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Occupations and Work Force Data in Russian and Soviet Censuses

MICHAEL PAUL SACKS

Occupations constitute a classification of activities of individuals which result in the production of economic goods and services. The term "occupations" is commonly distinguished from "industries," defined as a "classification of the activities of organizations" involved in such production (Stinchcombe, 1983: 108). Throughout the world, occupation is a critical determinant of an individual's social status. In preindustrial societies, occupation alone was probably a precise indicator of "dress, recreation, manners, patterns of association, speech, educational level, and other aspects of 'lifestyle'" (Bogue, 1969: 431). In modern societies, income and education are combined with a measure of occupational prestige to create an index of individual socioeconomic achievement (Bogue, 1969: chap. 14).

The occupational composition of the economy reveals much about the characteristics of the total society. It reflects the level of overall economic development and the position of a region or nation within the broader economic system. Data on the occupational structure of the economy can be used to determine the social class divisions within the society. Social inequality is revealed by examining the intergroup differences in occupational structure. Researchers, for example, can study the association between gender or ethnicity and occupational concentration. Data on occupational differences between generations show the extent of upward and downward social mobility.

For Russia and the USSR, detailed data regarding the occupations of the entire work force can only be found in the censuses. The censuses provide a uniform classification of occupations across regions and over time for at least the period between 1939 and 1970 (no such data are currently available for 1979, but their publication would surely extend the longitudinal comparisons that are possible). The censuses also
provide enormous potential for studying the association between employment and other social characteristics such as nationality, education, residence, marital status, and family size. This potential varies from one census to the next, but the 1926 census contains by far the most detailed information and the most sophisticated presentation and discussion of occupational data. More recent censuses are extremely disappointing by comparison.

A variety of Soviet economic handbooks provide data on the number of workers by branch of the economy, with additional detail on the branches of industry (USSR, 1981: 135, 357–58). However, each branch includes a wide range of occupations, and the same occupation can fall in many different branches. Further, the occupational composition of branches may change considerably over time and is likely to differ among regions; Feshbach (1972) notes that such problems as changes in the classification of workers and variation in the number of categories impede comparisons of branch data over time. There are also irregular publications containing data on the number of people employed in selected occupations. The categories given are rarely very numerous but may reveal the hierarchy of positions, for example, in the area of industrial management or school administration (Feshbach, 1972: 219–22; Dodge, 1966: chap. 2). In these areas the categories can be more detailed than in the census.

Very few studies have utilized the detailed occupational data from the Soviet censuses. Dodge’s (1966) research on women in the USSR has been extremely useful for subsequent study of the subject, but his work is largely descriptive. He presented data on female representation in the occupational categories of the 1939 and 1959 censuses for the USSR as a whole. In Women’s Work in Soviet Russia, Sacks (1976) used data from the censuses of 1897, 1939, 1959, and 1970 to construct summary measures of the levels of occupational gender differences and to pinpoint and describe where these differences were concentrated. As the title suggests, the book is concerned solely with the RSFSR. More recently, Sacks (1982b) extended this analysis and used detailed occupational data for each of the republics to make both cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons of gender differences. This work also includes an analysis of age differences in occupations based on 1959 census data and focuses on differences between Muslim ethnic groups and the Russians. Sacks analyzes census data for 1939, 1959, and 1970 to draw conclusions on this subject in the absence of occupational data cross-classified by nationality (the techniques are further elaborated in Sacks, forthcoming).

McAuley (1981) has also used detailed occupational data to analyze gender differences and calculate summary measures. He compares the republics for 1970 and compares the USSR as a whole over the period
from 1939 to 1970. McAuley’s findings differ from those of Sacks’s (1976; 1982a; 1982b) on a number of points, apparently because of their distinct approaches to interpreting the data and to the particular summary measures employed. Unlike Sacks (1982b: chap. 2), McAuley provides little information on the way he has resolved problems of missing occupational categories and of lack of comparability in the number and classification of categories. Thus, the two authors may have differed considerably in their resolution of this matter.

Despite their unquestionable richness, the occupational data from both the 1897 and 1926 censuses have remained almost entirely unutilized. The difficulty in making comparisons with the occupational categories in the more recent censuses has certainly contributed greatly to this neglect. What follows is a discussion of problems common to the Russian and Soviet censuses as well as to most censuses conducted in other areas of the world. Specific features of the 1897 census and the Soviet censuses are then considered separately with a focus on the detail and clarity of occupational categories, the number of variables by which occupational data are cross-classified, the internal comparability of tables of occupational data, and the potential for comparisons with the other censuses.

