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Introduction

The collapse of the mid-twentieth century expansionary period of capitalism has brought a range of predictions about its qualitative change. The predictions have been underpinned by notions of fundamental qualitative change - that in effect signals a transitional period in the history of change in capitalism. The notion of qualitative change is evident in a wide range of discourses, drawn to a common theme of fragmentation, diversity and particularism. This paper is concerned with the nature of the processes which generate this diversity, its effects on the management of capitalist organisations and the legitimation of this management. The paper selectively draws on the wide range of literature in order to point to the global nature of change, which can rightly be seen as qualitative.

The paper examines the effects on the labour process, especially on the processes of management, that are at the heart of such qualitative change. In particular the 'new production' literature, is discussed. For, in contrast to previous stages of capitalist development, this perspective highlights the role of choice - particularly in management strategies, organisational configuration and industrial relations - and the need for constant innovation. Although choice may be constrained by technological and market imperatives the new production view is largely optimistic concerning the trajectory of change. Indeed the main variants of new production stress the positive role of technology and market competition in achieving an optimistic outcome in the current processes of structural change in advanced capitalist societies.

In general, writers from the labour process perspective, are much more circumspect in their assessment of changes in production which have occurred from the onset of stagflation in the mid-1970s. Although the Braverman inspired unilinear theories of deskilling and managerial control have given way to a more detailed and considered evaluation of changes, there

---

The term 'advanced society' is used as a neutral reference to developed countries with economically advanced levels of productive capacities. These societies are capitalist, but much of the post-industrial literature, either implicitly or explicitly, refers to their post-capitalist nature.
remains a considerable ambivalence about the longer term significance of restructuring. On the one hand many writers have uncovered a continuing need for labour skills, an array of managerial strategies, the indispensability of worker co-operation and so on. On the other hand, writers have pointed to deepening capitalist labour intensification, the ever-present threat of unemployment, the decline of working conditions and a range of other negative consequences of restructuring. In short, the labour process perspective has more accurately reflected the contradictory nature of social change, in contrast to the sanguine picture painted by the advocates of the new production.

One area that has attracted increasing interest in the labour process view, and been relatively neglected by new production writers, is management. What is the role of management and the effects on management as new demands flows into all areas of organisational life in advanced capitalist societies? These questions lie at the centre of the work of labour process research on management. They are important in this discussion as well. However the questions can only be addressed in detail with an understanding of the pattern of social relations and organisational structures in which management operates. Reference to variables such as market pressures, new technology, new organisational requirements, globalisation, effects of new information systems and so on need to be related to deeper adjustments in the nature of capitalist relations. These variables may well be effects of more fundamental changes in the nature of capitalism. A preliminary examination of this issue is undertaken here.

This paper argues that the substance to which managerial practice is directed - the coordination and control of the production of value (valorisation) - is undergoing a radical transition as a result of changes in the nature of value itself. Value, understood through the concept of value-form, is socially formed. It is the nexus of economic and social determinations and as such registers effects from both domains. Shifts in the content of value-form alter the pattern of social relations in which management must operate.
The view presented here is that the fragmentation and cultural diversity generated in advanced capitalism is both an effect of, and a condition for, the deepening development of capitalist social and production relations. The uncoupling of representational forms of culture from the organic conditions in which they were generated has greatly increased the availability of consumption signifiers. This is reflected in the structure and effects of the capitalist value-form. Therefore, the production of value becomes increasingly constructed as a social or interactive process, through the intervention of signification structures and practices. That is, valorisation is a process that is progressively less dependent on physical or 'natural' constraint, and correspondingly more dependent on determination of the organisational, symbolic and discursive elements of social relations.

It is a process in which the axiomatic relation of exchange- and use-value is weakened through an expanded process of value-attribution. The latter concept refers to the socially formed valuable aspects, or attributes, of particular physical commodities and, the expansion of the types of 'non-physical' commodities entering consumption markets (such as services, leisure and entertainment products, special events, experiences and so on). In both of these forms of commodification, the representation of value increasingly tends to shape consumption. In so doing, it proceeds to dissociate consumption from the corporeality of use-value in the sphere of circulation, and in so doing increases the opacity of the labour power/exchange-value relation in production. This expanded process of commodification, through value-attribution, represents an expansion of the productive capacities of capital (or an enlargement of system boundaries) as an endogeneous process of the capital relation itself. Such an expansion must be viewed in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions. At the present time it is manifested in both, the expansion of output, which is a a constant condition for the reproduction of capital, and an expansion of signification 'field' of value, through value-attribution.

In response to these deep structure processes, the capitalist production process as a whole must subsume an expanded array of labour processes to produce the required commodities.
Many constituent labour powers therefore must be seen as 'productive labour', where they may not have been in the past. For they contribute not only to the production of surplus value as as corporeal process, but to the production of the representation of value as a signification process. In other words, where Marx had assumed a 'natural' relation in the structure of commodification, between use-value and consumption, it too has become subsumed under the logic of capitalist social production. With the result that labour power deployed in these industries becomes subject to the same form of capitalist exploitation as corporeal production. Thus, paradoxically, fragmentation and diversity expands the sphere of (capitalist) value production (through the expansion of the forms of commodities) while simultaneously undermining the value form on which it is based (that is, stable and calculable exchange-value grounded in use-value).

Some effects of these processes in regard to management will be consider in this paper. The absorption of more labour processes into the valorisation process multiplies coordination and control problems for management. In addition the difficulties inherent in assessing productive contributions of non-managerial and managerial labour have multiplied. Downsizing, contracting, organisational chains, networks and similar reactions have been the result. In other words, the 'elasticity' of organisational forms has grown resulting in altered pressures on intra- and inter-managerial relations.

These pressures create a management dilemma. Expanded value attribution requires more 'flexible' and productive operational contexts, and the the development of a framework of legitimation to accomplish this. Both of these threaten the position of many individual managers and the collective position of management. For management (and similar labour powers of 'conception') become increasingly ensnared by the contradictory demands of its role of capitalist control (of the production of surplus value by others) and value production (as an aspect of its own labour power). As a result it is, on the one hand, subject to same process of capitalist rationalisation as all productive labour, yet on the other, must simultaneously attempt to maintain its own appropriation of surplus value. Moreover it must
elaborate a framework of legitimation for those very processes which undermine its own position. In this sense management is indeed an internally contradictory social function (Wright 1980).

The additional decision-making and operational demands associated with expanded value attribution increase indeterminacy in managerial work. For example it undermines a simple quantitative notion of productivity. Traditional measures such as cost reduction, production continuity and output growth and the like are rendered less effective when marketability requires difference, novelty, position, timing, or other 'valuable' attributes. In short, the existing routine functions of management become more demanding, and must be supplemented by the demands of value-attribution. This lies behind many of the current accusations of poor quality of management in many advanced countries.

The altered conditions of the organisational basis of capitalist production has effects on the pattern of managerial employment and career development. Restructuring has seen much of management become subject to rationalisation, work intensification and degradation. Moreover, recent trends signal a decline in the organisational basis of managerial career achievement. Managerial careers based on the long-term accumulation of performance credits which are attached to relatively stable organisations with concomitant organisational 'memories', give way to a more fluid environment. Moreover, the distribution of managerial rewards increasingly becomes subject to discursively formed social regulative or normative rules as a political process. This occurs for two primary reasons. First, the implied basis of 'objective' measurement of any given contribution to value-attribution becomes progressively more indeterminate. Managerial careers will therefore be more dependent on recent output performance however categorized and measured; and thereby devaluing non-recent or long-term accumulation of achievement. Yet the effects of value-attribution render output more volatile. This results in a substantial rise in managerial turnover. The 'politicisation' of management is further amplified by a second reason, a rising organisational elasticity or rate of life-cycle change. Both market conditions and corporate strategy generate an increase in
turnover of organisational entities. Therefore managerial careers rely less on organisation-based orderly career development and more on organisational moves, punctuated by market assessments of levels of competence and remuneration. In other words, job-hopping. Both reasons accelerate the displacement of long-term achievement in favour of short-term performance measures in the progress of managerial careers.

In response to the dilemma of flexibility and legitimation undermining the collective position of management, organisational and managerial practice has served to generate a greater emphasis on the performance principle as a framework of legitimation of organisational and social distribution of remuneration and social rewards. The latter have been rising for senior management in relative and real terms in virtually all advanced capitalist countries as over the last decade. Indeed, a reconstructed performance principle underpins a dual process; the legitimation of the expanded subsumption of labour processes in production, and the precipitation of innovation and improvement required of existing labour process and labour powers. In short, it can serve to legitimate capitalist rationalisation in existing labour process and in the ranks of management.

Yet paradoxically in practice the performance principle has the capacity to provide the basis for resistance to rationalisation. For if the relative weight of the components of performance evaluation shifts to output(s), then demands for autonomy in operational methods to attain the defined output(s) may legitimately increase. This will hold true for labour processes based on conception and execution. In other words, the reciprocal expectations in a framework of legitimation dependent upon output judgments must be operational or transformational autonomy - even in a context of input constraints (although there are clearly limits in the case of the latter). For, in the context of given inputs, output variation can only be a function of performance in operations. Yet the definition and categorisation of output, not to mention measurement, is increasingly indeterminate. In other words, as the pressures of value-attribution mount, organisational effectiveness rivals efficiency as a management challenge. These concerns, combined with the career configuration mentioned earlier, lead to claims for
operational autonomy and decisional discretion by management - either in the form of agency independence or de facto professional standing. In short, the contradictory demands of capitalist transformation are mediated in management in pressures for rationalisation and demands for professional license.

Section 1 of the paper examines the salient pressures towards fragmentation in postmodernity. It is from this perspective that the social conditions of value-form can be identified. Section 2 specifically addresses the social constitution of value-form. In particular, it argues that the role of signification in advanced societies has assumed a greater role than has hitherto been the case. In doing so, it shapes use-value and therefore accords consumption greater effects on production. Section 3 examines the structure and work of management in the context of the rise of the achievement principle. It is argued that organisational configuration of capital an important determinant in the origin and development of managerial functions. In particular, the flows of exchange value often rival the production of surplus value in periods of capitalist reconstruction. It is within this context that the form of legitimation for managerial functions gains cogency. Section 4 is concerned with salient points in the current period of restructuring in light of the discussion in sections one and two. Specifically it is concerned with the dimensions of the reconstruction of the basis of legitimation in new production systems - that is, the role of the performance principle. Section 5 is the conclusion.

Section 1  Fragmentation and Diversity - Theoretical Developments

Many of the themes of post-industrialism, or new production, and the cultural fragmentation in advanced societies developed in the expansionary period of capitalism. They have found fertile ground in the recent decade of crisis. Post-industrial theory, which first gained currency in the 1960s (eg Faunce 1968; Touraine 1969; Dahrendorf 1959), proved to be highly resistant to criticisms voiced in the 1970s. Indeed the notion developed into the
intellectual force which underpinned many debates of the 1980s. The continuing interest in post-industrialism was partially sustained by the synchronic development of post-structuralist social theory. The interest in theories of culture and social movements provided the basis for the recasting of social theory. The intellectual demise of the objectivism and functionalist structuralism followed. Class theory, early labour process theory and historical materialism in general, all lost ground. For the refusal to see structure and change in the terms of a specifically capitalist dynamic proved attractive, and was consistent with the sustained critique of functionalism and historicism in social theory.

These theoretical developments provide an important basis for the understanding of the shifts in value. This section draws out the main features of these developments to provide a context for the consideration of value-form in section two.

