European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies (ISSN: 2750-8587)

Received: 08 September 2026 | Accepted: 05 October 2026 | Published: 01 November 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Marxist Analysis of Class, Capital, And Social Inequality

Haruto Nakamura

Department of Multidisciplinary Studies, Japan Institute for Management and Social Research, Tokyo, Japan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue11 2026

PAGE: 01-08

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

Class, capital, and social inequality are interconnected dimensions of social organization that shape access to wealth, employment, political influence, and cultural opportunities. This paper examines these relationships through a Marxist theoretical framework, focusing on the ownership of productive resources, the organization of labor, the accumulation of capital, and the reproduction of social hierarchies. Using a qualitative, conceptual research approach, the study synthesizes the nine references provided, including Marx's analysis of alienation and political economy, Harvey's account of capitalist crises, and Wood's historical interpretation of capitalism. It also considers how class and gender intersect in literary and social analysis through studies of Pride and Prejudice. The analysis develops a framework connecting economic ownership, labor relations, institutional structures, and social outcomes. The findings suggest that inequality cannot be adequately explained by individual differences in effort or ability alone; it must also be examined through the structural distribution of resources and opportunities. However, a Marxist approach requires careful consideration of gender, cultural agency, and variations across historical contexts. The paper contributes a synthesized framework for understanding the persistence of social inequality while identifying directions for empirical research.

KEYWORDS

Marxism, social inequality, class relations, capital accumulation, labor exploitation, alienation, gender inequality, capitalist society, economic hierarchy.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem Statement

Social inequality remains a central concern in the analysis of economic institutions and social relationships. Differences in income, property ownership, employment security, education, and political influence are frequently understood as outcomes of individual achievement or market competition. A Marxist perspective challenges explanation that isolate individual behavior from the social structures in which economic activity occurs. It argues that the ownership and control of productive resources influence the distribution of wealth, the organization of labor, and the relative power of different social groups (Marx, 1867).

The distinction between those who control productive assets and those who depend primarily on selling their labor provides a starting point for examining class relations. These relationships influence not only material living conditions but also individuals' bargaining power, access to opportunities, and participation in social institutions. Harvey (2010) extends this structural perspective by examining capital accumulation and the crises associated with capitalist development.

The problem addressed in this paper is how class relations and capital accumulation contribute to the reproduction of social and economic hierarchies, and how these processes interact with gender and cultural expectations.

1.2 Research Relevance

A structural analysis of inequality is relevant because economic growth does not necessarily guarantee an equitable distribution of its benefits. Even where employment and production expand, ownership concentration, differences in bargaining power, and unequal access to resources may preserve established hierarchies. Wood (1999) provides a historical perspective for examining capitalism as a distinctive social and economic system rather than as an inevitable consequence of human exchange.

Marx's early writings also provide a conceptual foundation for examining how economic arrangements affect human autonomy and social relationships. Alienation is particularly relevant because it connects the organization of production with workers' experiences of control, meaningful activity, and social relations (Marx, 1844).

1.3 Research Objectives

This paper has four objectives: to explain the relationship between class structure and capital accumulation; to examine the mechanisms through which economic inequality is reproduced; to explore the relevance of gender and cultural expectations to class analysis; and to develop a conceptual framework that can guide future research on social and economic inequality.

1.4 Scope and Significance

The paper adopts a theoretical and interpretive scope. It draws exclusively on the nine references supplied and does not claim to provide new statistical evidence or original fieldwork. Its contribution lies in synthesizing political-economic theory with research on gender, literature, and social hierarchy. This approach helps clarify the explanatory strengths and limitations of Marxist analysis across different social contexts.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Marxist Foundations of Class and Capital

Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844) provide a foundation for understanding alienation as a consequence of social arrangements that separate workers from control over their productive activity and its outcomes. This perspective shifts attention from income differences alone to the quality of social relationships established through production. A worker may receive wages while remaining unable to determine the purpose, organization, or distribution of the products of their labor.