General Problems Affecting the Census Data

The first problem with occupational data in the censuses concerns the adequacy of coverage of unpaid family labor. Especially in rural areas large numbers of young people and women engaged in economic activity can easily be overlooked by the census informant. Consequently censuses often both understate the share of the work force engaged in agriculture and distort the extent of women’s contribution to the household economy. According to a United Nations report pertaining to this subject, “It is commonly true in developing nations that nearly all the able-bodied members of farm households take some part in agricultural work, if only during the seasons of peak labor requirements, but the extent to which women and young people are reported as economically active varies over a wide range” (1968: 74).

This statement leads one to be particularly suspect of low rates of economic activity among rural women and children not in school. At early stages of industrialization, unpaid labor among women and children may also be widespread in cities (Tilly and Scott, 1978). This problem can be illustrated by figures from the 1926 Soviet census. In the RSFSR, one would have expected to find that most rural women in the age group 25–39 combined the bearing and raising of children with agricultural labor of some type. Yet, among families of agricultural
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workers, the census shows that in this age group 55,986 females were not part of the work force (nesamodeyat'nyy) and 66,046 were actively engaged in agricultural labor. Among males, on the other hand, the respective figures were 1,062 and 134,876 (USSR, 1930: 41). It does not seem plausible that 46 percent of the females would have been totally excluded from economic activity. To correct for this error, or at least to assess the extent to which it distorts findings based upon the census, the researcher must study other sources such as social science monographs, regional surveys, and even relevant works of fiction that describe the economic activity of all family members. This advice applies as well to the problems mentioned below.

A second problem concerns the adequacy of coverage of the labor of persons engaged in intermittent, temporary, or seasonal employment. Tilly and Scott (1978: 44) find that in preindustrial Europe “the normative family division of labor tended to give men jobs away from the household or jobs which required long and uninterrupted commitments of time or extensive travel, while women’s work was performed more often at home and permitted flexible time arrangements.” Thus, this second problem can exacerbate the difficulty of measuring unpaid family labor but may clearly apply to other workers as well.

Soviet censuses were conducted in winter, and if census informants were not fully questioned about activity undertaken during other times of the year, there may have been a tendency to undercount workers—especially in agriculture (United Nations, 1968: 74, 76). Noting that persons employed for an incomplete year had no way to specify this in the 1959 Soviet census, Feshbach (1972) contended that this flaw in the questionnaire had resulted in an upward bias in the number shown working within many occupations. He suggested that this might have been rectified in the 1970 census by additional questions directed specifically to those who had worked only during part of 1969.

The subsequent publication of the 1970 census, however, did not bear out Feshbach’s prediction, as no information was published regarding employment for part of the year. The 1979 census questionnaire also did not include the additional questions, and instructions to enumerators stated that persons engaged in seasonal work and not employed at the time of the census should record as their occupation the work that they were engaged in during their active season. Likewise, women who had taken leave of absence for the care of children under age one were to record their place of employment as that from which they had taken leave (USSR, 1978: 55). Ideally, occupational data should indicate the number who worked by time intervals for the year preceding the census.

A third and related problem concerns the treatment of individuals engaged in dual economic activities. The 1897 and 1926 censuses
contain much extremely detailed data regarding secondary occupations, but subsequent censuses show only primary employment. Instructions from the 1979 census stated that ‘persons having at the present time two or more places of work and also individuals working part of the year in one enterprise, institution, or organization and part of the year in another, are to write the name of the enterprise, institution or organization where the work is considered by the person to be his primary employment’ (USSR, 1978: 55). The consequence of such a procedure, according to a UN report (1968: 76), is likely to be ‘a tendency to understate the share of manpower in those activities that are frequently subsidiary, and to overstate the share in those which frequently occupy the major part, though less than the whole, of the worker’s time.’

Several factors contribute to the above problems being more significant for researchers using the earlier censuses. First, a larger proportion of the population was engaged in agriculture, handicrafts, and related activities that were commonly undertaken by the family as a unit. Second, economic activity began at an especially early age, as labor-force entry was rarely delayed by schooling. Thus, in the 1926 census the age group 10–14 actually constituted the first category of the working population. Children probably worked most frequently as unpaid family members, and the quantity or quality of labor viewed as necessary to define children as workers must have varied considerably. In their description of preindustrial Europe, Tilly and Scott (1978: 44) note that ‘the levels of skill expected of children advanced with age, with young children performing the simplest and crudest chores.’

