate by employees, should be low in company one and high in company two. The hypothesis was in fact strongly supported by the data ($x^2 = 113.41$; df = 4; $p < .001$; $\gamma = .86$). It was further predicted that those who perceive their company as an achievement system (= perceived achievement conflict) are less likely to have a cognitive experience of the consequences of the achievement conflict (in terms of rating of organizational climate) than those who consider their company as a nonachievement system. This was again strongly confirmed ($x^2 = 76.38$; df = 8; $p < .001$; $\gamma = -.50$).[7]

In the studies in Germany and the United States, only the employees' perception of their respective companies as achievement or nonachievement system was measured as independent variable. Perceived achievement conflict was again found to have a strong influence on organizational climate ($x^2 = 26.55$; df = 8; $p < .001$; $\gamma = -.64$).

Authoritarianism It was further hypothesized that the achievement conflict leads to authoritarian decision-making structures. In both studies, this hypothesis was confirmed. Using participant observation in Liberia, it was found that achievement oriented company one tended to delegate power to lower levels in the hierarchy and to use democratic procedures; non-achievement oriented company two tended to concentrate power in higher strata and to use autocratic procedures in decision-making. In the study in Germany and the United States, employees were asked to rate decision-

6. This difference was established through a detailed examination of company policies, through participant observation by two researchers over one year, and through depth interviews with management and employees.

7. To determine the relative influence of achievement conflict and perceived achievement conflict on rating of organizational climate, the data were path-analyzed. The path coefficient from achievement conflict to organizational climate was .41, the path coefficient from perceived achievement conflict .26. Both independent variables explained 30 percent variance.

making structures in their respective companies on a scale ranging from democratic to authoritarian. The underlying hypothesis was confirmed: (perceived) achievement conflict goes together with (rated) authoritarian structures ($x^2 = 20.78$; df = 8; p < .01; $\gamma = .39$). (It may be added that in none of the studies was there any evidence that the achievement conflict produces "authoritarian personalities.")

Individual satisfaction   Individual satisfaction, an indicator of individual alienation within the company, was operationalized as satisfaction with work, position, and promotion opportunities, and combined into a composite index. The result of the study in Liberia was unexpected: the achievement conflict, regardless of how it was measured, had no significant impact on individual satisfaction. This unexpected finding was actually the main reason for replicating the study in Germany and the United States. It was hypothesized that the effect of the achievement conflict on satisfaction in the two companies in Liberia might have been offset by the exceptionally high remunerations received (free housing; approximately double pay for expatriate employees compared with pay in home country; relatively high pay, by local standards, for local employees). The study in Germany and the United States confirmed the original hypothesis as well as the ad hoc hypothesis: perceived achievement conflict did have an impact on satisfaction ($x^2 = 30.62$; df = 12; p < .005; $\gamma = .43$).

The empirical studies in Liberia, Germany, and the United States thus lend additional support to our earlier findings of the consequences of the achievement conflict. (For a more detailed analysis cf. Seibel, 1973a and c.)

CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM

The superiority of today's capitalism over all previous economic systems culminates in the extraordinary technological and economic control it has gained over industrial processes. As capitalism outgrew the problematical settings of the industrial revolution, it also left its achievement-centered system of role allocation behind. However, because of vested class interest (cf. Sections Six and Seven), a contradiction has now emerged: the change to unproblematical settings has not been accompanied by a shift to a new ideology based on a new system of nonachieved criteria. The achievement conflict is a *contradiction of capitalism.*

The costs of this contradiction of capitalism are severe. The consequences of the achievement conflict harm the social system as well as its members as individual personalities: this is possibly the most serious problem. One has only to think of race and sex discrimination in the job market, which are results of the anarchy of the present role-allocation system, or of the crime problem which is at least in part due to the achievement conflict. Or one may think of the enormous number of people who seek psychiatric help because they can no longer take the stress that comes with the achievement conflict.

Why then don't we resolve the achievement conflict if it is that costly?

This is like many other questions: Why don't we give equal opportunities to blacks and women? Why do we continue to increase the military budget *after* the longest war in America's history is over, and cut back on social programs? Why is there widespread poverty and unemployment in the wealthiest nation of the world? The list of such questions could fill a book.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these contradictions of capitalism are all related to the supreme contradiction of the capitalist system, that between *social production* and the *private, capitalist form of control and ownership of the means of production.* The prodigious expansion of the productive forces has implied the enormous development of the division of labor into one huge interdependent cooperative (= social) unit; in other words, production has been effectively socialized.