In Capital, Marx (1867) develops a more systematic analysis of capitalist production, focusing on the relationship between labor, commodities, and capital accumulation. Together, these works suggest that inequality is connected to the organization of production rather than being simply an accidental feature of market exchange. The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels (1848), situates class conflict within broader historical transformations and emphasizes the political significance of opposing class interests.

These works provide complementary analytical levels: alienation addresses the human consequences of economic organization, the analysis of capital examines production and accumulation, and the Communist Manifesto emphasizes class conflict and historical change.

2.2 Capital Accumulation and Historical Development

Harvey (2010) examines the dynamics of capital accumulation and the crises associated with capitalist development. His perspective helps connect inequality with the pressures generated by investment, competition, expansion, and economic instability. Accumulation can create productive capacity while simultaneously concentrating economic control and exposing workers to insecurity.

Wood (1999) contributes a historical interpretation by examining the origins and distinctive characteristics of capitalism. Her approach is important because it discourages treating market dependence and capitalist social relations as timeless or universal. Instead, it directs attention to the historical conditions through which particular economic institutions emerge and become established.

Read together, Harvey and Wood support an analysis that combines the ongoing dynamics of capitalist accumulation with the historical development of the social relations that sustain it. Nevertheless, neither a historical account nor a theory of accumulation alone can establish the precise magnitude of inequality in a particular society without appropriate empirical evidence.

2.3 Gender, Property, and Social Hierarchy

The supplied literature also indicates the importance of examining class through gender and cultural expectations. Hayat, Waheed, and Iqbal (2021) approach Pride and

Prejudice through Marxist-feminist criticism, connecting economic position and women's social circumstances. Their perspective helps extend class analysis beyond the workplace to include marriage, property, and the social expectations governing women's choices.

Johnson (1995) examines women, politics, and the novel in the context of Jane Austen's writing. Suson (2023) addresses money and morality in Pride and Prejudice, while Yi (2014) considers gender and class oppression in the same literary work. Collectively, these studies provide a basis for exploring how economic dependence can interact with gender norms and cultural judgments.

Literary interpretation, however, cannot automatically establish how all women experience economic inequality in contemporary societies. Its contribution is analytical: it can reveal how wealth, inheritance, marriage, respectability, and social status become intertwined within a particular cultural setting.

2.4 Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

The supplied works address complementary dimensions of inequality, including alienation, capitalist accumulation, historical development, class conflict, and gendered social expectations. The central analytical opportunity is to integrate these dimensions into a single conceptual framework without assuming that one mechanism explains every form of disadvantage.

This paper therefore treats inequality as a multilevel process involving productive ownership, labor relations, accumulation, institutional arrangements, and gendered cultural norms. The framework is intended to clarify relationships among the concepts and support future empirical investigation, rather than to claim that the supplied literature proves a universal causal model.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative, conceptual research design based on critical literature synthesis. The method is appropriate because the research questions concern theoretical relationships among class, capital, alienation, and social inequality rather than the measurement of a specific population. The study interprets the supplied texts as complementary contributions to a broader Marxist analysis.

The research does not involve surveys, interviews, experiments, or statistical modeling. Accordingly, its findings represent conceptual interpretations of the provided literature, not independently verified empirical results. The nine references constitute the defined analytical corpus; no external sources are introduced.

3.2 Analytical Framework

The study organizes its analysis around four interconnected dimensions: economic ownership, labor relations, capital accumulation, and social reproduction. Economic ownership concerns control over productive resources. Labor relations concern the distribution of authority, compensation, and responsibility within production. Capital accumulation concerns the reinvestment and expansion of economic resources. Social reproduction concerns the institutional and cultural arrangements through which social positions and expectations may persist across generations.

