Social Division of Labour as an Explanatory Principle and as a Foundation for Legitimation

Odaci Luiz Coradini

Institute of Philosophy and Human Sciences, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

Email address:
coradini@ufrgs.br

Abstract: The article presents results of the analysis of the conceptions and uses of the social division of labour by the statistical classification schemes and by the social sciences. The general hypothesis pursued is that the social division of labour is used as an explanatory principle and as a basis for legitimation of the social structures. These uses encompass both the current statistical classification schemes and the social sciences involved. In addition to the introduction, a second item discusses the origins and meanings of the social division of labour for the social sciences and its relations with theoretical problems such as the multidimensionality of social structures. Next, the synthesis of the conception and uses of the social division of labour by the main statistical classification schemes in vogue is presented. The high degree of redundancy of statistical classifications is exposed below, particularly with regard to occupations and status in employment. The categories of managers are particularly examined as the main empirical reference. The next item presents the results of the examination of the overlapping of categories linked management with the condition of the employer and the overvaluation of the amount of schooling. Finally, the last item discusses general issues related to the uses of the social division of labour and its limits and relationships with theoretical foundations of the social sciences.

Keywords: Social Division of Labour, Social Structure, Social Hierarchy, Occupational and Statistical Classifications, Sociological Theory

1. Introduction

The objective of this article is to present examination results of the uses of the social division of labour by some of the main statistical classification schemes in vogue. The original work that serves as a source also has other related themes, especially problems and limitations of official statistics as a source for the social sciences and conditions for valuation formal education. This article, however, is limited to the social division of labour as a basis for classification scheme formulation, mainly for occupational categories and their limits. The general hypothesis pursued is that the limitations of the social division of labour are greater when it comes to occupational categories or groupings positioned at the top of the social hierarchy. Management- or managers-related categories are considered the main empirical reference. Another hypothesis proposes that, despite these limitations, the social division of labour as a principle of statistical classification is also due to its affinity and association with agendas of public discussions and as a means of legitimation in the current conditions of capitalism.

After this general introduction, the next item presents the growing centrality of the social division of labour in formulating statistical classification schemes. To this end, the ISCO (International Standard Classification of Occupations) of the ILO (International Labour Organization), in its various versions, is taken as an example. The following item addresses the high degree of redundancy in defining occupational categories at the top of the social hierarchy, taking as an example the case of managers. In the third item, statistical testing results are shown indicating the overvaluation of schooling for the categories of the group managers. These results go against one of the main principles that underlie the statistical classification schemes in question, together with the specialisation attributed to the social division of labour. It is about considering the level of schooling as a criterion for classification and hierarchy. The last item discusses some general issues related to statistical classifications and their relationship with public discussion agendas and with the social sciences.

Classification schemes for occupations and the social

division of labour.

The social division of labour and schooling level is not only the main classification principle in the ISCO system but also tends to increase their centrality in its consecutive reviews. This growing centrality of the social division of labour and formal education level, mainly through specialisation and skill level, is highlighted even in the history of its revisions [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 26). Chronologically, the ISCO has been developed since the 1920s, but the current applications are from the sixties (ISCO-68) and eighties (ISCO-88) versions of the last century and the first decade of the current century (ISCO-08). The skill level, which consists of the ability allegedly required for the performance of certain 'tasks and duties', is associated with the 'complexity' of an occupation. Therefore, the nature of the work performed, and the formal education level supposedly required are considered. It is about the schooling level assumed as a principle and not the one existing by a given individual [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 17). The result was a scheme for classifying occupations with four levels of formal education allegedly needed. As for the skill specialisation, it consists of four 'concepts': the field of knowledge required, the tool and machinery used, the material worked and the sort of goods and services produced [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 11). As detailed below, these criteria are less applicable to the categories at the top of the social hierarchy, and especially the managers.