> *But this socialization of production which transforms the labor of all mankind into objectively cooperative labor is not regulated, directed, managed according to any conscious plan. It is governed by . . . the variations in the rate of profit and the working of the equalisation of the rate of profit. . . . This is why the totality of production, though objectively socialised, develops independently of the human needs it has itself aroused, and is urged onward only by the capitalists' thirst for profit.*
>
> *The private form of appropriation makes profit the only aim and driving force of production. . . . Production develops by leaps and bounds, not in the sectors where the most urgent real needs are to be found, but rather in those where the highest profits can be achieved. The production of alcoholic drinks, of "comic books" and of drugs takes precedence over the struggle against air-pollution, the preservation of natural resources, and even the building of schools and hospitals (Mandel, 1970:171).*

An elimination of the achievement conflict is ultimately very unlikely without concomitant changes in the system of control and/or ownership of the means of production. For the anarchy of capitalist role allocation feeds into the achievement ideology, and the achievement ideology is the only principle that legitimizes the wealth and power of those who own and/or control the means of production.

9 Achievement in Socialist Society

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

Socialism is considered by its proponents as a transitional socioeconomic system between capitalism and communism. As socialism emerges from capitalist society, it

is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges (Marx, 1938:8).

The most significant of these birthmarks is, usually, a capitalist system of distribution. Competition for scarce resources, resulting in unequal distribution, will continue to exist in socialism until technological advances have made it possible to eliminate scarcity. Only when scarcity ceases to exist will the struggle for the private acquisition of goods and services disappear. As private acquisition provides the basis for a stratificaton system, which is nothing but the outcome of the process of differential distribution, a stratification system may wither away when scarcity is eliminated. Thus, classless society results. This process however marks the shift from socialism to communism, socialism itself still being a stratified society where the struggle for scarce goods and services goes on and leads to inequalities akin to those in capitalism. Ideally, no member of society, especially no worker, is exploited in socialism; he is supposed to receive his "fair share." In actuality, however, it appears to be difficult to maintain the "fair share" principle under conditions of scarcity.

Socialism is not in all spheres as remote from communism as it is in distribution. Unlike capitalism, socialism in the eastern hemisphere has socialized ownership of and control over the means of production. This implies that at least ideally production decisions are guided by social consideration, i.e., they are geared toward the needs of the people and not toward profits for the benefit of a few capitalists.

As socialism is defined as a transitional system, its characteristics tend to be fluid and highly variable. Depending on whether a society entered its socialist phase at the height of capitalism or at the beginning of its modernization phase, the structure of the newly emerging system is likely to be quite different. Moreover, depending on its distance from communism, its structure may be more capitalist or more communist. The subsequent study will be limited to the Soviet Union. Our theory (Section Three) will prove itself as useful to the analysis of socialist society as of capitalism. While this does indicate the *general* applicability of the theory, the underlying case, namely the Soviet Union, cannot be taken as "typical" of a socialist society. Because of the enormous variation, one may even say that no single socialist society is really "typical" of socialism, as found for example in China, Sweden, Yugoslavia, or elsewhere.

INDUSTRIALIZATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

From each according to his ability   The transformation of a very backward country that had barely entered the stage of capitalism into a highly modernized, socialist society in a very short period of time implies convulsive changes that even exceed, in magnitude and intensity, the years of frantic modernization during the industrial revolution of the now capitalistic societies. The approximate two decades after the October revolution of 1917

provided, throughout society, such extremes of *problematical settings* as were virtually unprecedented. The first of these two decades was a period of ultimate political turmoil, of all-out struggles for political survival, and of the consolidation of power. The enormous task of rapid industrialization, carried out with absolute determination and, when deemed necessary, brute force, fell more or less into the second of these two decades. According to our theory, we would thus expect an equally extreme and uncompromising reliance on achieved criteria for work-role allocation.

In fact, the "Leap Forward" involved a maximum mobilization of talents and skills, allocating work roles by competence only. Traditional mobility barriers like sex and social origin were torn down. The near-perfect achieving society emerged. Initial economic backwardness and industrialization at maximum speed produced extreme scarcities of all kinds of skills, particularly in the technical field. Highly specialized training schemes, directly germane to specific work roles, were introduced at all levels that aimed at developing any talent needed in the production process. As the national economy expanded enormously under the industrialization and collectivization programs from 1928 on, the labor force was transformed. In 1938, for example, a total of more than 6.5 million people in industry and allied fields were given initial or refresher training *outside* of the universities and secondary schools; an additional 1.2 million underwent training in agriculture during 1937 and 1938. Opportunities for advancement were literally unlimited. Only competence, and the use of one's competence through hard work, counted: achievement in the most narrow sense of our definition.

Intense training and role allocation by achieved criteria were accompanied by an effort to maximize achievement on the job. This effort was formalized in the Stakhanovite movement, the term stemming from Alexei Stakhanov whose production output in September 1935, soared to fourteen times the norm. He accomplished this feat by maximizing all inputs available to him: his skills, hard work, innovativeness, and the use of unskilled auxiliaries—everything that was germane to work role performance.

