

tion. The various segments of the working class tend to be hierarchically positioned at much deeper and more comprehensive levels than can be revealed by the employment structure; the working class seems segmented not only by division of labor (technical and social), but also by divisions external to the labor process.

To elaborate more on this, it requires further specification of this tentative "model" presented in the chart. We observe five hierarchically differentiated arrangements by which the working class is internally segmented. These are: ethnic, habitat, capital, industry, and occupation-related subsystems. Each subsystem consists of four hierarchical levels. They are hierarchical by a specific ranking criterion, as shown below:

<u>Vertical Dimension</u>		<u>Ranking Criterion</u>
1. Occupational hierarchy	→	Years of schooling, level of investment in human capital
2. Industrial hierarchy	→	Level of production (primary -- finishing) and "forward-linkages"
3. Habitat hierarchy	→	Standards of living or subsistence cost
4. Ethnic/national hierarchy	→	Political and ideological domination/subordination
5. Employer or capital hierarchy	→	Rate of exploitation

The various segments of the working class ranked on all these five normative scales make up four horizontally-integrated clusters. These are specifically revealing of the extent to which the segmentation of the working class is comprehensive and systematic. Each segment of the working class belongs consistently to one of the four hierarchical levels in all five dimensions. European-American proletariat are located on the top levels