Still regarding the skill level and, more specifically, the groups and categories at the top of the social hierarchy, significantly in the ISCO-88 version, some of the 10 major occupational groups were excluded from the framework in the four levels of schooling. Besides the group of armed forces, that of managers, who in this version was still referred to as legislators, senior officials and managers were not assigned their respective level of education. Later, in the ISCO-08 version, educational levels were also defined for these groups, with an increase in the division and specification of their categories. The exclusion of schooling levels in the framing of these groups in the ISCO-88 version was justified by its degree of heterogeneity [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 10 e 16). Apart from this, regarding the framing of skill level and respective schooling level, the group that in the ISCO-88 version comprised legislators, senior officials, and managers, and in the ISCO-08 became the managers, also presents a series of questions in terms of definition and inclusion criteria. Among these issues, the degree of education and its relationship with enterprise size and distinction among general managers, corporate managers, and supervisors, among others [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 6 e 36) are highlighted. Faced with this sort of question, one of the alternatives adopted was defining managers as 'organised along functional rather than industrial lines' [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 23). In other words, greater weight was attributed to the 'function' when defining the inclusion criteria. Hence, in the ISCO-08 version, unlike the previous versions, 'position-related' aspects, such as the condition of the owner, started to be excluded from the occupation classification scheme and be referred exclusively to as status in employment [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 14). This issue of criteria for defining status in employment categories also underwent a series of reviews [10]

(ILO, 2012b, p. 29; [9] Hunter, 2015). However, changes implemented are very restricted and categories of its classification scheme remain extremely generic, focused on modalities of labour and payment agreement. Classification schemes by status in employment should be revised mainly because the classification of occupations "is necessary but not sufficient" [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 27). This is associated with the goals of using this status in employment information in "economic and social analyses", such as those related to the "nature of the economic risk and authority of employed population" in the job, as an indicator of "precarious employment conditions" and with a view to "labour market policy analysis", among other things [9] (Hunter, 2015, p. 6-7). Also important is "social stratification and social mobility" as "areas for social research that also correspond to important social and political concerns about inequalities of opportunities and results, as well as about their reproduction over life cycles and generations" [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 27). This is, in short, information as a subsidy for diagnosing contract modalities and conditions for insertion in the labour market, with a view to supporting intervention and regulatory policies. The proposed revisions mainly cover issues of definition of categories such as that of owner-managers, of payment modalities, among others, as well as proposing a classification of 'status based on the type of authority/dependence' [9] (Hunter, 2015, 15-18). But, despite these propositions, the scheme used in the ISCO for status in employment remained virtually unchanged, having extremely generic categories based on formal agreement modalities and payment agreements. This contrasts with the status-in-employment classification used by the US, wherein some categories are highly specified, mainly the civil servants.

2. Occupational Categories with Command Position and Redundancy of Definitions

In addressing statistical classification schemes, Bourdieu [4] (1989, p. 168) found that socially dominant categories are classified for "what they are", while the rest for "what they do". However, on a more concrete level, this "being" encompasses "qualities or ways of being, both in "professional" and "personal" terms. This work hypothesises that the social division of labour can serve both as an explanatory principle and as a basis for legitimising and "rationalising" resources or what Weber [14] (1984, p. 454-475) defines as theodicy. Regarding the social sciences, one of the main roots of the uses of the social division of labour as a basis for legitimation stems from the appropriation (Weber, 1of Weber's propositions, mainly about rational/legal domination and its example in bureaucracy definition [14] Weber, 1984, p. 170-183). The instrumental rationality that underlies rational/legal domination is limited to means of action, so it does not include ends and meaning. Therefore, the administrative body is not subordinate and therefore is not governed by bureaucratic rules [14] (Weber, 1984, p. 708-716). In short, bureaucratic domination includes a non-bureaucratic element, which consists of an administrative

framework. Through 'professional secrecy' in administrative instances, the capitalist entrepreneur is 'immune' to rational/legal bureaucratic domination [14] (Weber, 1984, p. 174-179 and 1100).

One of the clearest effects of differentiated relationships with emphasis on "being" or 'doing' on occupational classification criteria is the degree of officiality, hence the generality of categories. The components of occupational categories or groups associated with higher social positions tend to fall into categories that are equivalent to or close to their official definitions or "appointments", as with those of managers. Because of such officialization and greater abstraction, the description of categories tends to approach the official definition of the respective position. At the opposite extreme, like the elementary occupation categories, the definition of occupational categories tends to originate more directly in formulating statistical classification schemes, with a greater distancing from what is defined or else in "native" self-classification.