The framework follows the distinction between the human consequences of economic arrangements in Marx (1844), the organization of capitalist production in Marx (1867), the historical development of capitalism in Wood (1999), and the dynamics of accumulation discussed by Harvey (2010). The gender dimension is informed by the supplied literary analyses of Hayat et al. (2021), Johnson (1995), Suson (2023), and Yi (2014).

3.3 Analytical Procedure

The analysis proceeds in three stages. First, the references are grouped according to their principal conceptual contributions. Second, recurring relationships among ownership, labor, accumulation, and social hierarchy are identified. Third, these relationships are integrated into a conceptual model and examined through hypothetical examples.

The procedure emphasizes conceptual consistency, comparison, and critical interpretation. It does not assign numerical weights to theoretical concepts or claim to establish causal effects. Instead, it evaluates how the selected perspectives complement one another and where their explanatory limits become apparent.

3.4 Conceptual Model

The proposed model can be expressed as follows:

Ownership structure → Labor relations → Capital accumulation → Distribution of resources and opportunities →

Reproduction or transformation of inequality.

Gender norms, cultural expectations, and institutional arrangements interact with each stage. The arrows represent proposed analytical relationships, not statistically demonstrated causal effects. For example, unequal ownership may strengthen the bargaining position of employers, but labor regulation, collective organization, and other institutional conditions may alter the resulting distribution of economic benefits.

This model provides a structured way to examine how inequality is produced and maintained while leaving room for historical variation and social agency.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Class Relations Extend Beyond Income Differences

The first analytical finding is that class inequality is more comprehensively understood through relationships of ownership and control than through income differences alone. Income measures describe how resources are distributed at a particular time, whereas class analysis asks how the distribution is produced and maintained.

Marx (1867) provides the theoretical basis for examining the relationship between capital and wage labor. From this perspective, the distinction between an employer and an employee is not simply a difference in earnings. It also concerns control over productive assets, authority over work processes, and influence over the distribution of production outcomes.

Consider a hypothetical manufacturing firm in which two workers receive similar wages but possess different levels of job security and decision-making authority. One worker has a permanent contract and participates in workplace decisions, while the other depends on temporary assignments and has limited bargaining power. Their current earnings may be similar, yet their economic positions differ substantially. The second worker has less capacity to withstand unemployment, negotiate conditions, or plan for the future.

This example illustrates why inequality must be analyzed through both material outcomes and structural relationships. However, employment status alone does not determine an individual's entire class position. Savings, household resources, public benefits, professional autonomy, and ownership interests may also affect economic security.

The findings therefore support a multidimensional understanding of class that combines income, productive ownership, bargaining power, and exposure to economic risk.

4.2 Capital Accumulation Can Reproduce Unequal Opportunities

The second finding concerns the relationship between accumulation and the distribution of economic opportunities. Harvey (2010) provides a framework for considering how the pursuit of accumulation interacts with instability and crisis. Marx (1867) provides the underlying analysis of capitalist production and the relationship between capital and labor.

When firms reinvest profits in productive assets, technology, and market expansion, they may increase output and create employment. These developments can benefit workers and consumers. Nevertheless, the distribution of resulting gains depends on ownership, wages, employment conditions, and the allocation of investment returns.

For example, a company may introduce automated machinery that raises productivity. If the gains are distributed through higher wages, reduced working hours, and improved working conditions, technological change may improve workers' welfare. If the gains primarily increase returns to owners while workers face displacement and declining job security, the same technological development may intensify inequality.

The technology itself does not determine the social outcome. Ownership and institutional arrangements influence who receives the benefits and who bears the costs of adjustment.

This finding suggests that capital accumulation should not be equated automatically with either social progress or social deterioration. Its distributive consequences require examination of the relationships through which productivity gains are generated and allocated.

Harvey's (2010) emphasis on capitalist crises further directs attention to the unequal exposure of social groups to economic disruption. Workers who depend on current wages may have fewer resources to withstand unemployment than asset owners with diversified investments. Nevertheless, the extent of this difference varies according to household wealth, public protection, debt, and employment institutions.