The stratification system that emerged was truly functional, status being based essentially on differences in the functions performed in economic production, administration, and politics. Hereditary and semi-hereditary factors, the main criteria of role allocation in Tsarist Russia, had been eliminated. And, contrary to popular beliefs in the United States, ideological considerations, which had been a major force in role allocation immediately after the October Revolution, were quite unimportant during the Great Leap (Inkeles, 1971: 153).

To each according to his contribution   How was this revolution of achievement accomplished? What motivated people to activate all their talents and maximize the use of their skills? Besides force and the threat of severe punishment, a new principle was introduced by Stalin: *To* each according to his contribution. This was to be incentive and reward to make the achievement slogan *"From* each according to his ability" become reality. By launching an attack against the "equality-mongering" and wage equalization of

the so-called war communism period, Stalin began a movement of personal incentive based on differential reward. A new system of payment was ordered, to give each worker "his due according to his qualifications." The rapidly implemented campaign produced a number of new differential economic rewards and strengthened those existing in a rudimentary form. On collective farms, a piecework system of payment was introduced. In industry, gradings between skill categories became more precise, wage differences between skill levels were widened, and the progressive piece-rate system was extremely extended. Workers and technicians were to be prodded by special pay scales, "personal salaries," and production bonuses.

The achievement system was now complete: both work roles and work rewards were allocated by achievement throughout the work process. As a result, the functional hierarchy of work roles differing in skill and modified by differences in individual efficiency became henceforth identical with a hierarchy of remunerative rewards. At the end of the achievement boom, around 1940, the system of work roles had grown into an elaborate stratification system of at least nine major social groupings: the intelligentsia subdivided into the ruling elite, the superior intelligentsia, the general intelligentsia, and the white-collar group; the working class subdivided into highly skilled and productive workers, rank and file workers, and low-skill and low-efficiency workers; and the peasantry subdivided into highly productive peasants and average peasants. A tenth grouping may be added, comprising those in forced-labor camps. There are overlaps between the intelligentsia, the working class, and the peasantry: highly skilled workers rank above the white-collar group and highly productive peasants above average workers; low-efficiency workers are at the bottom of the nine groupings. These are only rough approximations as they are all further subdivided. It must be emphasized that there are no sharp distinctions between these groupings, and that party members are *not* necessarily at the top of the hierarchy (Inkeles, 1971: 151-152).

During the era of rapid industrialization, the Soviet Union presented a model case of the functionalist stratification theory as had probably no other country. There was a serious scarcity of talents that had to be activated for functionally important work roles. To motivate people, differential rewards were offered. In the resulting stratification system, everyone occupied his place because he had "earned" it. All premises of the achievement ideology had become true.

MATURATION AND NONACHIEVEMENT

On the eve of the third postrevolutionary decade, the Soviet Union possessed a virtually complete open-class system that based role occupancy and change on achievement. But with the completion of its industrial "take-off," methods of production, planning, and administration became more orderly and systematic. As a new industrial economy in fact emerged and as industrial processes increasingly came under control, problematical settings

gave way to *unproblematical settings.* And accordingly, as predicted by our theory, achieved criteria started to give way to nonachieved criteria in work role allocation. Around the time of World War II, the transition to a nonachieving society gradually started to take place.

A first indication was the creation, in 1939, of special Stalin Prizes for outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, and industry. The achievement component was still present, but a new element had been added: the prizes were practically reserved to people in the upper ranks. On a much broader scale, status considerations were institutionalized during the war: for the first time in the history of the Union, different types of military orders for exceptional contributions were created for different ranks, thus rewarding both actual achievement and status. After the war, rank was formalized throughout the economy by placing several millions in civilian uniforms. The colors and insignia of these uniforms symbolized a person's rank, particularly his status in the hierarchy of income, power, and prestige. To "improve discipline and increase the authority of those in positions of responsibility," a precise system of social stratification was thus molded into permanency. Functional needs had become structural musts. In effect, the Soviet Union had returned to a stratification system that had been dominant in Tsarist Russia: the system of *chiny,* or formal civil service ranks—denounced as a paramount symbol of exploitation and oppression during the first two postrevolutionary decades (Inkeles, 1971:157–159).