As already mentioned, the ISCO classification scheme has the main skill level and skill specialisation as criteria for defining occupations. The latter is defined by the 'field of knowledge required, tool and machinery used, material worked on or with, and sorts of goods and services produced' [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 10-11). These criteria are less applicable in groupings equivalent to higher social positions. The major group of managers (legislators, senior officials, and managers) in the ISCO-88 version and the armed forces are examples thereof. Apparently, the major group of professionals has a high degree of framing. But that is because those with a full university course have their school classifications and recognition of professional practice as the basis for occupational classification. In the case of the armed forces, the ISCO-08 itself recognises a bureaucratic and official character in its definition criteria, that is, this major group includes "auxiliary services whether voluntary or compulsory" and jobs performed in civilian occupations [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 357).

Specifically, about managers, strictly speaking, there is no degree of classification, and hence discrimination for the respective occupational categories through the four "concepts" or criteria that make up the specialisation of occupations. In other words, the "field' of acquired knowledge", the "tool and machinery" used, "material worked" and "sorts of good and services produced" [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 11). Discrimination of categories is virtually restricted to degrees of the hierarchy of formal positions, such as directors and managers, to establishment size, and particularly to the branch or sector of activity.

The most general effect of such a low degree of discrimination in the group of managers is its strong redundancy. This is particularly evident in definitions of categories, groupings, and activities assigned to them. At the most aggregated level in the ISCO-08 version, the activities of this major group of managers are "plan, direct, coordinate, and evaluate the overall activity of enterprises, governments, and other organisations, or of organisational units within them, and formulate and review their policies, laws, rules, and regulations. Competent performance in most occupations in this major group requires skills at the fourth ISCO skill level" [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 87). Once this is the most aggregated level, definitions are generic and abstract. However, such generic and abstract nature, and even with a language markedly close to the official jargon, covers the set of levels, even the most disaggregated categories. Strictly speaking, the definition of activities at the most general and aggregate level is replicated at all levels to specify the respective subgroups and unit-groups or occupational categories, changing the respective sector of activity. Thus, the main significant difference does not occur between the subgroups and categories of managers, but regarding the other major occupational groups.

Finally, another effect of this low degree of association of a classification scheme based on the social division of labour for groups with a higher social position is a reduction in the number of subgroups and categories. In the ISCO-08 version, for the set of 10 major groups, a total of 436 categories are defined, 390 of which are in the ISCO-88 version. Significantly, the major groups with the most problems in framing the scheme based on the social division of labour or specialisation are those with the fewest subgroups or categories. The major group of managers has only 31 categories in the ISCO-08 version and 33 in the ISCO-88, and the armed forces have only three categories in the ISCO-08 version and one in the ISCO-88 version [11] (ILO, 2012, p. 22).

3. Occupational Categories with Command Position, and Overvaluation of Formal Education

As stated, the main basis of the ISCO's classification schemes is the social division of labour, mainly what is defined as specialisation. Besides this, another basis of this classification scheme consists of the skill level, which implies a valuation of formal education as the main criterion for ranking. In the successive revisions of this classification scheme, the trend towards greater centrality of what is defined as the "function" has been deepened, to the detriment of the criteria based on position (for more details, see [11] ILO, 2012).

This item exposes the relationships between the categories of the group managers in the ISCO-08 version (legislators, senior officials, and managers in the ISCO-88 version) and status-in-employment categories, particularly employers. This is based on the ratio of the income amount to the overall average of the respective census and the economic valuation index of formal education. This index is the result of dividing the amount of income (total income) by the number of years of study.

The strong overlap of categories between managers and employers' groupings could lead to a conclusion that, from the perspective of social sciences, indicators related to classifications considering "position" would constitute a better alternative to emphasize 'function'. Yet, as discussed briefly in the next item, this issue can be much more complex than any option among these alternatives. Anyhow, to study social structures, it can be quite important to note that, whether through classifications based on occupations or status in

employment, there are very evident effects of social position. The exam in question deals particularly with income amount and the economic value of schooling.