4.3 Alienation Connects Economic Structures With Human Experience

The third finding is that economic inequality has both material

and experiential dimensions. Marx (1844) offers a way to examine how productive arrangements can affect autonomy, identity, and social relationships.

Alienation is analytically important because it highlights the possibility that workers may have limited control over the activity through which they earn their livelihoods. A person may receive regular compensation while having little influence over working methods, production priorities, or the use of the resulting product.

Consider a hypothetical warehouse employee whose performance is determined by strict productivity targets and automated monitoring. The employee's income may be stable, but limited discretion over pace, breaks, and task organization can reduce autonomy. The example illustrates a possible relationship between organizational control and workers' experiences of their labor.

Such an interpretation should not be universalized. Some forms of employment offer professional discretion, meaningful collaboration, and opportunities for skill development. Workers may also find purpose and solidarity within difficult conditions. Alienation is therefore best used as an analytical question about control and social relations rather than as an assumption that all wage labor produces identical experiences.

The finding broadens the assessment of inequality beyond income distribution to include the organization and meaning of work.

4.4 Gender and Cultural Norms Complicate Class Analysis

The fourth finding is that class structures interact with gendered expectations and cultural institutions. The studies by Hayat et al. (2021), Johnson (1995), Suson (2023), and Yi (2014), all concerned with aspects of Pride and Prejudice or its broader literary context, direct attention to the relationships among money, marriage, gender, and social status.

In a hypothetical household where access to property is concentrated in one family member, another member may have limited financial independence even when contributing substantial unpaid labor. If social expectations also assign that person responsibility for caregiving, economic dependence may be reinforced by cultural norms. The resulting inequality cannot be fully understood through household income alone.

Literary analysis helps identify how property, marriage, morality, and status can become interconnected. However, the interpretation of a nineteenth-century novel cannot establish the prevalence or magnitude of contemporary gender inequality. It provides a conceptual lens that requires further investigation through context-specific evidence.

The findings indicate that class analysis benefits from attention to gender, household arrangements, and cultural expectations without reducing all forms of inequality to a single economic mechanism.

4.5 Inequality Is Historically and Institutionally Variable

The fifth finding is that class structures should be examined as historically situated relationships rather than as identical arrangements across every society. Wood (1999) emphasizes the historical specificity of capitalism, while Marx and Engels (1848) situate class conflict within processes of social transformation.

Institutions governing property, employment, education, inheritance, and public support can alter how economic power is exercised. Two societies with comparable levels of production may distribute opportunities differently because their labor arrangements, social protections, and ownership structures differ.

This does not invalidate structural analysis. Rather, it indicates that structural mechanisms operate through particular historical institutions. A Marxist framework can identify questions about ownership and power, but it cannot substitute for investigating how those relationships function in a specific setting.

Taken together, the findings support an integrated account of inequality involving economic ownership, labor control, accumulation, human experience, and social reproduction. The model is conceptually coherent, but its explanatory strength in particular settings remains an empirical question.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpreting Inequality as a Structural Process

The findings suggest that social inequality is best understood as a process through which economic resources, decision-making authority, and social opportunities are distributed unevenly. A Marxist approach is valuable because it shifts the central question from why individuals possess different amounts of wealth to how the institutions governing production and ownership create and sustain those differences.

Marx (1867) provides a foundation for examining the relationship between capital and labor, while Marx and Engels (1848) emphasize the historical and political significance of class divisions. These perspectives indicate that class relations are not merely descriptive categories; they involve competing interests and unequal capacities to influence economic decisions.

However, a structural explanation should not imply that individuals are passive products of their economic positions. Workers, employers, communities, and political organizations can respond to institutional conditions in different ways. Collective bargaining, labor protections, cooperative ownership, and social policy may modify the distribution of economic power. The central analytical issue is therefore not whether individuals possess agency, but how that agency is enabled or constrained by existing structures.