Rejection of the Concepts of Society and Socialisation

In reference to the structure of 'modern society' post-industrialism in its many forms claimed the demise of capitalism. In reference to agency, theories of social movements and post-modernity dismissed the exaggerated claims of class theory, and indeed the efficacy of any unified rationalist epistemology. In short, the effect on industrial sociology was registered a marked shift in intellectual focus away from economistic and structuralist concerns to localism and theoretical relativism or eclecticism (what Lyotard has referred to as "institutions in patches - local determinism" and the "incredulity towards metanarratives" 1984:xxiv). This has been reflected in the conceptions of management in the sociological and managerial literature over the same period. A closer examination of these theoretical shifts throws considerable light on the nature of the modifications in value in advanced capitalism.

The proposition of qualitative social change, involves the rejection of the universalistic motif (the 'metanarrative') of the Enlightenment project. The consequences are crucial. The premise of universal Reason, conceived as a form of instrumental rationality, has came has
come under increasing pressure. In this form Reason underpinned the practice of science was the foundation of 'rational' social action; best illustrated in Weber's conceptualisation of the rationalisation of social action. It is the basis of modernity.

The claim to universal validity, in whatever sphere (as rationalist truth, moral rightness or aesthetic beauty, see Habermas, 1987) has been rendered untenable by post-modernity. For the very foundation of the rationalist conception of the social, as an object amenable to universal reason, is questioned by the recognition of the incommensurability of the social. So, even in sociological discourse, where the 'scientificity' of the discipline has focused on the nature of social, and of its 'knowability', severe shock waves have been felt. For post-modernity questions the existence of the social. It thus questions the categorical imperative of the social. It is precisely at this point that the possibilities of a universalistic rationality meets its limits. Modernity was premised on the 'discovery' of the social, and the subsequent theoretical and practical exploration of, and intervention in, the social as a conditioned domain. That is, a domain considered as a naturalistic object of causality. Postmodernity announces the death of the social (Kroker and Cook 1986; Smart 1990) - and as such signals its rejection as a naturalistic object. With this flows the rejection of any notion of causality in any conventional sense (see Foucault, 1980, 179). Ironically, although this view was taken by post-structuralist theorists, it also underpinned much conservative ideology - for example Thatcher's denial of the existence of a 'British society' (there existed only a collection of individuals) which is consistent the libertarianism informing British policy (see Wedderburn 1989). The key point is that the identification of a unified foundation of sociality was open to dispute. And therefore any professed existence of such a foundation could only be considered arbitrary.

---

2 The nature of the social (conceptualised in a continuum of the theories from radical nominalism to positivism) is here irrelevant. The point is that the availability of the social as an object of discourse in which the charting of effects was possible (again the theoretical constitution of those effects - whether the result of nomothetic 'laws' or not is not here at issue) was constructed in the processes of the Enlightenment, see for example Z. Bauman (1987).
So, for example, Marx and Marxists, were charged with a 'productivism', which relied on a privileged concept of labour (Cutler 1978). Simple conceptions of the foundation and efficacy of the labour process suffered similar theoretical attacks.

Logically then, the rejection of any social imperative undermines any causal effects that may be said to flow from the social. One critical result is the complete rejection of a categorical sociality of the subject. The 'immediacy', or naturalness, of the social identity of the subject is thereby broken. For post-modernity the constitution and representation of the subject are problematic (Foucault, 1982,1980). Indeed, identity becomes a signification process. Therefore, the socialised conception of individualism can no longer be simply read off from an identifiable and relatively stable set of structural characteristics. Given this the radical atomistic individualism of libertarianism becomes incoherent. Hence identity formation and representation display an extraordinary level of indeterminacy and instability; even assuming a structural logic or social/class location. This assumption is also challenged by post-modernity.

In summary, developments in social theory undermined the naturalistic conception of society, the 'conventional' understanding of the ideology of conservative individualism and the notion of 'socialized' humanness of sociology and psychology. The implications of these ideas on managerial views of consumption and the consumer have had increasing impact, and will be discussed later in the paper.

**Rejection of 'Objective' Collective Action**

In a similar manner, at the societal level, the larger macro-economic and practical issues of advanced capital cannot be subject to prescriptive analysis based on instrumental rationality. Therefore, theories and remedies offered by both orthodox and 'alternative' or radical theoretical systems which claim universal validity, must be rejected. The demise of the
social implies that all theoretical systems must necessarily fall represent only partial views and be based on particularistic and even fragmentary modes of calculation.

From this position, the intractable problems of advanced capitalism (e.g. stagflation, unemployment, ungovernability, low growth and productivity and so on) and international problems (the collapse of existing state socialism and the cold war) merely provide proof of the existence, and inescapability, of the scope of the qualitative/transitional change posited. One key characteristic of this is that reactions to these issues often cross (modernist) classifications of right-left, conservative-progressive orthodox-radical, and so on. This means that any potential unity of social collectivities, especially class, is seen as theoretically problematic, much less attainable in practice. In other words, any putative class unity on political, economic, moral or social issues is no longer a tenable objective or practical possibility. This collapse of the possibility of unified class action based on objective position implies that where collective social divisions do exist, they are based on different conditions. In particular the existence of multiple collectivities. In other words, each collective action achieved (and the issue, or issues on which it is based) is the result of mutual contestation with other actions and position taken by other groups. Moreover the achievement of action is based on a number of grounds of support, overlapping creating social movement. Action is a constant reconstruction of multiple collectivities. Collective action is thus in a constant dialectic of identity and representation, of voice and articulation.

This has lead to the decline of class as a salient category in critical discourse. For the collapse of the social has meant the fragmentation of the possibilities of collective action premised on any structurally generated set of conditions. This has two aspects. First, class as a structural formation of oppositional interests has come under attack from a variety of theoretical perspectives (Cohen 1978, Gorz and Cohen 1982). Second, collective action is conceived of as an aggregation of individual and organisationally conditioned achievements.
Therefore the working class and its interests, responses and actions, are not seen as a priori categories. The notion of collective class interests as an objective structural condition has been undermined (Bertilsson and Eyerman 1979). Indeed class formation and the macro effects of social power are often rejected in favour of the analysis of the conditions of interest formation (Benton 1981; Hindess 1986). The resultant collective action however does not command sufficient theoretical, much less political, weight to rise above competing social movements.

From this perspective then, it is perhaps not surprising that social movements theory gained more prominence than class theory in charting collective action over the last two decades or so (eg. Touraine 1981; Jennett and Stewart 1989). For collective action ceased to be structurally generated, that is determined by an objective social location, but was based on the organisational capacities generated through a subjectively defined process of interest formation and articulation. Of course, such action, may be in response to social (or even structural) pressures, but the alleged existence of these is conceptualised as a discursive element in organisational achievements (Hindess 1986).

**Implications**

These theoretical developments attacked three central themes of western social science. These are a unified rationalist knowledge, a capitalist societal structure, and the possibilities of structurally generated collective change. They are also themes in the critical literature which are the foundation of the theorisation of the possibilities of radical transformational change of capitalism particularly the numerous strands of Marxism. The effect of these developments in social theory was to announce qualitative change while simultaneously - denying any universalistic claim to its explanation, shaping or outcome.

It is not claimed here that there has been a direct association between the literature on production and postmodernist theory. Yet there is evidence for such a proposition (see
Mathews 1989). What is of concern here is the influence these theoretical developments have had.

The significance of the broad notion of post-industrialism is two-fold. First, its denial of a structural logic - specifically a capitalist logic. Second, the shift in focus of conventional social analysis to knowledge - its structure, dissemination, technology, use and effects. The influence on futurology has been considerable. And in particular for the argument here, the role of knowledge in production. The key issue was the denial of a structural logic of capital. For once this was done, and replaced by a generic logic of technological change, then the basis on which system contradiction operated could disappear, as was the case of much post-structuralist theory; be rendered inoperable (Frankel 1987; Gorz 1982); could be subject to alternative logics (eg Foucault 1979, 1980) or be constructed in a manner consistent with a political calculation or the imputed needs of the system. The latter was usually centred around the dictates of technology in one way or another (Zuboff 1988; Piore and Sabel 1984). The optimistic senarios of futurology was a consequence. Class as an economic category of production and distribution is denied any theoretical space in these systems.

The second significant aspect is the focus on knowledge. The role of knowledge in production was complemented by a focus on knowledge, power and organisation in social theory. This included writers within the framework of historical materialism or sympathetic to it. Knowledge, and the language games in which it was constituted and circulated, displayed a variability, adaptability and indeterminacy which paralleled the growing sense of fragmentation and fluidity in social world. Moreover the analysis of cultural/organisational forms as effects of discursive, organisational, knowledge and other practices, appeared to offer a more 'realistic' direction in the analysis of the deployment of social forces in post-modernity (Morgan 1986). Again, the shift in focus diminished the saliency of class. The collapse of 'second - order' theoretical legitimation in social theory, characteristic of post-modernity is merely an extension of the analysis (Margolis 1989).
However, it is precisely these themes which have altered the types of change possible in social and production relations. But this is not to say that change will be necessarily positive in the way that the theoretical, organisational and social 'space' opened in many current debates imply. Fragmentation may provide possibilities for 'progressive' qualitative change but nothing is guaranteed. The next section will be concerned with the question of the changes in the content of value in capitalism.

Section 2  Society and Value-Form Content

From the labour process perspective, value in capitalism has been understood to be exchange-value which takes on a specific concrete physical or corporeal existence. Capitalist employers appropriate surplus value (that is, the concrete effects of the labour power of direct workers in the form of commodities) in the labour/valorisation process. Once this view of value is discarded in favour of a relational theory of value then the fragmentation and flexibility of advanced capitalism can be seen as a process of contradictory change in which diversity is both a result of, and condition for, change. Indeed, the fragmentation of symbolic forms in the structure of signification provide an expanded resource for deepening of the capital relation. As a result of these considerations central aspects of labour process theory need to be re-assessed in order to understand current changes in capitalism and the changing role of management.

This section will elaborate the view outline in the previous paragraph in order to place the course of the current phase of restructuring in capitalism in context. The first part considers the nature of the relation between labour power and exchange-value. The second part considers the changes in the nature of labour and exchange-value.
Labour power and Exchange-value

Capitalism as a commodity producing society requires a separation of production units. Moreover, since value distribution is centred in production, those expending labour are separated from the legal ownership and practical command of the means of production. Although the latter conditions may take different forms (as in merchant capitalism) for all intents and purposes they remain in force. The effects of the labour of individuals, or groups, working independently of each other are exchanged in the market (Marx 1954:77). Value, represented through the process of exchange as exchange-value, is the embodiment of the direct labour-powers of living labour and that proportion of embodied labour transferred to the product from the means of production in the labour process. The net value difference between labour power inputs and value realised in exchange reflects surplus value. The wage paid for labour inputs does not account for the surplus-value component; this is the technical definition of exploitation for Marx.

However, the theoretical argument expressed here is in value terms. As such it is not the basis of the economic calculation carried out by any capitalist. For the latter surplus value is represented through price calculations; profit as the excess of revenues over costs. That is, the market price of commodities must exceed their production costs. The key point of course is that the commodity itself is merely the vehicle of the transfer of value, through a set of price calculations, in the valorization of capital. Commodities signify value as a double relation; as a referential relation to its imputed practical utility or use-value; and as a distributional relation according to imputed contribution to its production. Social production is only possible once the ground rules for its recognition are formed. Therefore, valorization must subordinate the production process in order to ensure the reproduction of capitalism.

A simple view of the process of appropriation of surplus value sees a direct transfer of specific quanta of individual labour powers to individual commodities. Such a view, in the circumstances of a rising organic composition of capital or capital/labour ratio, inevitably
encounters the empirical problem of the calculation of labour inputs. As machinery absorbs more physical functions the measurement of quantities of industrial labour effort input in each commodity becomes meaningless. Advanced technology renders skilled labour a remnant of past modes of production. From this perspective the value of the individual quality of labour efforts, in terms of knowledge; manual competencies and the like, become submerged by the assessment of labour in terms of its intensity or quantity. That is, the focus on labour has been far too narrow, which is largely the result of Marx's use of the notion of simple labour power.