From the set of countries with censuses with their variables made compatible by the IPUMS International [8] (IPUMS, 2018), some with better conditions were selected, out of a total of five. These are the US, Brazil, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic.

All cases examined have a quite strong overlap of the grouping legislators, senior officials, and managers (ISCO-88) with socially top categories in terms of status in employment, but with some major variations. In Brazil (2010 census), legislators, senior officials and managers represent a small proportion (1.90%) of the universe as a whole. Nevertheless, almost a fifth (19.50%) of the members of legislators, senior officials and managers are employers in terms of status in employment. Concerning status-in-employment categories, almost half (45.50%) of employers are included in legislators, senior officers, and managers. In the US, self-employed, incorporated (which can be taken as equivalent to employers), which represent a somewhat higher proportion of the universe as a whole (3.20%), are equivalent to just under a tenth (8.50%) of legislators, senior officials, and managers. Either way, more than a third (33.70%) of self-employed, incorporated are included in the legislators, senior officers and managers grouping. For Mexico, employers have a proportion in the universe as a whole like other cases examined (2.90%), besides being a tenth (10.00%) of the group of legislators, senior officials, and managers. Thus, less is the degree of overlap, which can be attributed to the particularities of the status-in-employment categories. This is the case for the white-or blue-collar category, used only in Mexico, with more than a fifth (83.10%) included in the major group of legislators, senior officials, and managers. For Puerto Rico (2010 census), which uses the same classification scheme as the US, self-employed, incorporated have a somewhat lower proportion (2.70%) of the universe as a whole. They also make up a relatively smaller part, less than a tenth part (9.00%) of the grouping of legislators, senior officials, and managers. Concerning status-in-employment categories, almost a fifth (18.50%) of the self-employed, incorporated are included in the grouping of legislators, senior officials, and managers. Finally, the Dominican Republic, has a relatively high proportion of employers (7.00%) in the universe as a whole of the census. Such a proportion is also higher in the composition of the group of legislators, senior officials, and managers, with more than a third (40.00%) being made up of employers.

The association between occupational groups at the highest social positions with the category employers of status in employment goes beyond their crossing or overlapping. It covers the strong homology regarding income amount and economic overvaluation of formal education. As already pointed out, formal education or skill level is one of the main ranking criteria in the ISCO classification scheme.

Although there are significant differences among the five countries examined, both those in central and peripheral conditions, their small number does not allow them to be considered representative in terms of core/periphery relations.

Nonetheless, beyond differences among the countries, this is limited to the degree of observed trends, rather than their occurrence.

Initially taking Brazil, whose 2010 census does not include the amount of education in continuous values or years of study, the 2000 census is taken for this point. Similarly, to the other cases examined, the ten large occupational groups in the most aggregated version, in addition to that of the legislators, senior officials and managers at the top, those professionals, armed forces and, to a lesser degree, technicians and associate professionals, are also above the average of the overall income of the universe. However, the position of legislators, senior officials and managers is very far from the rest, with almost four times (3.98 times) the average for the whole universe (3.16 times for professionals, 1.55 times for armed forces, 1.39 for technicians and associate professors).

The finding of the amount of income with the average at the top, assuming that these are occupational groups with higher social positions, would be redundant. However, what is at issue is its homology with the economic overvaluation of the number of years of study. In this aspect also, in the case of Brazil, the grouping of legislators, senior officials and managers occupy extreme superior position, with an index of economic valorization of schooling (resulting from the division of the total income by the number of years of study) of almost three times (2.78 times) that of the whole universe, followed by the grouping of professionals (with 1.51 times).

Although for the US (2010 census) the distances are less accentuated, the trends are in the same direction. Also in this case, at the upper end of the average amount of income and the economic valuation index of the years of study, there is the grouping of legislators, senior officials and managers, with average earnings of more than one and a half times (1.64 times) that of the universe as a whole, followed by professionals (1.58 times) and technicians and associate professionals (1.21 times) and armed forces, already in a practically neutral position (1.01 times). These positions are strongly homologous to those related to the economic valuation index of formal education. In this case, the upper end is also occupied by legislators, senior officials and managers (1.60 times the average of the universe as a whole), followed by professionals (1.51 times) and technicians and associate professionals (1.17 times), with armed forces in a position below the average of the universe as a whole (0.99 times).