A series of new policies were introduced that aimed at grounding the system of work role allocation firmly on nonachieved criteria, even to making status hereditary—the epitome of a nonachieving society. (1) By strengthening the family, a new, strong emphasis was placed on kinship ties. There was now a large number of people who had gained high positions through personal achievement, and they were eager to pass some of the benefits and privileges they had earned on to their children. (2) By finding legal support in the abolishment of the inheritance tax law in force since 1926, the most striking blow was delivered against the achieving society. This law had provided for taxes graded progressively up to 90 percent of an estate. Today, a fee is collected that may not exceed 10 percent. Thus, the large incomes that were earned through personal achievement were now inherited by people who had in no way made any contribution. This, and a strong tendency toward regressive income taxation, is squarely contrary to the postulates in the Communist Manifesto of "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax" and "abolition of all right of inheritance." (3) Through introducing tuition fees at higher schools, and for the last three years of higher education, restricting access to educational opportunities. (4) Certain prestigious roles (e.g., military cadets) became accessible predominantly to the children of high-ranking parents. (5) Formal education (rather than specific competence) became increasingly important as apparent in the new trend of recruiting individuals for important managerial posts predominantly from the ranks of those who had gone through the regular educational channels; previously, any promising person could be rapidly trained and quickly advanced (Inkeles, 1971: 157–170).

. . . movement from the status of worker to high managerial positions within the same generation, the Soviet equivalent of the American dream of rags to riches, is now (1950) becoming less usual, whereas it was commonplace, if not the standard practice, in an earlier period (Inkeles, 1971:169–170).

Briefly, after World War II, the "bourgeoisification," as it is sometimes called, of the Soviet Union appeared to be in full swing, exhibiting similar tendencies toward role allocation by nonachievement, under similar conditions, as in the United States. This did not mean that mobility decreased; for structural changes in the economy continued to create new opportunities. But mobility was no longer solely dependent on achievement (Cf. Inkeles, 1971:150–155).

THE ACHIEVEMENT CONFLICT: FAILURE OF SOCIALISM

The achievement ideology Despite fundamental changes in the system of role and reward allocation during the third postrevolutionary decade, Soviet orthodoxy continued to propagate the achievement ideology.

The differentiation is, above all, determined by the differences of labor itself. The wage depends on the quantity and quality of labor—on the productivity and intensity of labor, on the qualification, skill and ability of the workers. . . . Increases in labor productivity due to technological progress have to be remunerated with a certain increase in monetary wages not only among those who introduce it. . . . The wage of managerial personnel is differentiated by extent, complexity and responsibility of organizational work (Zagolow et al., 1970).

As in capitalist society, the tenets of the achievement ideology were the same as those laid down in the functionalist stratification model: differential rewards were but incentives for the mobilization of scarce talents needed in functionally required work roles, the resulting class system being the outcome of differential achievement. Talents and skills were no longer scarce and production processes were mastered to the extent that little depended on individual achievement. But these facts were ignored; the ideology still presented the socialist slogan "From each according to his talents, to each according to his contribution" as an accurate description of reality at a time when reality had in actuality moved on to something like "From and to each according to his status in society."

Thus, a similar trend was found as in the United States: a continuing ideological insistence that roles and rewards were allocated by achievement, while in reality nonachieved criteria were being substituted for achieved ones in central areas, even with legal backing.

The achievement conflict Soviet society was then characterized by the achievement conflict: role allocation reality and ideology contradicted each other. The contradiction of capitalism had found a parallel in the Soviet Union.

Systematic studies are of course not available; but there is some evidence that the achievement conflict in the Soviet Union had similar consequences as in the United States: there were reports of high levels of alienation among Soviet workers.

Yet, the achievement conflict in the Soviet Union was not a contradiction of socialism. In the United States and other capitalist countries, the achievement conflict is a contradiction of capitalism as a system: it supports the continued existence of capitalism by legitimating the capitalist social order while it simultaneously hurts the members of society, economically, socially, and psychologically. In the Soviet Union, the consequences of the achievement conflict were possibly very similar; but the achievement ideology neither legitimated any socialist order nor did it support its continued existence. It did support the social order of the Soviet Union; but this order was not socialist. A rigid class system with semi-hereditary positions legitimated by an achievement ideology benefitted those Soviets who were in high-ranking positions, comparable to the way in which the same ideology perpetuates and safeguards the status of the owners and controllers of the means of production in capitalist society. But such a society is contrary to any principles of socialism. Thus, the achievement conflict is not a contradiction of socialism as a system but rather of a particular society, during a particular time of its history, that is labeled socialist. The achievement conflict manifested the failure of socialism in the Soviet Union during its third postrevolutionary decade.

TOWARD EQUALITY?

There is some indication that the Soviet Union may have entered a new phase, namely increased equality. In 1954, for example, uniforms, ranks, titles, and insignia were abolished for most civilian occupations (Inkeles, 1971:159). More importantly, tuition fees were abolished in 1955, and the Constitution was subsequently amended as of January 1, 1965: "Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to free education. This right is guaranteed by universal compulsory eight-year education . . . by free education of all kinds, by a system of state living allowances" (Inkeles, 1971:163). The full range of recent changes requires further investigation. Meanwhile, the possibility cannot be totally excluded that the Soviet Union may in fact be at the beginning of its way toward that society which is described in the following section.