Bearing this in mind, the first wave of labour process studies, were concerned to empirically identify variations in labour intensity as a function of capitalist control. This was based on a narrow view of relative surplus value. The latter was closely associated with the introduction of machinery and so deskillng and general labour intensification which resulted. The general argument asserts that capitalists strive to expand their practical control over the labour process, on the basis of their legal ownership. Taylorism, greatly advanced the technical efficacy of control while simultaneously creating a new economic and social category - management. The latter quickly enlisted the ideology of technical rationality to advance its claims on social rewards (Urry, 1985). In response the deskillng pattern is repeated in the case of managerial labour as an intra-managerial process. But in concentrating on identifying and elaborating the empirical patterns of managerial control the perspective lost sight of the theoretical object of that control - viz., value production, realisation and appropriation - and its internal changes. Therefore a more sagacious view of the process of the production and appropriation of surplus value is required. Ironically, this general argument is most clearly articulated Braverman (1974) who based his work on an attempt to re-evaluate Marx in light of contemporary changes (Baran and Sweezy 1966).

An expanded view of the labour process, as a valorisation process, circumvents many problems thrown up by the focus on empirically generated issues. The expanded view assumes that the class of suppliers of labour power impart value through a collective process
to the aggregate of commodities. In this process the class of owners and agents appropriate surplus value. The aggregate of the production of surplus value (from which profit is derived) is then distributed to individual capitals, and agents, through mechanisms internal to the organisation of fractions and agents of capital - many of which are not directly engaged in the direct production of physical commodities at all. Fractions and agents of capital, whether in command of labour processes of productive labour or not, may be concerned at the empirical organisation and conduct of labour processes, given their concerns with the flow of value to them and others. Yet the nature of their concerns and types of strategies may differ markedly; in large part a function of their position in the flow of value. Moreover, fractions and agents of capital may be concerned with the inter-organizational relations of the institutional structure of capital. For these essentially contested or negotiated relations, mediate the general organization of the production and relative flows of value.

From this perspective, the diversity of the type, scope and nature of concerns about the labour process and management can seen and be opened to theoretical and empirical analysis. For it may be the case that particular fractions may be more concerned with intra-capitalist relations than securing more value from the labour process as such. An expanded view provides the theoretical space for a consideration of the dynamics of the organisation of interlinkages of fractions of capital and the differentiation of the role of management in the command of production. On the one hand, many inter-institutional mechanisms limit efficiency audits. Particular product market structure, industry characteristics, dynamics of technological change, labour market behaviour and state regulation, may each, or in combination, serve to insulate an organisation, or groups from pressures for efficiency. Institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983), bounded efficiency (Zucker 1986:66-67) and similar processes can amplify this effect, by focusing on flows of surplus value, rather than its production. In all these cases efficiency is to varying degrees limited. On the other hand, the search for profit lead to the continuous reconfiguration of inter-organizational linkages. Thus, the 'visibility' of the firm performance rises. In which case they fall under more intensive
pressure for higher levels of efficiency. Furthermore, if the destabilising role of effectiveness is added measures of 'strategic' performance become more disciplined.

For management the ebb and flow of the conflicting pressures is reflected in the constant changes in "constellations of interest" which were found anchored to any given firm, or group of firms (Scott 1986, 1990). The differentiation of role of the corporate elites corresponds to the inter-organizational characteristics of particular capitals. Within the firm, the basis of the dominant coalition (Child 1972) of management becomes more indeterminate - that is, open to a wider range of strategic and political contests. This is partly the result of the rising indeterminancy attendant with the lack of effective measures of effectiveness. As a result, technical decision rules concerning management contribution to value, or even to appropriating value, are largely absent. One response by firms is to seek to externalize internal decision uncertainty by 'marketizing' them. It is not transaction costs (Williamson 1985) that generates externalisation but decisional veracity. That is, the formation of profit centres, business units, use of managerial consultants, business services, enterprises, and so on become separate units open to 'global' assessment. Thus the practical field of the 'productive' relations (or 'productive labour') within capital expands in concert with the functional differentiation of capital. This view of course retains the assumption that capitalism may be defined as a system based on the private appropriation of surplus value. The dominant rationality of production remains the increase in the wealth of private owners.

Overall, this approach removes the necessity for the direct attribution of individual values to specific commodities. Moreover, it removes the unmediated relation between the concrete labour process(es) and the formulation of particular types of strategies pursued by fractions and agents of capital. Yet, it establishes the conditions for monitoring any and all production processes in the service of the rate of production of surplus value.

To summarise, it has been argued that the capitalist value-form, exchange value, represented in the commodity is the embodiment of human labour. However the empirical content of
specific amounts of labour in particular commodities cannot be the appropriate conceptualisation of exchange value nor valorization in the labour process. Rather the labour process is the empirical expression of the collective embodiment of labour in the aggregate of all commodities under the capitalist relations. From this perspective the production of values is an effect of capitalist relations where particular labour processes operate to secure an appropriate flow of labour effects. Moreover the distribution of values is not directly tied to any given labour process, but is subject to the dynamics of the relations between fractions of capital. The organisational differentiation of capital (production, finance, business services, its intermediary functions or specialisations and so on) is in this view as much the effect of internal relations between capitals and as to the level of technology, the resistance of labour or other empirical conditions identified in the labour process literature.

So far it has been assumed that the exchange-value of commodities, take a physical form. Physical commodities are corporeal or material 'proof' of exchange-value. This assumption has become increasingly problematic as the deepening effects of real subsumption of production under capital are realised. In the labour process literature real subsumption is interpreted as the relation between capitalist authority structures, that is managerial control, and the production of surplus value. In Burawoy's (eg 1979;1985) terms, the (material) securing and (ideological) obscuring of the production and appropriation of surplus value are central to the 'factory regime' - that is the structuring of the labour process. But the dynamics of advanced capitalism deepen capitalist social relations well beyond the labour process which in turn affect relations in production. The nature of commodification and consumption, that is, the nature of exchange-value and its relation to use-value, have not only transformed the demands on labour powers in production, but also the types of labour powers use in production. The following section considers these changes.
Instrumental labour, Value and Consumption

Several attempts at the reconstruction of historical materialism, have revolved around the concepts of labour and value. It has been argued that; the problematic on which the critique of political economy is based merely reflects the productionist metaphor of orthodox political economy (Baudrillard 1981; 1975); the labour theory of value has been rendered untenable by the absorption of scientific knowledge into the productive forces (Habermas 1971); that the ends of power cannot be reduced to the economic (Foucault 1980; 1984); that labour is no longer unified by a single rationality (Offe 1985) and that the movements in social theory have precipitated a crisis in historical materialism (Aronowitz 1981). In effect these approaches have attempted to understand the shifting content of the capitalist value-form. This shift lies at the core of restructuring and not the technological, market or control imperatives of capital. The 'atter are effects of the former.

Of particular concern here are two aspects of these arguments that pertain to the social generation and representation of value and labour. For it is the relation between social value and human activity that is the central relation in the critique of capital. It is here that capitalist rationality penetrates deeper into social relations and in so doing reacts back into the sphere of production. The views of two influential writers, Jean Baudrillard and Jurgen Habermas will be briefly considered. For, although they adopt different perspectives, their work points to key aspects of the nature of change in advanced societies.

Firstly, Baudrillard questions the adequacy of the concept of value in political economy for the critique of capitalism. In his view historical materialism takes on the same assumptions as the object of its criticism, classical political economy. Therefore it cannot subject this key concept to critical analysis. In other words, its signification of value falls victim to the same principle, or 'code' of representation as classical theory. This is the domination of the sign. Baudrillard's analysis of the signification of value in general, and the role of sign in
particular, opens an important area of analysis which has effects beyond a narrow consideration of the market. What is the basis of Baudrillard's criticisms?

First, political economy, and so Marxism, is based on the conceptualisation of use-value and labour power as independent of capitalism. In other words, they lay outside, or are external to a system of production dominated by exchange-value (or in Baudrillard's terms the "play of exchange values"). To be sure, Marx recognised that exchange values are 'grounded' in commodity fetishism, and that commodities take a physical form. In Marx's (1954:76) terms a "commodity appears,... in reality, a very queer thing, abounding in metaphysical subtleties and theological niceties." Nevertheless, use-value is still seen as external to the metaphysical subtleties, in that although exchange-value may dominate the system of production and even formation of desires behind its consumption, it does not penetrate the material or actual consumption of use-values. That is, the way in which people experience consumption, as distinct from their prior conceptualisation of the act of consumption. In short, use-value, in Marx, is a 'natural' or realist category. Consumption is dominated by an internal relation between sensory mechanisms and the object of consumption. And although needs are seen primarily as socio-historic, and therefore necessarily conditioned in their empirical form and extent by historical social relations of production, they are ultimately limited only to this role. For, in Baudrillard's view, the concept of needs is hermetically sealed to labour in an essentially anthropological conceptualisation of the process of expansion in the productive capacities of human societies. Put in another way; need is posited as an universal category and a necessary condition for any social production (see also Heller 1976:23-39).

In contrast, for Baudrillard the totalizing effects of the representation of value meant that exchange-value lay in an internal relation with use-value. Consequently, the methods, experience and modalities of consumption are direct effects of the 'code of production'. In which case the representational form of the commodity becomes an integral component in the composition of exchange-value which any commodity takes do the market. For this to occur,
representational form must shape not only the the impulse for consumption, both extrinsically and intrinsically, but the mechanisms for the experience and evaluation of the act(s) of consumption. The implication is that exchange-value is, in part, subject to the act(s) of consumption which is thereby transformed into a signification process. Moreover signification must be immanent in the constitution of the subject, as a social category. The subjective experience of the act(s) of consumption is formed as an internal relation of the capitalist value-form itself. Under capitalism, the corporeality of the commodity initially acts as a signifier of its effects (the signified). This relation is later supplemented by the signification of its consumption, where the latter acts as a signifier of its effects (now as exchange-value). Use-value is thereby rendered invisible, or more accurately is absorbed like heat into black paper, into the "play of exchange values". In other words, consumption increasingly becomes oriented to its social effects, rather than to practical utility. We shall return to this argument below.

The result of this analysis is that the conventional notion of want satisfaction and Marx's concept of use-value are incapable of conceptualizing the nature of the production - consumption relation. Where the conventional economic concept of utility specifically excludes the nature of satisfaction from its concerns, historical materialism substitutes an elaboration of types of needs (Heller 1976) in which some notion of the social distortion of 'real' needs is required. But this anthropological conception of need is largely irrelevant once a realist use-value is discarded. More startling perhaps is that need becomes a derivative of the code of production. Thus any transition to 'associational production' and society will have to deal with a more complex than hitherto anticipated.

Yet it is precisely the nature of consumption which is important for the argument here. There are two primary reasons for this. The first is the effect of consumption on production and, second is the effect(s) on the consumption of labour power. These two issues will be referred to throughout the remainder of the paper, but the second requires some clarification.
This is because much of the post-industrial literature rejects the role of labour in changes which it seeks to analyse. Indeed, Baudrillard is also an example. Labour in his view, is of little concern and should no longer be a central concept in the critical analysis of advanced societies. For labour only became the dominant element in production precisely because it was assigned this role by the domination of exchange-value (Baudrillard 1975:28-30). And in doing so, labour substituted itself for "all other forms of wealth and exchange" (Baudrillard 1975:28-30). Labour and production were presented, or in his terms, "produced and projected", as "a generic dimension" of capital which was a self-generating process in the development of exchange-value itself. As the dominant signification of nineteenth century political economy it was adopted by critical discourse and classical theory. From this perspective Marx was trapped by the prior mode of linguistic signification characteristic of the nineteenth century. Thus the efficacy of the critique of political economy is limited, particularly in the late 20th century. In short, Marx did not, or could not, integrate use-value (as a mode of consumption of all commodities) into the critique of political economy.