This distinction strengthens Marxist analysis by preventing it from becoming economically deterministic. Structural conditions shape possibilities without necessarily dictating every outcome.

5.2 Capital Accumulation, Productivity, and Distribution

The relationship between accumulation and inequality requires particular attention because capitalist development can generate both material improvements and distributive tensions. Harvey (2010) provides a framework for analyzing accumulation and crisis, while Marx (1867) directs attention to the organization of production and the relationship between labor and capital.

Increased investment may improve productivity, expand production, and support technological innovation. Yet aggregate economic growth does not establish whether workers receive proportionate benefits. Distribution depends on such factors as wage-setting arrangements, ownership patterns, employment security, and institutional protections.

For example, a business may increase output through automation while reducing its workforce. Consumers may benefit from lower prices, and owners may receive higher returns, but displaced workers may experience prolonged unemployment or declining earnings. Alternatively, negotiated reductions in working hours and retraining programs may distribute some benefits of automation more broadly.

These alternatives demonstrate that technological change does not have a uniform distributive effect. A critical analysis must investigate who controls investment decisions, how productivity gains are allocated, and which groups bear the costs of economic adjustment.

The policy implication is not that accumulation should be rejected categorically. Rather, its social consequences should be evaluated through distributional outcomes and the capacity of institutions to protect groups exposed to economic risk. The limitation is that the conceptual literature examined here does not establish which specific policies produce the most equitable outcomes. Such conclusions require comparative evidence.

5.3 Alienation and the Quality of Social Participation

The concept of alienation adds an important dimension to the discussion by connecting economic structures with the quality of human participation in productive activity. Marx (1844) provides a basis for asking whether individuals exercise meaningful control over their labor and whether economic arrangements support or restrict their development.

This approach challenges the assumption that higher wages necessarily resolve workplace inequality. Compensation matters, but so do autonomy, dignity, stability, and the ability to influence decisions affecting everyday work. An employee may earn a comparatively high income while experiencing intensive surveillance or limited control over working time. Conversely, employment with modest compensation may provide greater autonomy and social value.

The concept nevertheless has interpretive limitations. Experiences of autonomy and meaning differ across occupations, individuals, and institutional contexts. Alienation cannot be inferred solely from an employment contract or income category. Researchers must investigate workers' experiences and organizational arrangements rather than assume that all employment relationships produce the same effects.

A practical implication is that assessments of workplace inequality should combine material indicators with evidence about decision-making authority, job security, working conditions, and opportunities for participation.

5.4 Gender, Property, and the Boundaries of Class Analysis

The gender-related literature broadens the discussion by demonstrating the analytical relevance of property, marriage,

and cultural expectations. Hayat et al. (2021), Johnson (1995), Suson (2023), and Yi (2014) provide different interpretive entry points for examining how economic status interacts with women's social positions in and around Pride and Prejudice.

These studies encourage consideration of how access to property and financial independence can influence personal choices. Economic dependence may narrow available options when social expectations attach financial security to marriage or family status. Unpaid domestic responsibilities may also affect access to paid work and independent resources.

Yet gender inequality cannot be reduced entirely to class inequality. People within the same economic class may experience different opportunities because of gendered expectations, while gender relations also operate through cultural and institutional practices not fully captured by ownership categories. A stronger analysis therefore treats class and gender as interacting dimensions rather than interchangeable explanations.

The methodological consequence is significant: literary analysis can illuminate mechanisms and social meanings, but claims about contemporary populations require additional evidence. The supplied literary studies support conceptual interpretation, not universal conclusions about all women or all economic systems.

5.5 Historical Context and Theoretical Limitations

Wood (1999) emphasizes the importance of historical context in explaining capitalism. This perspective cautions against treating present-day economic arrangements as inevitable or assuming that class relations operate identically across time and place. Marx and Engels (1848) likewise situate class conflict within historical processes, suggesting that social structures can change.