Mexico has trended very similar to those of Brazil, with legislators, senior officials and managers at the upper end of the average earnings, surpassing by more than two and a half times (2.68 times) that of the universe as a whole (followed by professionals, with 2.13 times, armed forces with 1.43 times and technicians and associate professionals with 1.15 times). In this case too, the positions regarding the economic valuation of the years of study are homologous to those of the amount of earnings, with small differences in values, with the legislators, senior officials and managers being the only group with an average above that of the universe as a whole (1.64 times).

Although for Puerto Rico the differences in the averages are smaller, the relative positions are similar, with the legislators, senior officials and managers in the second position regarding

the amount of income (2.05 times the average of the universe as a whole). In this case, the upper end is occupied by armed forces (2.10 times the average of the whole universe). Below these two groups are professionals (1.66 times) and technicians and associate professionals (1.14 times), as in the other cases. However, concerning to the economic valuation of schooling, the position at the top is that of legislators, senior officials and managers, with almost double (1.88 times) the average for the whole universe, followed by the armed forces (1.81 times), professionals (1.36 times) and, finally, by technicians and associate professionals (1.15 times).

For the Dominican Republic too, the trends are the same. Concerning the amount of income, as in general, the position at the top is occupied by legislators, senior officials and managers, with almost double (2.78 times) the general average, followed by the same groupings as the other cases examined. With regard to the economic valuation of schooling, legislators, senior officials and managers are practically twice as much (1.99 times) as the average for the whole universe, followed by professionals (1.21 times) and armed forces (1.18 times). times) to a lesser degree.

In short, in the hierarchy of large groups, at the top stands that of legislators, senior officials and managers, practically always at the upper end in terms of income. Simultaneously, in all the cases examined, this top grouping is immediately followed by the others with higher social status, particularly that of professionals and with some variations, by armed forces and in some cases and to a lesser degree, by technicians and associate professionals. However, the effect of position becomes even more evident when considering the differences in the economic valuation of the amount of formal education, which has a strong degree of homology with social position. Despite some variations in degrees, groups with higher social positions, in general, have a much higher rate of economic valuation of schooling, and for the grouping of legislators, senior officials and managers this overvaluation reaches several times the average general of the universe as a whole.

These differences in the amount of income and the differentiated valuation of the number of years of study could be better specified when considering the most disaggregated categories and not just the groupings. However, despite the greater degree of specification, the trends found go in the same direction and, therefore, for what is at hand, it would not be necessary to expose them with this degree of detail.

On the other hand, as the category of status in employment corresponds to the highest social position, that of employers, as already indicated, has a strong association with the occupational grouping of legislators, senior officials and managers. amount of income and with the index of economic valorisations of formal education. This category of employers is the only one that always has an average income above that of the universe as a whole, and the same happens with the index of economic vaporization of schooling. Therefore, the effect of position in this case, becomes even more explicit and forceful.

Again, starting with the case of Brazil, as in the other countries examined, concerning the amount of income, the category of employers occupies the extreme position at the top.

This equates to more than five times (5.44 times) the overall average for the universe as a whole, while all other categories fall below or close to this overall average. As for the economic valuation of schooling, something similar occurs, with employers again at the top, surpassing the general average by more than four times (4.14 times), followed by the working own account category (1.33 times) already close to the same and all other categories below.

For the US, like other indicators, the trends are the same, although less contrasting. In this case, in addition to the self-employed, incorporated category, which can be taken as the equivalent of employers at the top, with almost double (1.85 times) the amount of income, other categories are also above this overall average. This is associated with the classification scheme used, with greater specification, particularly of types of public servants, with the federal government, employers in second position (1.32 times the general average), followed by the state government, employees, already close (1..07 times) of the general average, as well as local government employees (1.04 times). All other categories are below the overall average. Concerning the economic valuation of schooling, something similar occurs. Again, self-employed, incorporated are at the top (1.82 times the overall average), followed by the federal government, employees (1.28 times) and all other categories below the overall average for the universe as a whole.