This is presumably the result of the capital's early incapacity to significantly alter the pattern of consumption of labour or the realism of use-value. In other words, both acted as a fetter on the domination of the rationality of exchange-value. In doing so it was elevated to a place in the theoretical system of historical system which has subsequently proved to be merely transitory. As for the present day, labour is little more than only one of a myriad of instruments which form a web of domination around the individual. It operates as a sign determined by the code production.

The second writer considered here, Jurgen Habermas, rejects the importance of what he terms instrumental labour - that is, labour guided by technical rules and directed at production - in the analysis of advanced societies. In early or liberal capitalism, the institutional separation of the economy and the state saw the critique of capitalism taking the form of political economy. For at that time it was possible to identify the fiction of the exchange of
equivalents (which was an adaption of the norm of reciprocity) and so unmask the ideological basis of capitalist society. This is precisely what Marx did.

The economy and polity each express different rationalities - instrumental action in the economy and the "logic of interaction" by the state. But advanced capitalism has seen two key changes, first, state intervention and second the role of scientific rationality in society and production. State intervention stabilises the system but in so doing repoliticises the institutional structure of society. That is, politics penetrates all recesses of the social fabric and thereby undermines the base/superstructure metaphor essential to the Marxist critique of political economy. The spread of scientific rationality leads to the overthrow of tradition-based legitimation in favour of rationalised natural law. The latter is the ideological mask of science and technology. In Habermas' terms, legitimation dependent upon "the logic of interaction contexts", based on "the grammar of systematically distorted communication ... with the fateful causality of dissociated symbols and suppressed motives", gives way to "the rationality of language games, associated with communicative action" (Habermas 1971). Put simply, traditionalism gave way to rationalism (modernity). In this transition science is pressed into the service of capital as a direct productive force. Critically, science is an independent source of surplus value. In other words, rationalised technical knowledge generates social value, although we are not told precisely how this occurs. A critical effect is that the labour-power of immediate producers contributes even less to the production of surplus-value. In short, science and technology assumes multiple roles in advanced capitalism; as ideology, through a rational form of state legitimation and as a productive force of increasing magnitude.

At the practical level, the conversion of the localized norm of reciprocity to a generalized principle of equivalence in economic exchange in liberal capitalism, proved difficult to sustain. The implicit equivalence of the employment contract continually succumbs to economic pressures of production (e.g. greater scale, growth of new industries, types of competencies needed, labour mobility and so on). This continually weakens the ability of
localized tradition-bound normative conventions to survive, much less maintain behavioural effects on workers. When such norms do survive and adapt, they often have greater benefits for capitalists than is often recognized. Workers failed to learn the rules of the game as Hobsbawm (1961) put it. When, near the end of the nineteenth century, workers did gain some appreciation of the rules, they were faced with an ideological shift away from the principle of equivalence to the principle of achievement in work and society. Here again, the state stabilised the system by erecting a welfare system to compensate for market failures.

The importance of the operation, and contradictions, of the achievement principle will be addressed below.

Although Baudrillard and Habermas now stand in opposition to each other the target of their criticisms of historical materialism coincide - the inability of political economy to adequately analyse changes in advanced societies - in particular the problems of the representation of value and role of instrumental labour. And although the theoretical space opened by each writer demonstrate an essential opposition, they point to key points. They will now be considered in more detail.

Baudrillard argues that the structure of use-value is internal to exchange-value and merely sited in the (false) referent of the subject. This opens up to analysis the social construction of modes of consumption. He rejects any focus on the social shaping of subjective wants or satisfaction. It is the nature of the semiotic relation between the commodity-object and consumption which interests him. Consumption becomes increasingly mediated by the demands of exchange and thus becomes separated from the subject. From this perspective, then, a critique of capital grounded in (a subject based) instrumental labour and production, is locked out of an analysis of the "code of production" of advanced capitalism and so again is rejected. The 'code' refers to the processes in which signification posits certain types of commodity representation, or "orders of simulation" in his terms (Baudrillard 1988:135ff). These intervene in the relation between the object as commodity and the consumption of use-
values in various historical periods. In the present period, the 'code of production', stamps objects as consumable entities with certain origins and destinations, which are mediated by what may be called 'transformation rules'. The self-evident, private nature of consumption (of use-values) masks the complexity of its conditions of presentation. From this, production is seen as only one order of representation corresponding to a value-form; one that was dominant in the industrial era but has since passed. As noted earlier, consumption as a self-evident, or natural category ceases to exist.

In fact, in advanced societies, consumption structures social action and collective identity and not the relations of production. For consumer products operate as signs, indeed signals and emit multiple meanings, which are only intelligible as a relational code of classification. Signals are no longer primarily referenced to individual objects - and therefore are unlike symbolic orders dominant in pre-modern societies or the signs of industrialism. Signals operate as a network of interrelated signifiers that valorise the object-sign through the play of difference, or in his terms, "the modulation of differences" (Baudrillard 1988:139). Nevertheless, the referent (physical object), cannot be entirely eliminated as it provides the system (of signifiers) "with a reality guarantee" (Baudrillard 1988:94).

Thus, in his view, the classical theory of value, linked to reality through physical commodities, is displaced by the a fragmented structure of floating signs in which value is subject to the determination of the code of production. Consumption thus becomes a vicarious practice constantly swamped by the emission of many more signals, constantly subjected to an accelerating rate of decay. The actual experience of consumption is less related do its use per se and more to its relation to other commodities. The result is the search for ever-more signs which pushes the system into, what Baudrillard terms, hyper-reality (Baudrillard 1988:143ff). He writes,

'In this revolution, the two aspects of value [relational and functional], which sometimes used to be thought of as coherent and eternally linked, as if by natural law, are disarticulated;
referential value is nullified, giving the advantage to the structural play of value' (Baudrillard 1988:125 emphasis in the original)

In other words, the classical theory of value (i.e., referential or functional value), tied to the performance of the physical characteristics of the commodity gives way to a new structural (or relational) theory of value. Baudrillard sees no short circuit in this trajectory. Indeed argues that the "similacra" has already gained an autonomy which is largely impenetrable. With no past or future, and only a fleeting present, in what Jameson (1984) terms the 'present with no depth' advanced societies are facing a bleak future. In rejecting historical materialism Baudrillard has advanced a pessimistic nihilism.

Yet, this view is too hasty. For, in rejecting any role for referential value, Baudrillard provides no theoretical basis for the "reality guarantee" of the referent which has been referred to above. This problem may be overcome by viewing referential and structural value as a relation of domination/subordination. In neglecting the determinants of use-value, both classical political economy and Marxism overlooked the effects of symbolic and normative conditions. In short, the code of production. Where the symbolic dimension has been opened to analysis it has been limited. For example Hirsch (1978) saw the pursuit of "positional goods" as ultimately limited by its own internal contradictions. Baudrillard has gone one step further in arguing that the "supply" of difference is limitless. The penetration of the code of production into the very structure of satisfaction, creates the actual 'utility' of use-value.

Two important effects flow from this. First, the expansion of free-floating signals breaks any universal definition of meaning - a process referred to as "the implosion of meaning". Second, a point not made by Baudrillard, is that the subordination of any symbolic relation of commodities to consumption through the functioning of signals, expands the possible types of contribution to the production of value. That is, since objects can have an almost infinite
range of meanings, then their 'value' can be expanded by a matching array of attributes, which can be inscribed in the object at any stage in the process of production and circulation.

Here we find a novel reconceptualisation of the formation of value in post-modernity, through the play of difference as a domain of socially-constituted signs. Structural (relational) value is conceptualised as a floating, episodic and ephemeral value which sees its classic 'consumption' in its aesthetic form - in essence detached from the irrelevant baggage of the necessity of corporeal existence. For Baudrillard the commodity or referential law of value has been replaced by the structural law of value. The rising decay rate, rapid turnover and constant reproduction (through the simulacra) creates a value-form which is essentially ephemeral (as the term "hyper-reality" conveys). From this point of view the ideal commodity is one devoid of any physical form. While this is impossible, the expansion of certain types of commoditie; such as services, leisure, tourism, finance and so on, are those that are characterised by rapid rates of 'decay'.

The result of these considerations is that advanced societies are not, nor can they be driven by some imputed productionist logic of labour. Rather they are driven by the 'logic of simulation'. In other words, post-modern society is driven by a consumption ethic. Here value-attribution takes on a wider set of economic inputs which flow from 'difference'. Some writers argue that difference is indeed an ontological property of the social. Society as a naturalistic phenomenon, can only be identified through the effects of the continual and infinite discursive constitution - the "play of difference" of meaning is the social (Laclau 1980:24).

Baudrillard's analysis of the role of consumption goes beyond the neo-Marxist view. For he argues that post-modernity is beyond Marx's capitalism because the commodity law of value (the technical definition capital) has been superseded the structural theory of value. Yet he does concede that capitalism, as a mode of domination, remains (Baudrillard 1988:129-130). His view of instrumental labour outlined above is an illustration of this domination. But this
still leaves a key question concerning the nature of consumption. Does consumption in advanced societies indicate a social form beyond capitalism, or is it merely a higher form of commodification within capital? Baudrillard provides no answer to this question. He has been unable to bridge the gap between his analysis of value-form and domination. As a result he has been unable to theorise the possibilities of overcoming the domination inherent in (post-) capitalist society. In sum, Baudrillard provides a novel analysis of the change in the structure of value, albeit within a pessimistic view of the possibilities of transformational change.

In contrast, the spirited defence of modernity and Enlightenment rationality by Habermas seeks to escape from the pessimism of many theorists of post-modernity. Although he discards the linkage between labour and social value, his development of the theory communicative action provides a theoretical bridge between symbolic systems and social action. A brief discussion of salient aspects of his work is useful here.

For Habermas labour represents only one aspect of the structure of a specifically human interest. He rejects primacy of instrumental action, ie. labour, as the basis of sociability. To do so in social theory, is to remain rooted in the western objectivist/positivist problematic. Habermas turned to Weber in developing a problematic of interaction which underpins the theory of communicative action. Yet, in his view, Weber's formulation of rational action is unduly restrictive. Weber's focus on instrumental action is incapable of analyzing the rationalising effects of technical rationality in the domain of social organisation. Weber was in fact seduced by the claims of technical rationality to universality.

Nonetheless he accepts Weber's notion of rationalisation at two levels. First, the modernisation of the conditions of material production where a mean-ends relation (conducted through the medium of instrumental and strategic action) comes to dominate the economy (or the sub-systems of production). From there it then expands into more areas of social life. Second, the secularisation of cultural domain which occurs through the spread of
rational argumentation as a means to validity claims. In this process, substantive rationality or values becomes constantly subject to reason. As well, in Habermas' view, the process can only take a linguistic form - which is illustrated through the constant elaboration of rationalised natural law. He expands the early Durkhiemian index of law (in the latter's case the movement from punitive to restitutive law) in his more recent work. He analyses the logic of interaction, arguing that it continually peels away, or unveils the influence of "the fateful causality of dissociated symbols and suppressed motives" in social life. In other words, the role of myth and magic (i.e. traditionalism) decline as the sacred aspects of the 'life-world' are increasingly subjected to reasoned analysis and argumentation. They then enter a continually rationalised reformulation in the modern legitimation order.

The most significant aspect for the argument here is that communicative action is internally differentiated - covering the value 'domains' of truth, moral right and art. Each domain displays a specific form of rationality - termed the cognitive-instrumental, moral-practical and aesthetic-practical. With this formulation Habermas shows that capital has historically displayed only a partial and one-sided development of reason. Indeed, technical/instrumental rationality has come to dominate moral and aesthetic reasoning. This prompted Weber's acceptance of the claims of technical rationality, resulting in his pessimistic view a future dominated by the 'iron cage' of rationalised social action - particularly in its institutional or (bureaucratic) form.