10 Achievement in Communist Society

In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity

45

of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs! (Marx, 1938:10)

WORK ROLE ALLOCATION

The technological basis of communism is characterized by complete mastery over economic processes. Production and its organization are completely unproblematic:

Anarchy in social production is replaced by conscious organisation on a planned basis. The struggle for individual existence comes to an end. And at this point, in a certain sense, man finally . . . has become master of his own social organisation. . . . It is humanity's leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom (Engels, 1966:309–310).

According to our theory, achieved criteria of role allocation are irrelevant in such a situation of unproblematical settings. In fact, the notion of scarce talents and skills and of role allocation by specific competence is markedly absent in Marx's vision of communist society. In such a highly developed system, anyone can do virtually any work, and there is no need to devote one's work energy to a single work role:

. . . in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing to-day and another to-morrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic (Marx and Engels, 1947:22).

Communism is the first, and ultimate, social system which gives all its members without exception an opportunity to develop their physical and mental faculties to the fullest. It is this total mobilization of all abilities of man, in conjunction with a high level of technological development, that makes this free-floating system of work distribution possible. Communist man's motivation to work must of course be very different from capitalist or socialist man's work attitudes; this new motivation emerges only after the "need to work" has become engrained as a personality disposition into every individual. "From capitalist greed to social need," might become the slogan for this resocialization process.

. . . the former division of labour must disappear. Its place must be taken by an organisation of production in which, on the one hand, no individual can put on to other persons his share in productive labour, this natural condition of human existence; and in which on the other hand, productive labour, instead of being a means to the subjection of men, will become a means to their emancipation, by giving each in-

dividual the opportunity to develop and exercise all his faculties, physical and mental, in all directions; in which, therefore, productive labour will become a pleasure instead of a burden (Engels, 1966:320).

REWARD ALLOCATION

In capitalist and socialist society, remunerative rewards go with occupational roles; the differential distribution of rewards corresponds to the place of a work role in the status hierarchy. With the elimination of scarcity in communist society, differential remunerations become irrelevant. Differential remuneration would only be justified by differential achievement as a basis of work roles. Communist society is the first one to draw the logical conclusion from the fact that work roles are no longer allocated by achievement: it allocates goods and services "to each according to his needs." Thus, the system of distribution is no longer a system of remuneration or reward.

THE WITHERING-AWAY
OF WORK ROLES AND REWARDS

The question, "Is communist society an achieving or a nonachieving society?" is unanswerable. For the question, "Are work roles and rewards allocated by achieved or nonachieved criteria?" cannot be asked. With the elimination of scarcity of talents and skills and with the activation of all of man's physical and mental faculties, specific work roles are no longer allocated to specific individuals by specific criteria. And with the elimination of scarcity of material goods, the very idea of remuneration has disappeared. In the same way that classes, the state, and many other institutions vital to capitalist and socialist society "wither away," the communist society also implies *the withering-away of the system of work role and reward allocation.* An achievement conflict is then no longer possible.

11   The Inefficiency
of Achievement

Before we can tackle our final question, namely, what to do about the achievement conflict in *our* society, the main findings concerning the efficiency of the achievement principle have to be summarized. For depending on the efficiency or inefficiency of the achievement principle, future societies (including the future of our own society) will or will not have to be based on achievement as a central criterion of work role allocation.

If we operate on the assumption that achievement is the most efficient basis for the allocation of roles, the following two paradoxes emerge:

(a) Among preindustrial societies, those that are, relatively speaking, technologically highly developed, are typically ascriptive. That is, work roles are allocated by virtue of birth and other nonachieved criteria. However, whenever they have a serious problem as in war for instance, whenever they do not master a situation, a tendency emerges to allocate roles in those critical areas by achievement.

It is largely among technologically "primitive" societies that one finds preindustrial achievers: societies that tend to allocate work roles by achievement. However, in those spheres of their existence that are nonproblematical, where they do master the situation, these "primitive" achievers allocate work roles by ascriptive criteria, particularly by kinship, age, and sex.

(b) As industrial societies mature, that is, as they advance technologically and economically from the industrial revolution to where the United States, England, Germany, and other countries are today, they move from an emphasis on achievement to a predominance of nonachieved criteria in their system of work-role allocation.

Paradoxically, high efficiency goes together with nonachievement. This paradox can be resolved by simply reversing the axiom: by substituting *the axiom of the inefficiency of the achievement principle* for the efficiency axiom. The argument now reads: Any technological and economic superiority of preindustrial or industrial societies in a given stage of technological development (e.g., neolithical, metallurgical, industrial) is due to the tendency to allocate work roles on the basis of nonachieved criteria.