Finally, the extremely low status of women in traditional Russian society may have increased the likelihood that their economic activity would be overlooked. It must have reduced the probability of their being directly interviewed as part of the census. Furthermore, in rural areas women appear to have been the most subordinate and the most insulated from change. Despite the persistence of inequality in a wide range of dimensions, the position of women has improved markedly over the period covered by the censuses (Sacks, 1976; 1982b).

The same factors noted above make it likely that the accuracy of the census results will vary across regions at any single point in time. This is owing to the considerable variation in economic development and in cultural factors influencing female status and the employment level of children and teenagers. The change over time in this level of heterogeneity remains very controversial.
The 1897 Census

Social and occupational categories in the 1897 census differ substantially from those of the Soviet period because of both the dramatic change in the economic structure of society and the distinct influence of political ideology on the conduct of social inquiry. In this latter regard, Lenin complained that the 1897 census lacked the requisite categories to delineate the class structure of the population (USSR, 1958: 11).

Looking back at 1897, commentators writing in the 1926 census criticized the lack of information showing the hierarchy of positions within each occupation, and efforts to correct this are obvious in this first complete Soviet census (USSR, 1929b: vii–viii).

The contrast between the 1897 enumeration and those conducted during the Soviet period is immediately evident from the divisions by social strata. For each district and for the major cities, tables in the main volumes of the 1897 census divide the population into such categories as family members of hereditary nobility, church personnel, and petty bourgeoisie. Peasantry is a single category. This framework cannot be used for meaningful comparisons with later census data.

For each guberniya, data are presented for 65 categories of employment, cross-classified by gender and age. Persons active in the labor force are shown separately from nonworking members of the family. As in the 1926 census where this same distinction appears, it is unclear how dependents were classified in cases in which members of the same family were working in different occupations.

The 65 categories constitute an industrial as opposed to an occupational classification (International Labour Office, 1959: 26–39). This classification, therefore, indicates more about where an individual works than what he or she does within a particular area of service or production. Prostitution is one of the categories but, since a small number of both males and females are shown here, it is likely that this too encompasses different occupations (the category does not appear in Soviet censuses).

The industrial classification may not have created serious problems in 1897 because the distinction between occupation and industry was not likely to have been as distinct as it was at a later time. Where the organization of economic activity is not complex, industry is largely equivalent to occupation. “This is particularly the case where agriculture dominates the economy, since even in the most highly developed economies the differentiation of occupations within agriculture has not progressed far” (UN, 1968: 110). The secondary activities of persons engaged in agriculture, hunting, and fishing are shown in remarkable detail. For each district over 150 categories are listed indicating the
wealth of material collected in the course of the census and only partially
tapped in the actual publications. It is unclear why secondary activities
were specified in so much greater detail than were the primary activities
of the total population.

Particularly significant additional tables appear in a supplementary
volume to the census (Troynitskiy, 1906); these were used to a limited
degree in the work of Sacks (1976: chap. 2). The data refer only to
"workers," which has a meaning perhaps synonymous with proletariat
and includes those in manufacturing, mining, communication, transpor-
tation, and some aspects of trade. Twenty-eight of the 65 categories in
the main part of the census appear here. In one set of tables, the number
in each category is shown for married persons by age and gender and for
household heads by gender and number of persons within the household.
Thus, there is especially rich potential for study of the relationship
between family status and employment.

Another type of table shows data for a substantial number of subcategories
of the 28 main categories. These data are cross-classified simultaneously
by age, gender, and literacy. The further detail may make this table
particularly valuable for regional comparisons of age and gender differ-
ences. Cross-sectional rather than longitudinal comparison entailing links
with the Soviet census data is surely the most fruitful research agenda.

The 1926 Census

Tables in the 1926 census vary greatly in the detail of the occupational
categories, and careful consideration is necessary when deciding upon
the geographic units to be compared. The headings of the tables can be
confusing and reflect both the intricacy of the occupational classification
and the large number of variables by which data are cross-classified. Re.
searchers will find it very useful to become familiar with the number
and lettering scheme used in the occupational classification.