Habermas offers a possibility of a rational escape from this 'iron cage' future. The system imperatives of capital become progressively separated from the (interactional) life-world. In turn, each become internally differentiated. This accelerates problems in the coordination of economic functions as social life becomes more varied and diverse. Although he does not adequately explain the conditions of this differentiation, it is plainly related to the decreasing salience of direct labour power in the economy. This means that the logic of social life becomes more dependent upon the rationality of moral-practical and the aesthetic-practical interests. As these interests are given greater social space they in fact accelerate the process
of de-sacredisation of moral axioms and normative interaction. The key point is that this process realises the immanent rational potential of communicative action. Moreover it is not a trajectory of rationalisation dominated by a purely technical rationality. On the contrary, the non-intrumental interests serve to undermine the universal claims of science. The problem of the coordination of economic functions is then paralleled by the problem of the integration of the economic and social sub-systems. The rationalisation of the life-world is a many-sided process. It includes, amongst other things, the universalisation of moral and legal norms at higher levels of abstraction, the growth of individuation, and the expansion in the reflexivity of symbolic orders. An empirical result of this process is an unprecedented expansion in cultural diversity characteristically seen in post-modernity.

From the argument above, cultural diversity and signification may serve as resources for the images (or signs) of commodities as well as resources for the redirection of production. Thus at this point the process of value-attribution may fall into the domain of rationalised communicative action. For if the actual use, and attributes, of products were open to collective and rational argumentation and decision, such products could well be directed to serving non-economic ends (and so undermining valorisation). The domination of production system imperatives, such as exchange-value, is therefore potentially open to challenge. Resolution of the problem would be through rational argumentation.

But the process is not as straight forward as this. Habermas identifies some counter pressures. In the interim period (such as at present) the disjunction between social and system integration cannot be resolved through communicative action. The wherewithal for this task is absent. Thus Habermas is forced to reintroduce the Marxist notion of the cycles of accumulation to explain the symbolic use of money and power as media to co-ordinate the system and social differentiation. Money circulates the flows of value to and from the production system and the state mediates the exercise of social power (at a level necessary for the integration of the life-world) to ensure system reproduction. This process can lead to situation of "overkill", in which these "steering media" over co-ordinate the two spheres
leading to a "pathological" form of modernisation. In this scenario the life-world is "colonised" rather than "mediationised" by technical rationality through its instruments of monetarization and bureaucratisation. In other words the functions of the latter are vehicles that overwhelm the life-world, rather than facilitate its enrichment and growth. The result is a general apathy and loss of meaning characteristic of the 'post-liberal' capitalism - an effect Baudrillard termed the 'implosion of meaning'.

Notwithstanding counterpressures, Habermas provides the theoretical space for the insertion of action with transformative capacities. More importantly, he provides an analysis of the sources of the internal generation of discourses on value which extend beyond the instrumental and economic dimensions. This is not possible in Baudrillard's theory of the domination of the code of production. However, Habermas' identification of instrumental labour with the economic system is too narrow. As a consequence he attributes too much to the role of science in production. Technology and automation have not, to date, proved to be the independent source of value hypothesized by many post-industrial writers. Similarly, Baudrillard's characterisation of instrumental labour as merely "a sign .... a set of described operations .... [or the] reproduction of the assignment to labor, as the general habitus of a society unsure whether to produce or not" (Baudrillard 1988:130-131, emphasis in the original) is also premature.

In summary, a number of points can be made from this section. #1. First, Baudrillard shows that the referent of value is no longer a natural category which derives its validity from the assumption of consumption outside of the effects of the capitalist value form. Therefore the real subsumption of labour in capitalism must extend to the structure of consumption. #2. Second, the role of systems of signification in constituting value is vital. Indeed it is absorbed as a sphere of productive labour; if productive labour is defined as the contribution to the formation of value as a quality and surplus-value as a quantity. #3. Third, the signification of value is an inherently indeterminate process. This is likely to be felt most acutely at the organisational level in advanced capitalist societies. For any contribution to
value-attribution will be open to dispute - and resolution of such disputes will inevitably lie outside the domination of a purely technical rationality. Habermas points to the importance of moral and normative argumentation in formulating value. If this is the case, then viewing labour in production as narrowly instrumental is untenable. This is particularly so for the management of work organisations. This issue will be considered in the next section. #4.The final point is that value-attribution must therefore be seen as a relational process. The labour process is one of construction or building of value rather than merely a defined production of value. Value is not the result of the application of rational economic programs, defined managerial strategies driven by a putative capital logic, it is a social structural process subject to constant change, but within the constraints of certain trajectories of change. The nature of these trajectories, discussed in this section form the basis of the discussion of management, production and legitimation in the remainder of the paper.

Section 3 Management and Achievement

Management as an economic function and social category is a relatively new historical phenomenon. Braverman identifies the rise of management with the coordination of technical functions associated with the collection of artisans into one workshop by nascent capitalists. This collection of workers establishes the conditions for cooperative labour and thereby the functions of management. For, in order to live the capitalist must appropriate surplus value. To do this, control over production is required. Braverman thus associates the rudimentary forms of management with the impetus to control in capitalism, or at least the latter develops "a wholly new art of management" (Braverman 1974:65). In doing so he disregards managerial functions which were performed by, and under, the guilds or other forms of pre-capitalist work organisation.

Braverman's (1974:59-60) distinction between the organisation and performance of work and auxiliary functions of production is unclear. Ordering supplies and raw materials, scheduling
work and the maintenance of records, are three sets of tasks which he associates with nascent capital and not the pre-existing craftwork. Yet historically these tasks were very much under the control of the master or the guild (Unwin 1957, 1966). Nevertheless Braverman outlined a two stage model of the development of capitalist management. In the first stage, management performed the coordination functions of production. The second phase, which he associated with monopoly capital, added the control of the labour process. This completed "the specifically capitalist mode of management and thus of production" (Braverman 1974:61). The nature of managerial work may be examined through this model.

Management as Coordination

In the first phase capital accepted craft labour in its pre-capitalist form and took over only the auxiliary functions associated with the co-ordination of production. The extensive use of sub-contracting and the putting-out system demonstrated that capital was dependent upon the existing forms of labour. Thus it was unable to shape the labour process in any detail.

Braverman and others have closely identified the use of piece rates in the wage-exchange relation, with this first stage of management under capitalism. Indeed this type of wage, or in more general terms, system of distribution, was seen as a major mechanism in simultaneously deepening commodification of labour and the control of output. Yet wage forms need to be seen in the context of changes in wider systems of distribution and authority. Income was often paid in non-wage or non-monetary forms. The range of such sources of income was varied. In agricultural work it may have included housing, rights to use of certain buildings, payment in goods, percentage of specified parts of the harvest, and so on. In the maritime industries, each ship had a manager who was took a percentage of the turnover, or if a partner in the ship, the return was proportionate to the number of sixty-fourths (the usual number used to allocate 'shares'). Each rank of sailor and officer had rights to trade up to a specified limit.
The organisation of subcontracting outlined by Pollard (1965), Littler (1982) and others demonstrated the wide range of methods of distribution in operation throughout most of the nineteenth century. What remains of these forms distribution today has been marginalised, although they may still strongly influence worker action (Edwards and Scullion 1982; Ditton 1977). Moreover, contracting permitted the adaption of pre-existing normative systems of the exercise of authority in the workplace. Littler's industry level typology of control systems illustrates the wide range of authority structures that existed in the nineteenth century. From these flowed a wide range of functions, such as recruitment, training, discipline and so on. Moreover the introduction of factories, allegedly for reasons of control (Marglin 1974) did not greatly affect many of these types of relations - either in terms of the distribution of income or in the nature of the exercise of authority. Internal contracting permitted the continuation of practices which existed in putting-out, domestic work and other forms of subcontracting. This was certainly the case in the eighteenth century. Pollard concludes that the large-scale establishments of the day failed in critical areas of management - maximising work effort and preventing theft of materials (Pollard 1965:57) Finally, taken as a whole the range of functions performed by intermediaries, who were mainly from the ranks of direct workers, exceeded those associated only with the performance of work in the labour process.

This brief overview of the coordination period of management demonstrates that the vast bulk of managerial functions were performed by groups and individuals not identified as managers. Thus where management did exist, in the period up to the end of the nineteenth century, it was more likely to be associated with ownership. The classical entrepreneurial role, characterised by founder-owners, was augmented by several alternative paths to a similar status. Indeed entrepreneurialism itself was a path to social rank by marginal social groups, in the absence of their access to conventional alternatives. Often industrial ownership was only a path to the more established status of landowner. The widespread use of the partnership structure allowed promising 'managers' to join the ranks of owners. Not only did this expand the ability of the enterprise to perform a wider range of operations, by adding to the number of owners, but it also secured the allegiance of managers by locking
them into the ownership structure. Finally, as the flows of income dependent upon pre-capitalist social structure diminished, the private wealth of families and individuals was directed into industrial investment. A key point in this pattern of development in managerial functions, or the lack of it, is its relation with existing standards of social value.

So, in the pre-monopoly period, both of these managerial 'levels' - what could be termed operational and top management - operated according to the same social standards and normative systems. Both the worker, particularly the craftworker, and the manager/owner were keen to maintain their social position, which itself was based on an older hierarchy of rank. In this ideological context there was little stimulus to venture into the domain of the ranks below or above. Moreover the basis of contact between ranks, although fundamentally changed in the transition to capitalism, appeared to offer many compensatory aspects. Recall from the argument above, that equivalence in employment exchange was an adaption of the principle of reciprocity. That is, the wage relation replaced the bonds of personal obligation. But the process of the formation of "free" labour took place in conditions where labour maintained authority in the workplace. It must be said that this was not in any sense a democratic exercise of authority. For there were many divisions within the ranks of working people, seen in the expression, 'the working classes'. Indeed many owners attempted to curb the excesses of their workshop masters. But the salient point is that the maintenance of structure of rank blunts any demands for large scale social mobility. Therefore it forestalls the development of the concept of an achieving society.

In sum then, the relatively slow development of management in the nineteenth century reflected the adaption of older social values to new economic and organisational conditions. Almost by default the practice of management through coordination was restricted to managing a series of local, diverse, even idiosyncratic, systems, often only loosely connected. It was in effect indirect management. It was this system of management that Taylor was highly critical in the United States (Taylor, 1987).
Management as Control

But the economic pressures inherent in the expansionary nature of capitalism undermined this system. In response the second stage of a specifically capitalist management developed near the end of the nineteenth century. The system of indirect management, which Taylor saw as lazy management, was radically altered by the systematic incursion of capital into the organisation and methods of work. The impetus for this transition has been seen as the need to overcome worker resistance (eg. Braverman 1974, Edwards 1979). But such resistance, whether stronger or weaker in individual countries is itself a function of the slow development of managerial structures, consistent with changes in the nature of the economy. The separation of coordination management from workshop or operational management created a crisis of agency. The key to this crisis was the shift in the nature of value at the turn of the century. Production needed to be standardised in order to serve mass markets. Fordism resulted.