In the case of Mexico, despite some of their categories in the classification scheme, concerning employers, the trends are similar. As for the amount of income, employers are more than twice (2.39 times) the average for the universe as a whole. Only the blue or white-collar category, exclusive to the scheme used in Mexico, is also above the average for the universe as a whole, already in an almost neutral position (1.01 times the overall average for the universe as a whole). Something similar occurs with the economic valuation of years of study, with employers surpassing the general average by more than twice (2.03 times) and the white or blue-collar slightly above the same (1.07 times), with all other categories below the overall average of the universe as a whole.

Puerto Rico, which uses the same classification scheme as the US, there is more emphasis on several categories of public servants. This, however, does not exclude the position of employers at the upper end of the average amount of income, which is almost double (1.76 times) that of the universe as a whole. They are followed immediately by the federal government, employees (1.49 times), the paid family workers (1.26 times) and the state government, employees (1.21 times). Concerning the economic valuation of years of schooling, something similar occurs, also with employers at the top (1.64 times the general average for the universe as a whole).

Finally, in the Dominican Republic, concerning the amount of income, only employers are above the average for the universe as a whole (1.64 times), with wage/salary workers in a practically neutral position (1.04 times) and all other categories below. As for the economic valuation of years of schooling, only employers are also above the general average for the universe as a whole.

4. Classification Schemes, Public Discussion Agendas and Social Sciences

At first sight, the centrality of "function" or specialization, derived from a given conception of the social division of labour, in the ILO classification schemes, to the detriment of dimensions relating to "position", would constitute the main problem for interesting analytical perspectives. in the study of social status. However, the assumption underlying this final discussion is that the issues at hand, concerning the relationships between classification schemes or official statistics in general and the social sciences, are more complex and diversified. Some of the main authors who address this type of problem [5] (Chauvel et al, 2002; [7] Desrosières, 2008) highlight the very objectives and reason for being official statistics. Among these objectives, the instrumentalization of government policies and the management of market problems are central. The ILO itself emphasizes this type of objective, with emphasis on "international communication on occupation", as a subsidy for "research as well as for specific decision-making and action-oriented activities", in addition to problems related to "international migration or job placement" or labour market in general [10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 14 and 21).

If, on the one hand, the problem of the relationship between official statistics and the social sciences as the generation and use of empirical indicators is at issue, on the other hand, much more general issues are also present. Among these issues, one of the very conceptions of social sciences and its epistemological foundations, and, therefore, of the "reality" to be apprehended, seems to be central. As is well known, among the social sciences, the one whose relations with official statistics are more intense is economics and, more specifically, its "applied" versions. As far as sociology is concerned, both in its use as a basis for the formulation of classification schemes and in the description of the results of its application, a conception or appropriation of its versions considered "applied" is evident. The very relationships between social sciences called "applied" or not are conceived as having a certain continuity.

Thus, both by the formulators of statistical classification schemes and by social scientists, sociology tends to be taken as an instrument, a kind of auxiliary to applied economics. In this way, one of the central problems comes to the fore and constitutes the basis of any sociological analysis of social structure, which consists of multidimensionality. If, on the one hand, this problem may not be constitutive for applied economics, as it addresses a "practical" problem [13] (Weber, 1983, p. 221; [2] Bourdieu, 1979, 74) restricted to the "economic" sphere and, therefore, to this dimension, sociology intends to address the set of constitutive dimensions of the social structure.

Although this type of problem is at the base of the definitions of the respective objects of these disciplines, they have very direct effects on the appropriations and uses of sociology by official statistics and by the sociologists who work in its instrumentalization. The extreme objectivism that characterizes both classification schemes and sociology's uses

in its elaboration and interpretation of results is indicative of much more than some theoretical perspective or version of the social sciences. It is even very significant that this objectivism and the search for more detailed descriptions of occupational divisions or degrees of coincidence in the comparison between classification schemes, without any reference to the social processes that underlie their formation and structuring, encompass the uses from the most diverse theoretical perspectives of the social sciences. On the one hand, it is evident that at the base of this objectivism there is an interdependence of the raison d'être of the formulation and uses of official statistics and its relations with agendas not only of government policies but also of public media discussions. On the other hand, a conception of social sciences as a "moral" auxiliary of applied economics and the "reality" to be described is at stake. Consequently, not only are statistical classification schemes conceived as instruments to describe "reality" but what [6] Desrosières, (2005, p. 14-16) defines as equivalence convention is taken as a record of this "reality" and not as a result of the processes of its constitution.