The broadest categories are denoted with capital Russian letters. They
represent the status in the labor force and include the following:

1. Workers (rabochii)
2. Office personnel (sluzhashchii)
3. Free professionals
4. Employers with hired labor
5. Household heads with family members working for them or members of
 producers' collectives
6. Own-account workers (hiring no employees)
7. Family members assisting in an economic enterprise operated by another
 member of the same household
There are three additional categories for persons not considered to have an occupation:

8. Persons either not having or not stating their occupation
9. Unemployed persons
10. Military personnel

The distinction between the first two categories is especially important. "Worker," the same term used in the 1897 census, refers to "persons employed directly in the production and transfer [peremeshcheniye] of material value or in the maintenance of production mechanisms." The category of office personnel applies to "persons whose participation in production is in the form of nonmaterial service connected indirectly with production ... or in the servicing of population" (USSR, 1929a: 519). The distinction is sometimes difficult to make, as is acknowledged in the statement following these definitions in the 1926 census: "The boundary between both concepts is not fully established, in that it is not possible to posit completely the precise boundaries between 'material' and 'nonmaterial' production. For that reason the placing of specific occupations in the area of worker or office worker is subject to debate. For the great majority of occupations, however, such designation is not difficult" (USSR, 1929a: 519).

The distinction between the first three statuses is best appreciated simply by examining the categories included within them. (Also see the definitions provided in USSR, 1929a: 517–22.) Over time the distribution of occupations among statuses undoubtedly has changed, as is illustrated below by the 1959 and 1970 censuses.

Other status categories are not free of problems. A UN report states that "in the reporting of status the distinction between employers and own-account workers is especially likely to be unreliable; that a self-employed worker hires one or two employees may easily be overlooked by the census informant, with the result that the number of employers is understated and the number of own-account workers overstated" (UN, 1968: 73–74). The status categories are subdivided into a small number of branches of the economy which are assigned uppercase Roman numerals. The third level of divisions (lowercase Russian letters) consists of broad occupational categories. The appearance of a great many of the same occupations across diverse branches of the economy clearly shows the deficiency of branch data alone.

The last subdivisions are of two types—both demarcated with Arabic numbers. The first appears in tables where occupational data are cross-classified by marital status among other variables. This type shows position within the occupation. For workers the positions consist of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled. Other categories are used for office
personnel that number as many as seventeen within a single occupation. Some status categories do not have further subdivisions at this level.

The alternative type of subdivision consists of still more detailed occupations; the tables containing employment data by nationality have this format. The categories are far more numerous and can readily be converted into the categories of the first type. Volume 18 of the 1926 census (USSR, 1929a: 521–38) shows the complete list of occupations in both the full and abbreviated occupational tables of the census and also indicates which occupations fall within each of the hierarchical positions. The level of skill of the worker was not based on a statement by the census informant. Instead, skill levels were established for specific occupations using information from a previous survey and from union handbooks. These levels represent the average or typical level of skill of workers in those occupations (USSR, 1929a: 521). It is therefore quite possible that systematic errors could result, for example, in the understating of differences between male and female skill levels. Unfortunately, it is not possible to convert the first type of subdivisions back into the more detailed occupations from which they were derived.

A brief examination of some of the more significant occupational tables illustrates the richness of the data in the 1926 census and their enormous research potential. One table, for example, distinguishes among males and females who are married, single, widowed, and divorced. For each occupation these categories are further divided into those who are active in the work force and those who are dependent members of the family not gainfully employed. This is the same division found in the 1897 census. There are also between eighteen and twenty age categories, and a distinction is made between urban and rural residents. Furthermore, both age and residence are given not only by gender but also by the literacy or illiteracy of the individuals.

Other tables show occupational data cross-classified by the largest nationality groups in the region, the previous occupation of the unemployed further divided by length of unemployment, city size of current residence along with age and marital status, and place of birth along with place of residence or length of residence in current location. Detailed tables show primary occupation by secondary occupation, and in almost every case the data are also shown separately for males and females.

Obviously the way the variables appear in the tables limits the manner in which they can be combined. For example, researchers cannot examine the impact of marital status on employment while controlling for age, nor can they directly examine the extent to which differences in literacy contribute to the superior position of one nationality group over another. But careful integration of the information on occupational characteristics from several different tables can enable researchers to draw inferences about a wide range of interrelationships.
The 1959 Census

In sharp contrast with the 1926 census, detailed occupational data in the 1959 and 1970 censuses are available only for the republics and not for smaller geographic units. Data are cross-classified only by gender, and the classification of categories is less revealing. Longitudinal comparisons are also complicated by change in occupational characteristics resulting from social and economic changes since 1926—such as the forced collectivization of agriculture and substantial industrial development. The same categories may not represent the same type of activity, and new occupations are present which did not exist in 1926.