Until the turn of the century operational management was largely in the hands of contractors. Thus in effect, contractors were in an agency relation with owners. There were four problems in this relation. First, the full exchange-value of labour power was not realised in the labour process. That is labour was not wholly directed at the maximisation of valorisation. It still retained significant exercise of authority in the workplace - although this was under increasing pressure from the 1870s in all capitalist countries. The widespread interest in systems of arbitration in the formation of modern systems of industrial relations was substantially concerned with the exercise of industrial authority (Macintyre and Mitchell 1989). Second, contractors were able to appropriate a greater proportion of surplus value due to the inadequate development of control systems of owners and top management. The very diversity of operational systems precluded any systematic monitoring and correction of a production system as a whole. Third, the lack of standardisation also precluded the systematic development of product diversity. This was a paradoxical situation, in that markets were often served by scores of commodities of a similar type, yet each individual
producer could not easily alter the characteristics of the commodity produced. This was largely the result of production rigidities related to particular craft labour. Moreover this structure restricted competition for market share on the basis of flexibility in product differentiation. Finally, the lack of systematic central control systems lead to a widening degree of organisational uncoupling. The problems associated with the internal differentiation of individual establishments by craft were compounded by the differences between establishments. This was particularly acute in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century for two key reasons, company size and vertical expansion. Horizontal expansion was little more than a response to the problems of market structure which was dependent upon use-value. In short, the agency problems encountered by top management in the contract system spanned both production and appropriation questions.

Braverman associates control with labour. And as Pollard points out in the case of Britain, labour control was a constant issue. Yet this was related to size. For size multiplied the complexity of coordination for management. Yet again as we have seen larger factories existed for over a century - albeit managed through the internal resources of the ranks of direct workers themselves as shown above. But this system found its limits not in the internal differentiation of the labour process as such, but in the coordination of multi-establishment firms. Particularly those that ventured into vertical integration. For these companies were then locked into an internal line of supply, and thus into interdependence between different establishments of the company. That is, the extension of formal managerial functions into operational control was as much a problem of inter-organisational coordination as the recalcitrance of workers. For, the domination of use-value in consumption in that phase of capital meant that material supplies for individual factories were chosen on the basis of the physical needs of craft production in each factory. However this was severely curtailed when an establishment became locked into a given supplier. The requirements of coordination and direct production then coincided; both needed methods to deal with new inter-organisational relations. Standardisation was the solution to problems in both areas. It permitted closer integration of individual establishments through standardised materials and the reorganisation
of the labour process to produce standardised products. Longer production chains were created, with less varied labour processes. It is for this reason that systematic management spawned scientific management.

This pattern of processes is most clearly seen where the use-value of the commodity produced required standardisation of operational procedures and equipment. It is not surprising therefore that land transport, specifically railway companies, first established such systematic operations. For in this case, effective long distance control systems were required to deliver a predictable movement of goods and people (which was the commodity produced). Schedules, ticketing, railtracks, engines and rolling stock, maintenance, materials handling methods and so on all had to be standardised over large expanses of space and time. Integrated production processes had the same effect. Industries, such as chemicals, petroleum products, later plastics and so on, depended on the continuous flow of materials and so standardisation of the labour process. The principles of continuous flow assembly line production were little more than an extension of this principle.

In all these cases, the primary objective in managerial strategies was the coordination of phases of concrete production to facilitate organisational and inter-organisational integration. In such circumstances the craft-based restrictions on the use of labour power were only one barrier to be surmounted. In strategies to accomplish this task, scientific management was primarily directed at more successfully linking the expenditure of labour effort with the refashioned organisational configuration. Taylor's extensive work on the standardisation of materials technology and procedures focused on this function more than the subordination of labour as such. Moreover his ideas on the functional organisation of production tasks again were directed at integration rather than intensification as such. Low work effort, in his view, was consistent with the lack of standardisation in craft work - epitomised by its rule-of-thumb methods. Empirically the prime source of productivity growth in the US economy, exclusive of technological change, in the decades after 1900 was systemisation, that is the, "efficient
arrangements of work ... [through the elimination of] waste and reduction of time and effort" (Fabricant 1942:75-76).

Thus the growth of managerial control functions was as much a rational extension of its existing coordination as it was the seizing of the functions from craft work. Nevertheless the effect was the same. That is, the tasks of operational management previously embedded in the ranks of contractors, superintendents, workshop masters and similar groups, became formal managerial tasks over the following century. The newly created positions which resulted however did not simply assume the functions of its predecessors, but performed new functions associated with the complexity of coordination and standardised production.

A central result of this process was a key transformation in the conception of management. It no longer indirectly commanded the labour process, through a intermediaries who operated in plethora of arrangements and procedures. Although management still performed coordinating functions, these and the additional direct control of labour were guided by a convergent rationality. That is management represented an intervention in the practical use-value of labour power. The objectives were, first, the detailed specification of work behaviour in order to accomplish specific and planned goals. Then, second, the integration of particular goals to the general goal of the expansion of production. It was a particular mechanical conception of rational action in which effort progressively converged on one goal.

**Achievement Displaces Equivalence**

As the practice of management extended from indirect to direct functions the work conditions for labour of the exchange under the principle of equivalence were undermined. The established exercise of authority by and through the representatives of direct workers was in large measure removed by the end of the first world war. Although it was a process that began sooner or later in different countries and proceeded at varying speeds. The
equivalence in the wage exchange was premised on the exercise of authority through some collective agency. Moreover this was in turn based on a generalised view that social position was allocated according to a relatively immutable and stable ranking system. This has been argued earlier. The long hiatus in Britain between the repeal of the Combination Acts and the granting of legal status for trade unions, was filled by such an informal exercise of collective authority (see Foster 1974; Price, 1980). Although there is evidence to indicate instability in through the nineteenth century leading to its breakdown. The social and ideological conditions for custom-based wage exchange were weakened (Hobsbaum, 1960; Phelps Brown and Hopkins, 1981).

The collapse of the exercise of workplace authority through the ranks of workers signalled the end of the legitimation based on equivalence. The latter had literally been an exchange, however asymmetrical in reality, of new rights of income (wages) for labour services on the one part and new sources of income (profits) derived from those services on the other. The widespread use of paternalist management policies by owners reflected another aspect of the exchange. Detailed management control implied an individualisation of the exchange relation. Taylor's conception of personnel selection and economic incentives created this effect. Moreover social mobility within the employing organisation was now based on direct employment. This broke the differentiation of work by rank, in terms of the existence of relatively fixed limits. Whereas in the past, elevation in rank was tied to the crafts and local norms, a ladder or hierarchy of positions opened up the possibility of continuous elevation.

The result was a deepening of the concept of an achieving society in which the distribution of status positions was a function of individual ability and performance. In this process, all existing, political, social, cultural and traditional bases of the allocation of social position were to be removed. The position of the individual in society was to be literally achieved.

In light of the expanded functions of management discussed above the rise of the principle of achievement was a mutually reinforcing process. There was an elective affinity between the
functional role and social aspirations of management and the means of legitimation of social mobility in the performance principle. Offe (1976:43-44) identifies four functional dimensions of achievement principle; compensation, equivalence, productivity and allocative. In brief these refer to the compensation available for the performance of work where there exists certain costs of that work. This may entail objective costs associated with long periods of training or the acquisition of relevant experience over a long period. Alternatively there may be subjective costs associated with responsibility, stress or other objectionable conditions of work which attract relevant compensation. Second, the principle of equivalence is now relegated to a subordinate position as only one component of the more general principle. Equivalence is thereby interpreted to mean equivalence of conditions, from which the processes of individual achievement, based on natural capacities, may properly proceed. It thereby masks actual inequality through the ideology of equality of opportunity. Third, the productivity principle in which the conditions for the maximisation of individual productivities permits a fair and equitable distribution of the returns labour in accordance with one's marginal productivity. Finally, the allocation function ensures the most rational allocation and distribution of labour (Offe 1976:43-44).

An important dimension of the achievement principle was the elevation of the importance of the sphere of economic labour in the determination of social position. The four functions outlined either directly relate to the economic domain or are interpreted in a manner consistent with it. Therefore the basis on which the determination of the level of achievement in work depends is individual performance. Offe (1976:44-45) points to a crucial dichotomy in the calculation of performance. The dimensions of compensation and equivalence relate to individual inputs while productivity and allocation refer to economic outputs. No mechanism exists to satisfactorily resolve the incommensurability of the two, not to mention the problems attendant to the application of such a mechanism if it were to exist. The key point is the performance dimension is subordinate to the achievement principle as a whole.
Once the achievement principle came to legitimate social mobility and position, management was able to secure a unique position in advanced societies through this century. The expansion of the productive capacities of the economic system via the development and application of technological and organisational knowledge by management has seen a small functional and social group grow into a central one in the space of a few decades. Indeed the haven for top management in the previous century - namely individual ownership - has been devalued through this century as a consequence of the 'managerial revolution', identified by Berle and Means in the 1930s. The separation of formal ownership and effective control through the spread of shareholding in public companies, permitted full-time top management to acquire effective control of such companies.

Moreover the ranks of management expanded as the size and complexity of capitalist organisations expanded. Indeed the proportion of employment in administrative functions (not all of which were managerial of course) of firms grew faster than did employment in production. That is the ratio of staff to production personnel grew. This functional differentiation served to expand the career paths of management, the range of competencies and education required for management, the social and political influence of management and so on and so forth. In all cases the expansion of management was said to serve production.

Yet a central feature of the Fordist phase of capitalist production was the expansion of the market. Consumption needed to expand to permit the realisation of surplus value which had its source in production. Initially market expansion was accomplished through the mass production of standardised commodities. But the development of standardised production, particularly in assembly based industries, was unable to adapt or change its products quickly. This was followed by product differentiation. But through the Fordist phase markets expanded on the basis of commodities which were dominated by use-value.
In sum, management could only emerge as a economic function and social category when production had developed organisational blockage related to the size of organisations, complexity of functions and inter-organisational coordination. In this process the early managerial coordination functions were extended to address the new intra- and inter-organisational problems. This prompted the extension of the managerial role into operational areas. The move precipitated the collapse of the previous pattern of workplace authority, where intermediaries, who rose from the ranks of direct workers, exercised workplace control. Finally, the rise of the achievement principle provided a more appropriate form of legitimation for the role and growth of management through this century. The next section examines the effects of the current phase of restructuring on management.

Section 4 New Production, Management and Performance

The current phase of capitalist restructuring revolves around the debates on new production. These are in turn based in part on several themes of post-industrialism (Gahan, 1991). This section is concerned with salient themes of new production, their impact on work and management and the rise of the performance principle in light of the changes in the content of value discussed in section two.

Post-industrialism rests upon arguments related to the structure of tendencies of 'industrial' societies. The latter is essentially defined as a society which provides conditions for the expansion of productive capacities. As such, productive capacity is a dependent variable determined by the insertion of certain technologies in the relation between human labour and the natural environment. That is, appropriation from the natural environment is no longer a type of near nature (or first-order) production utilising simple tools. But it entails a progressive separation from nature (or second-order production) in which the scope of appropriation from nature is increasingly determined by the self-expansion of the 'powers' of technology. This view is usually based on a developmental model, ranging from primary
production to secondary to tertiary and so on (see Jones 1981). Habermas adopts a general evolutionary model of societal development in proposing that technology takes on independent productive powers. In short, it is a technological determinism. From this perspective capitalism and socialism are merely sub-variants of industrial societies. On the basis of this general proposition several areas of argumentation have developed.

First, propositions based on the rise in white-collar, office based occupations. An increase in demand for competencies in the manipulation of symbolic systems follows; surpassing the demand for competencies associated with manual labour. The latter are implicitly tied to first-order competencies of manual/motor skills. These are in secular decline. A putative balance is thereby introduced in which competencies required for second-order work come to match the intervention of advanced (i.e. automated) technology in the human-natural environment relation. This balance, or equilibrium, is established. In effect the equilibrium of pre-industrial craft-based societies, is thereby re-established, albeit a higher level. It is this argument that provides the moral force for the superiority of work in industrial society - it combines the satisfaction of pre-industrialism with the high standard of living achievable with advanced technology.