Nevertheless, the framework developed in this paper has limitations. First, it does not include original empirical data, so it cannot estimate the magnitude of inequality or test causal relationships. Second, the supplied references do not cover every relevant dimension of contemporary inequality, including detailed comparative evidence on education, taxation, welfare institutions, and labor-market outcomes. Third, the literary material offers a context-specific view of social hierarchy rather than a representative account of modern economic institutions.

A further limitation concerns the potential breadth of Marxist explanation. If every social disadvantage is interpreted exclusively as a consequence of capital, the analysis may overlook institutional differences, individual circumstances, and forms of domination that require distinct explanations. The proposed framework addresses this concern by incorporating gender, cultural norms, historical variation, and human agency.

5.6 Implications for Research and Practice

The discussion yields three principal implications. For researchers, inequality should be examined through the combined analysis of income, ownership, labor relations, autonomy, and access to opportunities. For institutions, the distribution of productivity gains and the security of workers deserve attention alongside measures of aggregate economic performance. For future theoretical work, Marxist political economy can be combined with historically specific and gender-sensitive analysis without assuming that all social outcomes derive from one mechanism.

Future empirical research could test the framework through comparative case studies, household-resource analysis, workplace interviews, and longitudinal examination of employment security and wealth distribution. Such studies would need clearly defined measures and evidence suited to the particular context.

Overall, the theoretical contribution of this paper is an integrated framework that connects capital accumulation and class relations with the experiential and cultural dimensions of inequality. Its value lies in organizing research questions and clarifying possible mechanisms, rather than claiming to have demonstrated universal causal laws.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper examined class, capital, and social inequality through a Marxist conceptual framework grounded exclusively in the nine supplied references. The analysis indicates that inequality involves more than differences in income: it also concerns productive ownership, control over labor, the distribution of accumulation benefits, and unequal access to economic and social opportunities.

Marx's account of alienation highlights the human consequences of economic organization, while his analysis of capitalist production clarifies the relationship between capital

and labor. Harvey (2010) and Wood (1999) contribute perspectives on accumulation, crisis, and historical development. The literary studies by Hayat et al. (2021), Johnson (1995), Suson (2023), and Yi (2014) help extend the analysis to gender, property, marriage, and cultural expectations.

The paper's principal contribution is a conceptual model linking ownership structures, labor relations, accumulation, resource distribution, and the reproduction or transformation of inequality. The model also recognizes that institutions, historical conditions, and individual agency can modify these relationships.

Because the study is conceptual rather than empirical, its conclusions should be treated as theoretically informed interpretations, not statistically verified findings. Future research should test the proposed relationships using comparative and longitudinal evidence, with particular attention to labor-market institutions, household resources, gender relations, and the distribution of productivity gains. Such work could establish more precisely when and how Marxist analysis explains persistent inequality and where complementary approaches are necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Harvey, D. (2010). The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Hayat, U., Waheed, Q. and Iqbal, N. (2021) 'An Economy of Her Own: A Marxist Feminist Critique of Pride and Prejudice', Jahan-e-Tahqeeq, 4(1). Available at: https://jahan-e-tahqeeq.com/index.php/jahan-e-tahqeeq/article/view/283
3. Johnson, C. (1995). Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Marx, K. (1844). Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts. London: Progress Publishers.
5. Marx, K. (1867). Capital: Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 1. London: Penguin.
6. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). The Communist Manifesto. London: Penguin.
7. Suson, S.E. (2023) 'Money and Morality in Pride and Prejudice', Journeys Dartmouth. Available at: https://journeys.dartmouth.edu/serenaesuson25/money-and-morality-inpride-and-prejudice/
8. Wood, E. M. (1999). The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View. London: Verso.
9. Yi, C.C. (2014) 'Gender and Class Oppression in Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice', The Dawn Journal, 3(1), pp. 789-805. Available at: https://thedawnjournal.in/wpcontent/uploads/2014/07/2-Chung-Chin-Yi-July-2014.pdf