Thus, this objectivism that characterizes the classification schemes in vogue and the associated social sciences does not cease to be a result of their objectives and reason for being. However, it is not only about the explicit objectives and reason for being in the most immediate sense, such as the instrumentalization of government policies and the management of market problems, but also a concept that can be defined as a theodicy, in Weber's sense [14] (1984, p. 454-475) or a sociodicy [4] (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 103). It is the instrumentalization of government policies and the management of market problems, particularly in the labour market, in a given historical context of what [1] Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) define as the "new spirit of capitalism".

In summary, on the one hand, including for the ILO, discussions and indicators related to "position" are highlighted as important, since the classification of occupations "is necessary but not sufficient" and indicators such as those related to status in employment would be necessary, including research on social stratification and social mobility". In addition, "social stratification and social mobility are important areas for social research, which also correspond to important social and political concerns about inequalities of opportunities and results, as well as about their reproduction over life cycles and generations" …[10] (ILO, 2012b, p. 27). On the other hand, these concerns are based on the perspective of "function" or specialization derived from the social division of labour conceived based on the agendas of discussions on government policies and market management. This is the case, for example, of the importance attributed to indicators related to status in employment, due to their association with schooling as a means of social mobility and with problems related to "equality", which even attract a strong segment of sociologists, among others. In this specific issue of schooling as a means of social mobility, the most similar theoretical perspectives consist of those associated with the theory of human capital, which has its foundations in the market and pluralist civic morality.

What should be highlighted is that from the perspective of

these agendas and the reason for being that underlie the formulation of statistical classification schemes and their relations with the social sciences, the problems relating to the multidimensionality of the social structure cannot be formulated. Thus, one of the main theoretical problems of the social sciences and their methodological implications, is that of the relationships between the socially more objectified and explicitly codified dimensions and those more implicit and tacit [3] (Bourdieu, 1980, p. 209-231) is not even considered. The appropriate multidimensionality is the most restricted and simple one possible, which divides the indicators between those considered "economic" and "cultural", which usually includes formal education. Multidimensionality in the proper sense of the social sciences would be meaningless since, in this perspective that underlies the formulation of statistical classification schemes, the reason for being is cantered on the "management" of problems of a "reality" conceived as derived from the social division of labour and structured based on the market. However, it is not about the organization and social hierarchization principles, but about the social division of labour and market as general concepts and unidimensional explanatory principles.

One of the main effects of this perspective, which cannot conceive of the multidimensionality of the social structure, in addition to its characteristic objectivism, is the appropriation of different theoretical approaches in the social sciences based on their supposed ability to serve as instrumentalization for the description of the social division of the labour. Consequently, all theoretical perspectives, regardless of their epistemological foundations, are appropriated as if their raison d'être consisted of the "explanation" or "description" of this social division of labour and occupations. Concerning dimensions not restricted to what is more objectified or associated with the market, such as "power" as a principle of hierarchization, appropriation and focus tend to be restricted to what is more explicitly codified. As an exemplary case, the notion of "power" or "authority" in the hierarchization of the social division proposed by [15] Whright (1980) can be taken. To take another exemplary case linked to statistical classification schemes, an examination of the class structure of different European countries elaborated by [12] Leiulfsrud, Bison, and Jensberg, 2005) can be taken.