Second, a shift in the nature of institutional attachment by employees is ascertained. This is largely in response to the change in occupational content and identity just mentioned. The alienation from work and society characteristic of mass production mechanization gives way to satisfaction and organizational commitment gained from white-collar/technical work. Moreover, this is a dual process, in which the professionalisation of post-industrial work results both from a secular decline in factory work and the upgrading of the remaining industrial work. This transformation brings the remaining industrial workers into the new world of high trust quasi-professionalised employment. Here industrial workers gain the benefits of pride in work, satisfaction, meaning and individual and social identity attained by white-collar employees. This greatly accelerates the transition of social production from its roots as a "game" with nature, to the realm of a "game between persons" (Bell 1974:117).
The third aspect of the transition to post-industrialism was the rise of the 'medium' of that game - namely, knowledge. Theoretical knowledge is the basis of the post-industrial work and society. It is the central axis fundamental to the recasting of a moribund industrial society. Knowledge underpins the development of new technology; ensures economic growth; forms the basis of the (new) social structure (Bell 1974:112); determines access to the means of administration (Dahrendorf 1959); distributes membership of the new class or service class (Gouldner 1979) or even underpins claims to authoritarian leadership in other contexts (Djilas 1966, Konrad and Szelenyi 1979).

The fourth dimension, found in critical cultural and social theory, sees the collapse of the epistemological basis of certainty. As discussed earlier, this view argues that the grand narrative of the Enlightenment and the domination of technical rationality have collapsed (or will) under the weight of the "game between persons". The death of certainty or the domination in style of a particular school (of thought, technique, genre, and so on) has been particularly evident in aesthetics and cultural theory.

**The Changing Nature of Work Competency**

This section outlines the general framework of the notion of post-industrial work. In particular, given the predicted role of knowledge-based work, the question is, how is work related to social value. This question has underpinned many of the concerns of 'new production' writers. This section will identify the nature of changes in the structure of work which has taken place over the last few decades.

Paid labour may be seen as, the expenditure of effort guided by a technical rationality for largely instrumental goals. The expenditure of effort in this context has three aspects or functions, and each may be ranked by levels of task complexity. The distinction between functions is intended to identify functional components of all jobs - not to draw distinctions between manual and non manual, white-collar or blue-collar work. Nevertheless jobs within
such broad distinctions will display a specific mix of functions and tasks. Manual functions are related to hand eye coordination, motor skills, strength, and a range of physical attributes required for specific tasks. Low level tasks maybe handling, feeding, simple operation of equipment and so on. Symbolic functions are related to communication, records, data banks, and the creation and manipulation of information. Tasks range between the simple, such as comparing and coping, to the more complex, for example co-ordinating, synthesizing and innovation. Finally interactional functions relate to intersubjective contact, involving a range of social skills and related tasks. Tasks range from taking simple instructions, helping and serving to supervision, negotiation and mentoring. Table: 1 outlines these aspects of work.

Table 1: Dimensions of Skill: Work Functions and Task Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Complexity</th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Interactional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>I1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision operation</td>
<td>Synthesising</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation control</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set-up</td>
<td>Co-ordination</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>I2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine feeding</td>
<td>Comparing</td>
<td>Taking instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handling</td>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrying</td>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>Serving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from - McCormick (1979)

Moreover each level of task may be carried out at a different level of competency. The scope of the competency rises in direct proportion to the indeterminacy of the task. The aggregate composition of function, task and competency is usually identified as skill. Although this concept has limited applicability in the context of qualitative technological, organizational and social change. Moreover, 'high discretion' (Fox, 1974) or good jobs have a task mix
weighted in favour of high complexity tasks. Thus these jobs are characterised by wide scope and greater indeterminacy. This formulation of what may be called, work competencies, can accommodate well known frameworks for the analysis of work.

New production theory is predominantly concerned with the manual and symbolic manipulation functions. Hence the significant shift in the nature of work in industrial society is seen as twofold; away from predominantly manual functions to symbolic manipulation and away from low complexity tasks to high complexity tasks. In terms of Table 1 there is a secular shift across functions, away from the manual functions, M1 and M2, to symbolic functions, S1 and S2, As well as this, there are seen to be shifts within each function, M2 to M1 and S2 to S1. Moreover the mix of tasks across functions sees more S1 tasks with M1 and to a lesser extent more S2 tasks with M2 jobs. The grouping of tasks is less a function of an conventional occupation (or craft) identities than the functional requisites of modern production systems (flexible production). These pressures can derive from technological, market or organisational imperatives but whatever the source the effects are essentially the same. Indeed, it is the organisational demands that create a wider demand for interactional function competencies.

In summary, then, new production identifies a secular change in employment away from manual blue-collar jobs to non-manual white-collar jobs. At the same time both the remaining blue-collar jobs and the growing white-collar jobs are increasingly knowledge-based. Thus they require greater conceptual, analytical and interactional competencies.

**New Production and Organisation**

The new production perspective is concerned with types of competencies required to complement operation requirements of of advanced technology in organisational settings. This is so in two senses; to maximise operational output for a given technology and to mobilize the creative and innovative input of all organizational members. The theoretical
thrust of new production writers whether technology (Freeman) or market structure (Piore and Sabel 1984) is less important than this closer linkage of worker competencies, organizational co-ordination and market demands.

Piore and Sabel's (1984) periodisation of the capital involved in the notion of the second industrial divide is based on the assumption of the fragmentation of mass markets. The saturation of markets with mass-produced goods, the fragmentation of tastes, demands for new consumption commodities and the uncertainty of markets has undermined the basis of long term output planning of firms. In this context Taylorist mass production techniques characteristic of Fordism are unable to provide the necessary variety and quality of goods to meet demand in the new market conditions. Specialization and fragmentation of jobs closely prescribed work positions and work organization are no longer suitable to match the demands of the market. The type of manual and white-collar jobs created over the last eighty years, clustered around M2 and S2 competencies (in Table 1) and attached to dedicated technology are impediments to flexible production. The creation of these jobs over that period was the process of deskillling identified by Braverman. The Fordist utilisation of labour power actually discouraged workplace variety and autonomy as has been argued earlier. The lack of anything more than prescribed competencies suited mass production. However, the stability gained in mass oligopolistic markets has diminished. Fordism, long productions runs, standardised commodities, highly prescribed job roles and low trust industrial relations have all been rendered unprofitable.

The production driven Fordist prescriptions of appropriating workplace knowledge, developing scientific planning and so on, employs the kind of convergent rationality referred to earlier. This is increasingly incompatible with both market demands and the optimal use of advanced technology. Rigid and bureaucratic levels of authority characteristic of fordist management and administration now constrains development. Centralized authoritative control over larger and more bureaucratic structures have proved to be ineffective in combatting international competition. The formalized elaboration of departmental and
sectional structures decreases lateral co-operation in organisations. In sum, then, the mass production organization of Fordism has become moribund. It is unable to deliver sustained economic prosperity for capitalism. What is to be done?

The perceived feature of Keynesian macro-economic policies, a general disenchantment with the efficacy of the state and the economic performance of State-owned or sponsored forms have been crucial factors in the response to this question. With opportunities for collectivist solutions at the macro-level closed off and the theoretical developments identified in section one and two there has opened up a wider view on the social construction of value and its effects on consumption. The answer to the malaise of capitalism is the extension of craft-based, artisan work characteristic of certain industries and regional economies (Sabel and Zeitlin 1985; Busco 1982). Lateral relations, networks, cooperation, characteristic of pre-bureaucratic capitalist production are the key features of production innovation, flexibility and efficiency. The social relations of interaction, both in the workplace and interorganisational linkages, provide the social innovation required to effectively adapt production methods and the division of labour to meet uncertain and changing demand. It has been argued above that uncertain and changing demand is itself an effect of the expansion of the content of the capitalist value-form. Value-attribution undermines both mass markets and stable production relations.

Table 2 sets out the organisational characteristics of Fordism and new production in summary form. Granting greater autonomy to (the new) highly skilled labourforce unleashes worker creativity in both technical and social innovation. Thus such artisanal work organisation is not only economically and technically more efficient but also more humane and socially satisfying for the labourforce. The central features of new production are based around notion of a skilled labour force possessing "polyvalent" skills that extend into the organisational or interactive functional competencies listed in Table 1. These are absorbed into the technical structure of the organisation. In other words the exercise of 'technical skill' is heavily complemented by the exercise of perceptual, interactive and organizational skills
and commitment in the service of continuity of production. This includes competencies in both I1 and I2 categories (Table 1).

Table 2: Organisational Structure: Fordist and New Production Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Fordist</th>
<th>New Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1. Production driven</td>
<td>1. Market driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rigid hierarchy</td>
<td>2. Flat structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Defined sections</td>
<td>3. Flexible functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>4. Delimited positions</td>
<td>4. Clustered positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work organisation</td>
<td>5. Prescribed tasks</td>
<td>5. Fluid group tasking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7. Centralised</td>
<td>7. Decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Authoritarian</td>
<td>8. Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>10. Bureaucratic (mechanistic)</td>
<td>10. Responsive (organic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This applies not only to simple continuity (keeping the system running) but to the organizational and technical capacities of production systems (continuous expansion of its capabilities). In short, new production adopts the post-industrialism theme of an equilibrium between technical capacities of the system and the nature of work in its reconstruction of craft or artisanal skills. Now higher level symbolic manipulation (S1) and interactive (I1) competencies are recombined with complex manual competencies in jobs on the shop floor.
This reconstitutes the notion of the artisanal craft worker as the post-industrial flexible specialization version of its pre-capitalist antecedent. For post-industrialism theory, the recomposition of industrial work is complete. Alienation (among other Fordism pathologies) is eliminated and prosperity is achieved (or at least achievable) through the diligent, productive and innovative work. Hence the inherent satisfaction of such work.

However there are crucial differences which are invisible to the post-industrial perspective which do not address the issue of the capitalist nature of the changes. The empirical realites of polarisation of skills, lack of genuine or lasting exercise of interactional competencies, labour intensification and so need to be carefully balanced against much of the anecdotal evidence of new production (eg Williams et al 1987; Elger 1990; Gahan, 1991). However, here we shall concentrate on the changing nature and role of management in advanced capitalist societies.

**The Role of Management**

The role of management in the reorganisation of production is two-fold under new production systems. It must be concerned to adopt strategies that are capable of eliciting the commitment of workers to organisational goals. Moreover it must also be concerned to press the claims for the contribution of particular specialisms in the value attribution process. The disaggregation of large bureaucratic organisational structures into smaller business units and the like, reflects the attempt to limit or reverse the widespread use of administrative rule. This places different pressures on management. In the first place, the conceptualisation of management itself required a change. The reliance of management on a set of technical or mechanistic practices associated with positional authority and characteristic of Taylorism has given way to a more complex model (Reed 1989). Wood (1989:386) argues that management the role of management is less dependent upon the exercise of hierarchical authority than on the structuring of relations or the negotiation of relations, process and outcomes. Thus the key shift in post-Peters and Waterman management theory has been
away from management as a discrete set of technical and interventionist activities to an internal facilitation and leadership. The term 'intrepreneur' encapsulates the shift. Management, can be seen as the co-ordinated regulation of organisational relations and interactional routines in the workplace rather than the technical prescription of specific tasks.

The second stress relates to managerial work that flows from this. By definition, the absorption of S1 and I1 tasks into what were previously routine, manual, technical and office jobs, deprives much of management of its functional support in the Taylorist tradition. As Ray (1989) points out the 'technical' aspects of managerial work have steadily declined over many decades, to be replaced by social skills. These are more indeterminate than technical competencies. Given that the effect of job enlargement referred to eliminates lower and middle management positions, the remaining management is therefore more likely to be dependent on indeterminate competencies and measures in performance evaluation.