The explanation is based on the very nature of organizational and economic efficiency. From an organizational point of view, our economic system is highly productive because of the predictability and determinancy of processes and outcomes. All complex organizations tend to increase this predictability and determinancy and to decrease uncertainty (Cf. Thompson, 1967). An allocation of work roles by achievement implies a permanent search for the most competent man for a job and a willingness to substitute him for the second-best. Constantly promoting and demoting members of an organization would defeat the very tendency toward increased predictability and determinancy.

By the same token, we explain in part the seeming wastefulness and inefficiency that still characterize our industrial system despite its high productivity by the anarchy of work role allocation, that is, by the failure to substitute for the present anarchical nonachievement oriented system a well-defined one. The absence of a new, thorough definition of the nonachievement-based system of role allocation is related, as we have seen, to the maintenance of the achievement ideology in which the capitalist class has a vested interest.

There is only one situation in which achievement as a principle of work-role allocation is efficient and superior to a nonachievement oriented system: the setting of overall structural change, characterized in its very nature

48

by unpredictability, indeterminacy, and uncertainty. Such situations may be found, e.g., in the change from a preindustrial to an industrial society, in a period of rapid restructuring of a society, and also in those niches of our society that remain problematical (e.g., in certain areas of research).

It can therefore be safely concluded that as long as change continues to be gradual in the United States (all "future shock" mythology notwithstanding), the emphasis on nonachieved criteria of work role allocation will be retained. This is a premise on which all further thinking about the possibilities of eliminating the achievement conflict has to be based.

12 The Achievement Conflict Resolved

The following model of a society without an achievement conflict, a "concrete utopia," is characterized by three parameters:

(1) There will be no achievement ideology, i.e., no claim will be made that society is, or should be, an achieving society. Differences in occupational prestige will have been leveled. The belief in individual achievement as a value will have been replaced by "work as a social duty" and "group solidarity" as values.

(2) The anarchical state of role allocation will have ended. All jobs will be open to everyone, regardless of sex, race, etc. In an economy that is largely automated and highly efficient, work roles will not be allocated to individuals but to work groups that are responsible for work performance *as groups*. Competence to do the job will be gained "on the job." Work performance of an individual that would have been considered insufficient under the old system will be made up for by others in the group. As there will be no achievement ideology and no differential occupational prestige, no one will push into jobs which he or she dislikes or for which he or she is unsuitable for whatever reason. A system of informal social control will help the individual to choose among a variety of work tasks. No one will be necessarily limited to one task; jobs will be rotated. Leadership in industry, a diffuse phenomenon, will have been institutionalized into a system of group leadership, where no one has individual responsibility, under rotating chairmanship.

(3) Income from work will be equally distributed; there will be differences only by "social" criteria, like number of children. It is an empirical question whether change to that new system will or will not be abrupt. If it is gradual, the transition may come, in part, through increasingly progressive taxes. Abolishing private ownership of the means of production may help the emergence of a society without an achievement conflict; but it is no guarantee, as the example of the Soviet Union shows.

The equalization of rewards (monetary remuneration, power, prestige)

would eliminate the morbid interest in social mobility; for mobility is now measured only as movement to work roles with higher or lower rewards. As a consequence of this equalization, criteria of role allocation would lose their social relevance. At present, these criteria are taken very seriously by everyone, not because of the work roles as such that are allocated on their basis, but because of the rewards that go with the work roles. With equalization of rewards, it would then be a purely technical problem without socio-political relevance by what criteria work roles or work tasks are allocated.

Such a society without an achievement conflict would be a very "social" society, highly desirable for the masses, where everyone would enjoy the benefits of modern technology to the same maximum degree. But we can be sure that all presently existing powers would be mobilized against such a change. This makes it unlikely that such changes will occur. But many changes have been unlikely in history, and yet they did come. Ultimately, technological necessities are stronger than social, political, and economic interest groups. The coming of a society without an achievement conflict is in the long run, maybe the very long run, a technological necessity.

References

Almond, Gabriel A. and James S. Coleman, eds.
1960   The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967   The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Breed, Warren
1963   "Occupational mobility and suicide among white males." American Sociological Review 28:179–188.

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
1963   Sociology: A Text with Adapted Readings, Second Edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Brown, Roger
1965   Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press.

Coates, C. H. and R. J. Pellegrin
1956   "Executives and supervisors: a situational theory of differential occupational mobility." Social Forces 35:121–126.

Dalton, Melville
1959   Men Who Manage: Fusions of Feeling and Theory in Administration. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan
1972   Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Durkheim, Emile
1966   Suicide: A Study in Sociology. New York: The Free Press.

Engels, Frederick
1966   Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science. New York: International Publishers.

Featherman, David L.
1972   "Achievement orientations and socioeconomic career attainments." American Sociological Review 37:131–143.