The "social groups" within the society are shown to include workers, office personnel, collective farmers and a very small number of independent peasant farmers, and uncollectivized handicraftsmen. Table 30 shows members of the Soviet Army as a separate category within the employed population, but in Table 31 the military is not listed and its members are divided among workers, office personnel, and collective farmers.

The distinction between collective and state farm workers appears to be of far greater significance ideologically than as a sign of very different forms of economic activity, particularly in recent decades (Volin, 1970: 526–31). However, only state farmers are categorized as workers (rabochii). The group that is commonly formed by combining workers and office workers is not equivalent to the nonagrarian work force, although it is often treated this way in Soviet social science literature and statistics.

In Table 45 of the 1959 census, detailed agrarian occupations are shown separately for collective farmers and for a category labeled "workers" (rabochii). These latter must be exclusively state farmers. However, the workers (rabochii) shown as having employment in the branch of agriculture in Table 33 are not restricted to state farmers.

Persons solely engaged in production for family consumption or for the market on small privately tended plots of land (the private subsidiary economy) are considered to have a source of income but not an occupation. They are clearly not counted as state or collective farm workers (they may also be found among the families of other types of workers). No tables show secondary activities of those in the labor force, but labor in private agriculture frequently takes this form (see Soviet time-budget studies).

Table 44 contains the most detailed occupational categories separately by branch of the economy, but the data are only for the total population. Other tables do not show the breakdown by branch but have data either for 1939 and 1959 or for seven age categories for 1959 only. The table for the USSR as a whole shows only the distribution among age categories, but for each of the republics the number of persons is shown.
Occupations are divided into those that are professional or semiprofessional, defined as requiring "primarily mental exertion," and those that are nonprofessional or requiring "primarily physical exertion." As in the distinction between material and nonmaterial production, there obviously are definitional problems here. This division further confuses matters because it does not correspond to any clear combination of the "social groups" noted above.

Substantially abbreviated occupational tables show the number of females in 1939 and 1959 and their number in the seven age categories (hereafter referred to as the female listing). The number of males must be derived by subtracting the number of females from the corresponding table with the total figure (hereafter referred to as the total listing). This task at times requires some searching and some trial adding together of categories to determine exactly which of the categories in the total listing combine to equal those in the female listing.

Subcategories in the female listing often do not sum to the main category under which they fall. By calculating the residual and then referring to the total listing, the researcher can frequently specify the occupations of those unaccounted for. Some main categories are also missing, and, thus, a residual exists for both major occupational divisions. This can be examined using the same procedure (see Sacks, 1982b: chap. 2).

Table 49 compares the total number of workers in a selected group of occupations for 1959 and 1926. This table is a useful starting point for comparisons between these censuses, but the researcher must study the way in which it was constructed from the categories in the 1926 census. Adding the dimension of gender should be possible for many of the categories.

The 1970 Census

The 1970 census has fewer occupational categories than does the 1959 census, but several new categories appear and added information can be derived from the presentation of data for both 1959 and 1970 in the same tables. Using data for 1959 from both the 1959 census and the 1970 census, the researcher can determine how the occupational classification has changed and also specify categories missing from the female listing in both census publications (see Sacks, 1982b: 30–35). Fully exploiting the analysis of residual categories, the dual set of data for 1959, and other sources of information, Sacks (1982b) shows a definite pattern to categories that are missing or poorly specified in the census tables:

Occupations that are missing or have been deleted from the 1970 census tend to have distinctly low and/or declining female representation. . . .
Occupations that were added to the listing in the 1970 census showed the opposite trend. In addition, there are many cases in which female overrepresentation is obscured by combining of occupations with a low and high proportion of women. Finally, the nonprofessional female listing clearly omits some of the least desirable occupations and obscures the large numbers of women doing such work. (Sacks, 1982b: 42)

Commenting on the 1970 census, Labutova (1976: 231) notes that the stated occupation was not always the sole basis for classifying the individual as being engaged primarily in either mental or physical work. Social group, education, and answers to questions pertaining to the character of the work were sometimes considered, but these instances would appear to have been rare. The difficulty with this distinction between mental and physical work is shown by changes in occupational classification between 1959 and 1970. In 1959, barbers, manicurists, photographers, and those in the large category of salespeople were considered to be professional or semiprofessional. In 1970 they were reclassified as having occupations that required primarily physical exertion (Sacks, 1982b: chap. 2; Labutova, 1984a). This distinction also influenced the way in which employed persons were distributed between the categories of workers and office personnel, because the numbers given for 1959 differ in the 1959 and 1970 censuses.