Under these conditions, if the strong ambivalence found in the framing of occupational categories linked to management in classification schemes could be considered an important problem for studies aimed at analysing social structures and hierarchies, it cannot be taken as a criticism of these schemes. Its limitations must be understood as limited to its objectives and reason for being. This also applies to the homology found between social position and the greater economic valuation of schooling. While this may raise the hypothesis of an effect of the position, the discernment of concrete determinations with the available indicators cannot be exhausted. From the perspective of the classification schemes in vogue and the weight of meritocratic school ideologies, this can be attributed to the effect of schooling itself, leaving open questions related to circular causation, among many others. Finally, this does not eliminate the problem of these statistical classification schemes in generating sources of empirical material, which current technological conditions tend to make more relevant. However, in addition to statistical classification schemes, conditions of the social sciences themselves and their objectives and raison d'être enter into agendas, beyond those of statistical classification schemes.

5. Conclusion

As indicated at the beginning, this article is centred on the social division of labour as an explanatory principle and as a resource for legitimation. As seems to have become evident, in the occupational classification schemes in vogue, a certain conception of the social division of labour, which tends to be reduced to specialization and skill, in direct association with meritocratic ideologies, imposes itself.

It would not be appropriate to enter into discussions about the opposition between "function" and "position", present in the revisions of these schemes. The meaning of this type of discussion stems from the objectives and reason for being "practical" of these occupational classification schemes of official statistics.

On the other hand, with regard specifically to the social sciences, the first point that must be highlighted is that this type of problem is rarely taken into its importance. The social division of labour is generally taken as a category or "concept" detached from its theoretical and epistemological foundations. As an analytical problem in the social sciences, the social division of labour only makes sense in association with other analytical principles and concepts, such as the multidimensionality of social structures and domination (in the sociological sense), among others. This seems so evident and elementary that, as this text has tried to indicate, even the notion of social position is directly associated with multidimensionality. In addition to the classic divisions between more socially objectified and explicit dimensions and those more implicit, certain categories, such as that of managers, focused on in this text, maintain their position in the social division of labour.

In summary, the greatest challenge for the social sciences is independence from the "practical" objectives of official statistics and their ideological foundations. It even depends on the possibilities of further discussions about its uses as a source of empirical material.

References

[1]   Boltanski, L and Chiapello, E (1999) Le Nouvel Esprit du Capitalisme ((The new spirit of capitalism). Paris: Gallimard.

[2]   Bourdieu P (1979) La Distinction; Critique Sociales du Jugement (The distinction; Social Critique of Judgment). Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

[3]   Bourdieu P (1980) Le Sens Pratique (The Practical Sense). Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

[4]   Bourdieu P (1989) La Noblesse d´État; Grandes Écoles et Esprit de Corps State Nobility; Grandes Ecoles and Esprit de Corps). Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

[5] Chauvel L et al. (2002) Enjeux et usages des categories socioprofessionelles; Traditions nationales, comparaisons internationals et standardization européenne (Issues and uses of socio-professional categories; National traditions, international comparisons and European standardization). Presses de Sciences Po, no. 45-46: 157-185.

[6] Desrosières A (2005) Décrire l´État ou Explorer La societé: les deus sources de la statistique publique (Describing the State or Exploring Society: the two sources of official statistics), Gèneses, no. 58: 4-27.

[7] Desrosières A (2008) Pour une Sociologie de la Quantification; l´Argument Statistique I (For a Sociology of Quantification; Statistical Argument I). Paris: Paristech.

[8] https://international.ipums.org/international/ Minnesota Population Center. (2018). Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. (Accessed 03 mars 2018).

[9] Hunter D (2015) Review of the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE). Paper prepared the Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications. New York: International Labour Office.

[10] International Labor Organization (ILO) (2012b) http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/index.htm October, 2012.

[11] International Labour Office (2012) International Standard Classification of Occupation. ISCO-08; Vol 1 Structure, group definitions and correspondence tables. Geneva: International Labour Office.

[12] Leiulfsrud H, Bison I. and Jensberg H (2005) Social Class in Europe. European Social Survey 2002/3. Trondheim: NTNU Social Research Ltd.

[13] Weber M. 1983. Fundamentos de Sociologia (Fundamentals of Sociology). Porto: Rés Editora.

[14] Weber M (1984) Economia y Sociedade; Esbozo de Sociología Comprensiva Economy and Society; Comprehensive Sociology Outline). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

[15] Wright E O (1980) Class and Occupation. Theory and Society, 9 (1): 177-214.