Galbraith, John Kenneth
1967   The New Industrial State. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Horowitz, Irving L.
1966   Three Worlds of Development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Huber, Richard M.
1971   The American Idea of Success. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Inkeles, Alex
1971   Social Change in Soviet Russia. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kleiner, Robert J. and Seymour Parker
1963   "Goal-striving, social status, and mental disorders: a research review." American Sociological Review 28:189–203.

Kluckhohn, Clyde
1949   Mirror for Man. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kornhauser, Arthur
1965   Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lavin, David E.
1965   The Prediction of Academic Performance. Russell Sage Foundation.

LeVine, Robert A.
1966   Dreams and Deeds: Achievement Motivation in Nigeria. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levy, Marion J., Jr.
1966   Modernization and the Structure of Societies: A Setting for International Affairs. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Linton, Ralph
1936   The Study of Man. New York: D. Appleton-Century.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Reinhard Bendix
1959   Social Mobility in Industrial Society. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lynd, Robert S. and Helen Merrell Lynd
1937   Middletown in Transition. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Mandel, Ernest
1970   Marxist Economic Theory. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Marx, Karl
1938   Critique of the Gotha Programme. New York: International Publishers.
1967   Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. New York: International Publishers.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels
1947   The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers.

McClelland, David C.
1961   The Achieving Society. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand.

Merton, Robert K.
1968   Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Middleton, John and David Tait, eds.
1958   Tribes Without Rulers: Studies in African Segmentary Systems. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, Delbert C. and William H. Form
1964   Industrial Sociology: The Sociology of Work Organizations. New York: Harper and Row.

Moore, Wilbert E.
1963　Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1962　An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Row.

Parsons, Talcott
1966　Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Rosenthal, Jack
1971　"Census study finds an 'education gap'." New York Times, February 4.

Seibel, Hans Dieter
1971　"Achievement and modernization." Pp. 93–115 in Africana Collecta II: Studies on History, Society, Politics and Economy of African Countries, ed. Dieter Oberndörfer. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag.

1973a　"Folgen des Leistungskonflikts in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft." Das Argument 78, 1–3: 123–143.

1973b　"Systems of status allocation and receptivity to modernization." Pp. 51–77 in Social Change and Economic Development in Nigeria, eds. Ukandi G. Damachi and Hans Dieter Seibel. New York: Praeger.

1973c　Gesellschaft im Leistungskonflikt. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag.

Smith, M. G.
1959　"The Hausa system of social status." Africa 29:239–252.

Sorokin, Pitrim
1925　"American millionaires and multi-millionaires." Journal of Social Forces 3.

Taussig, F. W. and C. S. Joslyn
1932　American Business Leaders. New York: Macmillan.

Thompson, James D.
1967　Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tumin, Melvin M.
1953　"Some principles of stratification: a critical analysis." American Sociological Review 18:387–393.

Weber, Max
1958　The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Wells, F. A. and W. A. Warmington
1962　Studies in Industrialization: Nigeria and the Cameroons. London: Oxford University Press.

Zagolow, N. A. et al.
1970　Kurs polititscheskoi ekonomii, tom II, sozialism, isdatelstwo "ekonomika." Moskwa.

Suggested Readings

Ralph Linton's classic book The Study of Man (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936) may still be the best introduction into the field. Ralph Linton was the first to define achieved and ascribed roles and to analyze the conditions under which achieved vs. ascribed roles would be emphasized in a society and the conditions under which a shift in emphasis would occur.

In his historical account of The American Idea of Success (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), Richard M. Huber tells the story of achievement and success in America since its beginnings, with colorful biographical sketches of those men and women who came out first in the race for success.

With statistical precision, Otis Dudley Duncan, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan, in Socioeconomic Background and Achievement (New York: Seminar Press, 1972), analyze the influence of some major social variables on occupational achievement in contemporary America.

In a study of Dreams and Deeds: Achievement Motivation in Nigeria (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), Robert A. LeVine found that those societies who traditionally emphasize achievement in their social system generate individuals high in achievement motivation who are acutely receptive to change; preindustrial societies who allocate occupational and political roles by nonachieved criteria tend to be more resistant to change.

What happens in a society when achievement goals are generally propagated while achievement opportunities are restricted? Dorothy L. Meier and Wendell Bell show that anomia results, in a paper entitled "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review 24, 1959, pp. 189–202 (Bobbs-Merrill Reprint No. S-190). More specific evidence, that a major discrepancy between achievement goals and opportunities may lead to mental disorders, is presented by Robert J. Kleiner and Seymour Parker in "Goal-Striving, Social Status, and Mental Disorders: A Research Review," American Sociological Review 28, 1963, pp. 189–203. Similar effects are traced by Arthur Kornhauser in Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965). This study concerns automobile workers in a prepathological stage. Within the present social order, Kornhauser concludes, remedies to the personality consequences of this discrepancy are unlikely to be found.