The reduction in occupational data in the 1970 census is especially striking in the tables where age categories are shown. The 1970 census contains no absolute figures and no separate data for females. All that appears is the distribution across age groups for the total population. The number of persons can be calculated only imprecisely, as the distribution is to just three decimal places.

Another consequence of the reduction in occupational data is that labor-force participation rates for 1970 cannot be calculated by age and gender. Although subsequently published data show the rates for the USSR as a whole (Vestnik statistiki, 1974: 90), they still cannot be determined for each of the republics. In addition, the age group 60 and over is a single category in the 1959 data, and the appropriate population base for calculating the rate for this group is difficult to judge.

A useful set of tables in the 1970 census have greater detail than do their counterpart in 1959. Tables 69–83 in Volume IV show the distribution by educational attainment within each of detailed occupational categories. Whereas in 1959, educational attainment including and beyond incomplete secondary education comprised a single category, in 1970 this was divided into four categories. This arrangement is far better for roughly distinguishing between high and low status occupations (see Sacks, 1982b: chap. 5).
The 1979 Census

The single volume in which the results of the 1979 census were published (USSR, 1984) contains no data whatsoever on even the total number of persons within each occupation. The only pertinent tables show for each republic the proportion in the same four educational-attainment categories as existed in the 1970 census by branch of the economy (Table 42) and by major occupational category (Tables 45 and 46). The occupational categories appear to be the same as those of 1970, and in Tables 45 and 46, data are provided for both 1970 and 1979. Again, there is no distinction between males and females.

Occupational data were obviously collected in the course of the 1979 census, although the questions on this subject were administered to a sample population made up of 25 percent of the population living in their permanent residences (Labutova, 1984a: 10). Perhaps, as was the case with the 1939 census, researchers must await the publication of a future census before more results for 1979 are made available. It is apparent, however, that previously unpublished findings will appear from time to time in Soviet statistical publications and monographs. In a chapter in a book on the 1979 census, Labutova (1984b: 192–93) mentions the percentage of women in a number of occupations. Labutova reveals, for example, that among doctors and head doctors the percentage of women was 69 percent (as opposed to 76 percent in 1970) and among engineers it was 48 percent (up from 42 percent in 1970). This is significant information, but it provides a very paltry basis for analyzing work-force structure and patterns of change.

Conclusion

When working with recent censuses of the United States, researchers commonly use data on the characteristics of individuals for the multivariate analysis of occupational attainment. Computer tapes are available with information on large random samples of the population. For those accustomed to studying social processes with such data, the Soviet census would certainly appear quite useless.

Relative to other sources of information pertaining to Soviet society, however, the censuses constitute a source of hard data that is of enormous value. Furthermore, the 1926 census is surely of exceptional quality compared both to censuses of other countries during this era and to present-day censuses conducted in nations at levels of economic and social development comparable to that of the USSR in 1926. The occupational data from the 1959 and 1970 censuses provide, by comparison, extremely scant data, but they can nevertheless be used for reliable
measures of many aspects of Soviet society and of social change. Problems arise primarily from the omission of subcategories and of tables cross-classifying occupational data by additional variables rather than from the publication of false information. This must be considered in the light of the recent reduction in statistical information evidenced by the 1979 census.

Future research might most profitably focus on the following: (1) interregional comparison of occupational differences by gender, nationality, and marital status based on the 1926 census; (2) comparison of the occupational structure of republics in 1926 with that of 1939 through 1970; and (3) intensive study of the characteristics of selected occupations or industries over the entire period from 1897 to 1970. The cumulation of results in the form of a growing data base easily accessible for computer analysis and exchange among scholars is certainly essential. Census data should continue to be used in conjunction with the full range of other sources that, as noted in the section on general problems with the censuses, can help compensate for both possible distortions and omissions. And finally, it is through examining conclusions from research on other countries and applying broader social science theory that the most significant issues warranting further study can be defined and that findings based on Soviet data can be critically evaluated (Sacks and Pankhurst, 1980).
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