THE BOBBS-MERRILL REPRINT SERIES

The author recommends for supplementary reading the following related materials. Please fill out this form and mail.

Indicate number of reprints desired

____ **Chinoy, Ely** 1955 "Social Mobility Trends in the United States." American Sociological Review, pp. 180–186.   **S-40**/66446 40¢

____ **Chinoy, Ely** 1952 "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers." The American Journal of Sociology, pp. 453–459.   **S-41**/66447 40¢

____ **Collins, Orvis, Melville Dalton and Donald Roy** 1946 "Restriction of Output and Social Cleavage in Industry." Applied Anthropology, pp. 1–14.   **S-49**/66455 40¢

____ **Dahrendorf, Ralf** 1964 "Recent Changes in the Class Structure of European Societies." Daedalus, pp. 225–270.   **S-564**/66941 60¢

____ **Dalton, Melville** 1951 "Informal Factors in Career Achievement." The American Journal of Sociology, pp. 407–415.   **S-60**/66466 40¢

____ **Duncan, Otis Dudley** 1965 "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States." American Sociological Review, pp. 491–498.   **S-574**/66951 40¢

____ **Hodge, Robert W.** 1966 "Occupational Mobility as a Probability Process." Demography, pp. 19–34.   **S-590**/66967 40¢

____ **Marsh, Robert M.** 1961 "Formal Organization and Promotion in a Pre-Industrial Society." American Sociological Review, pp. 547–556.   **S-453**/66831 40¢

____ **Meier, Dorothy L. and Wendell Bell** 1959 "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals." American Sociological Review, pp. 189–202.   **S-190**/66589 40¢

____ **Ramsøy, Natalie Rogoff** 1965 "On the Flow of Talent in Society." Acta Sociologica, pp. 152–174.   **S-616**/66993 40¢

____ **Rosenfeld, Eva** 1951 "Social Stratification in a 'Classless' Society." American Sociological Review, pp. 766–774.   **S-491**/66869 40¢

____ **Seeman, Melvin** 1959 "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, pp. 783–791. **S-254**/66645 40¢

____ **Sewell, William H., and Vimal P. Shah** 1967 "'Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education." Sociology of Education, pp. 1–23. **S-626**/67003 40¢

____ **Udy, Stanley H., Jr.** 1962 "Administrative Rationality, Social Setting, and Organizational Development." The American Journal of Sociology, pp. 299–308. **S-647**/67024 40¢

____ **White, Robert W.** 1959 "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence." Psychological Review, pp. 297–334. **P-364**/66177 60¢

Instructors ordering for class use will receive *upon request* a complimentary desk copy of each title ordered in quantities of 10 or more. Refer to author and *complete* letter-number code when ordering reprints.

☐ Payment enclosed   ☐ Bill me (on orders for $5 or more only)

____ Course number   ____ Expected enrollment

☐ For examination   ☐ Desk copy

Bill To_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY_____ STATE_____ ZIP_____

Ship To_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY_____ STATE_____ ZIP_____

Please send me _____ copies of the sociology reprints catalog.

Please send me related reprints catalogs in_____

_____

Any reseller is free to charge whatever price he wishes for our books.

For your convenience please use complete form when placing your order.

About the author:

Hans Dieter Seibel is an associate professor and chairman of the department of sociology at Manhattanville College in New York. He received a Ph.D. degree in sociology from the University of Freiburg in 1966, and qualified for the "Habilitation" (academic inauguration) at the University of Münster in 1972. From 1967 to 1969 he taught at the University of Liberia, and from 1969 to 1972 at Princeton. Over thirty of his articles have appeared in various scholarly journals, and he is the author of *Industriearbeit und Kulturwandel in Nigeria* (1968). With co-author Michael Koll, he wrote *Einheimische Genossenschaften in Afrika* (1968); with co-editor Ukandi Damachi, he edited *Social Change and Economic Development in Nigeria* (1973). A forthcoming book, written with Andreas Massing, will be *Traditional Organizations and Economic Development.* At present Professor Seibel is at work on a study of Yugoslav workers' councils.

The Bobbs-Merrill Studies in Sociology

General Editors:

Gerald Marwell   **Marcello Truzzi**
Samuel F. Sampson   **Maurice Zeitlin**

In this unique series of individual studies, written from diverse points of view about the major fields of sociology, the authors explain why it is intellectually interesting and worthwhile to examine the subject matter of the field, critically review what they consider to be the field's most significant research and writing on central theoretical and methodological issues, and offer suggestions for further reading. The papers vary widely in the perspectives brought to them by their authors, but each study, whatever the issue or perspective, is an important statement about its field.

Published

In Preparation

61335