In an attempt to counter this effect, management previously untouched by direct quantifiable performance measures, fall victim to them. Hence the spread of such systems over the last 5-10 years in Australia, and over a longer period overseas. Paradoxically more mechanisms of measurement are generated by a system based on job enlargement, teamwork and more autonomy. The uncoupling of management from the direct and minute specification of work roles decreases the role of conventional mechanisms of operational monitoring that affect production. That is to say, closely ordered supervisory functions exercised through various levels of the organizational hierarchy have diminished. In other words, people have to made to stick to the plan/procedures/rules or whatever is specified, decline. Moreover, the sort of convergent rationality, characteristic of Fordist systems, cannot accommodate the type of change required under the structure of value-attribution. Clearly this change in the work of management is aided by the spread of the use of technical systems of surveillance, particularly management information system(s) (MIS), in the monitoring of work performance. Moreover the expansion and indeterminacy of the contribution to labour productivity of 'tacit' skills of interactional competencies can be measured use of MIS.
Through the use of MIS, operational outputs set by top management can be monitored without the need to directly control operations themselves. Whether these operations be those of subordinate managers or the labour process itself. In a similar manner middle management use such information systems.

Here a critical function of these systems is to facilitate the continuous improvement characteristic of new production. Factory or office technology, methods and procedures are monitored to identify innovative methods in order to quickly disseminate them and reapt productivity gains. This type of workplace diversity, within delimited organisational boundaries, in work organisation and methods may be termed divergent rationality. The same principle is adopted in intra-managerial performance evaluation.

In general terms the legitimization of the use of MIS is achieved precisely through the management of the cultural environment of the workplace and organisation (Ray 1986; Wilkins and Ouchi 1983). Interest in the concept of organisational culture has been growing over the last two decades. It is a key dimension of a shift to the application of divergent rationality organisations. Some aspects of such a strategy will be considered here.

In this strategy authoritative control must be sustained through the co-ordination of perceived returns to co-operation, which normally takes the form of income and non-pecuniary compensation. In other words, an increasing number of management (and other staff) will enter agency type relations with firms. A crucial aspect of the operation of systems of appropriate returns for labour is the organisation wide integration of normative imperatives. Important elements in the operation of these two aspects of the management of culture can be demonstrated in the functioning of small work groups. In this case management (or at the workplace level this may be the supervisor, but the principles are the same) becomes the management of the arena of social action (ie the appropriate area of diversity delimited by higher management). That is, operational performance of management (and increasingly groups of workers) will be subject to output controls, but at the same time will gain wider
operational autonomy in the attainment of the specified output. Indeed the actual establishment of output will be subject to joint control. The formation of the group/unit/section is the framework for rule formation which structures the interational routines of the group. But crucially these will be less likely to be linked to generalised moral concepts than to the functional requirements of production. Yet this is not necessarily the case. Such rules often originate as spontaneous relations, indeed such 'spontaneity' minimises the 'transaction' costs in terms of rule formation and implementation in the first place (Sugden 1989). It is for this reason that the moral dimension can play a major part in this system of rule formation. Moreover interational routines based on systems dominated by self-generated moral axioms modulate the flow of human capacities in the labour process. That is, there is a closer alignment with some aspects of 'traditional' work patterns which are governed by customary standards (Thompson 1967; Le Goff 1980).

The modulation of labour is nothing other than the level of effort expended in particular types of work. Both, the radical Marx and the neoclassicist Marshall represented effort as an average quantity. Marx distilled units of simple labour power in the term abstract labour, and Marshall assumed labour of average 'efficiency'. But Marx argued that the tendency of capital to continuously restructure the production process led to technical change and a rising organic composition of capital (i.e. capital-labour ratio). This was accompanied by the production and appropriation of relative surplus value in which labour, or effort, intensification is a chronic feature. It is precisely the distribution of effort that lies at the heart of the relation between capital and labour (Baldamus 1961:30).

What is of interest here is the nature of the intensification and its relations to managerial work? Effort level can be viewed as one aspect of the returns for labour. In this case effort intensification is a negative return. It has two dimension. First, an income dimension - i.e. marginal income decreases per unit of effort. Second, a non-pecuniary effect - however this may be defined and measured. For example Baldamus refers to three sets of such negative
returns or deprivations - namely, physical impairment, mental tedium and perceptual weariness.

Effort can be related to routines of method and time. That is the way things are done and the time taken to do them. In the context of advanced technical systems methods are constrained by managerial control over the technology. The time taken to complete a job is in turn a function of the technical system. Nevertheless the adaption to new systems (the need for different qualities of labour and the like) is an important source of costs to capital. In securing co-operation in the way discussed above management can develop new methods (and time to perform tasks) within the constraints of existing technology through increasing the quality of effort of workers. In addition effort quality may increase output of a given technology. In other words the use of workgroups can achieve the integration of normative imperatives for management and labour as a positive-sum outcome. The advantage here is normative integration flows into perceived return for labour with no additional costs to management. Returns can be taken in non-pecuniary forms - for example, non-authoritarian supervision, technical input, the maintenance of self-generated rules and so on.

Turning briefly to intra-managerial relations the existence of market determined production increases the indeterminacy of the calculation of contribution to value-attribution by management. As was discussed above the expansion of possibilities of value-attribution through more varied 'productive' activities eg. image enhancement, advertising, packaging, availability, back-up service and so on increases the difficulty in separating the economic effects of particular empirical policies of any given management function. Such policies are therefore increasingly open to contestation. In periods of rapid change the mechanisms of 'objective' testing lose applicability and saliency. Thus management becomes increasingly politicised in both the organisational and inter-organisational contexts. Intra-managerial relations thus become subject to discursive formation in particular arenas within the management structure. Such discursive arenas become the medium of transmission of power as legitimate authority.
In the case of the public sector the importation of managerialism has in effect been a discursive resource for those concerned to manipulate the terms of organisational change. We have already questioned whether the characterisation of management theory as rational-technical is adequate. Moreover the domination of managerial knowledge production by universities means that such knowledge may be more a reflection of knowledge validation mechanisms under such "academic reputational systems" (Whitely 1984a:346) than of managerial practice. Organisation theories (Mintzberg 1983; Burns 1977; Pfeffer 1981 ) based on internal politics - the politics of management have shown the political processes which rely on the strategic use/deployment/positioning of organisational resources or 'strategic' contingencies for the maintenance of managerial alliances in the service of essentially sectional goals. In this view managerial power is tied to organisational resources.

Added to this is the politics of discourse which is premised on the development of a public availability of language signs with a generalized utility (eg performance, market efficiency, restructuring). Such discursive signs have the potentiality to enter a universalistic strategy that have particular effects in different circumstances. A politics of discourse in these terms can disarm oppositional discourses which do not, or refuse to, or cannot, contest the moral axioms embedded in such discursive signs. In the present circumstances the public availability of language signs, infused with technical rationality, has been used as a generalised resource for managerialism. Indeed some have argued that the generation of particularised usage of such signs amounts to "a storehouse of disciplinary techniques" (Clegg 1989:192).

In sum, the shift of work away from close to nature (or first-order) type to the separated from nature (or second order) type has the potential to undermine Taylorist modes of work organisation. Organisational structure and managerial work have changed in response to this. Management is less concerned with the detailed prescription of tasks and more concerned with the outcome of the process of production. However it is increasingly difficult for management to determine specific contributions to value-attribution, as such determinations
are open to discursive dispute. One such resource in the discursive contests is, the performance principle. This will be considered in the next section.

**Legitimation and the Performance Principle**

The legitimation of managerial functions in Fordism has been through the pervasiveness of the achievement principle. Social position is here understood to be the complex of social valuations of any given social location. The components of such valuations are innumerable, but invariably contain access to flows of income, access to authoritative control, social honour and superior life-chances. Indeed, as has been pointed out above achievement is uniquely able to combine the abstract values of egalitarianism and individualism with the perceived functional requirements of a capitalist socio-economic system.

In the Fordist system the assumption of production was that it was for direct use-value. This has meant that managerial functions were seen as tied to either the direct management of the productivities of others (as in the case of line management) or as indirectly serving such a function through close and appropriate advice to the line management. In other words all the efforts of management whether direct or indirect converged on the production function.

With this in mind the problem of the incommensurability of the input and output dimensions of the performance test under the achievement principle was solved by adjudging inputs through proxy measures over time. Moreover outputs were measured by fixed standards (again these were in fact largely proxy measures) on the assumption that they contributed to maximising the productivities of direct workers. Column one in Table 3 sets out the main dimensions of performance measures for management under the achievement principle.
Table 3: Characteristics of Achievement and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Achievement</th>
<th>(2) Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative rules</td>
<td>Market (or proxy) decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable/end point standards</td>
<td>Moving point standards/targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of success</td>
<td>Standards of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative model</td>
<td>Non-cumulative model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low decay of performance</td>
<td>High decay of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input/output measures</td>
<td>Output measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large and complex management structures that developed under Fordism were able to develop complex administrative rules to adjudge performance. Offe points out that in task discontinuous status organisations there exists no independent body capable of applying consistent and universal rules which would apply to all occupations. This is true, but the assumptions of the role of management under a convergent rationality surmounted this problem. Rules applied to different groups in different ways. Output was adjudged by reference to relatively stable standards, even if these standards were in the form of a rate of increase. Moreover both input and output measures were taken into consideration. Finally, since this was the case, success in reaching specified output (whether formally or informally set) was seen as constant standard. It was for this reason that the principle of seniority was invoked as a proxy as it was possible for many, if not most, management to have reached an acceptable standard of success in the performance of their job role. In which case the force of past performance remained cogent in present and future claims to promotion. Or claims for the present position. In other words there existed a cumulative model of performance 'credits', which in the long term assembled a balance of achievement.
But under the pressure of the social development of value-attribution, the achievement principle has been displaced by the performance principle. Under the regime of performance the greatest exposure to market pressures is pursued through the de-integration of organisational structures. Thus down-sizing, sub-contracting and internal contracts for certain jobs are strategies invoked to surmount the problems of large bureaucratic organisations. This externalises performance decisions through exposure to market judgements, particularly in the case of managerial labour. It also breaks down the organisational conditions for the development and application of universal administrative rules in relation to performance measurement. The contribution of management to value-attribution is particularly difficult to determine, especially in a period of restructuring. Such contributions are therefore open to discursive contestation as has been discussed above. Market-based decisions tend to close off such intra-managerial conflict.

Market judgements open the arena for performance measures far beyond the boundaries of the organisation. Indeed the market allows performance judgments to be more closely related to the nature of the structure of valorisation. That is they are continually upgraded. Consequently identifiable end point standards are replaced by moving point standards. The latter become the norm, reflecting (relative) standards of excellence in contrast to fixed point standards of success. Where the latter were mediated by the influences of administrative rules, the objective of market-based standards (or best-practice) is to diminish or eliminate these influences. For example one major construction company in Australia demises its lowest performing marketing staff each quarter as an organisational policy (Private information 1991). Moreover performance itself is re-divided by the incommensurability of input and output measures. The use of market related performance measures has had the effect of devaluing input measures to the point that they often are ignored in performance judgment (the case of female managers is a case in point). Taken together, market-based measures which are based on output mean that performance is characterised by a rapid rate of decay. In which case a cumulative model of building achievements over a long periods gives way to a non-cumulative model in which immediate past performance is accorded far greater
weight in the general assessment of performance. The widespread use of seniority rules in bureaucratic structures have been progressively removed over the last decade. And the removal of automatic salary increases, generalised benefits and so on has taken place in the name of performance. For only the most recent performance is relevant for either appointment, reappointment or promotion.

Why did the technical assessment of achievement decline in saliency? Offe argues that second-order work replaces first-order work. The advanced technical systems required for this transition are characterised by an integrated complexity in which the measurement of individual contributions become evermore problematic. The opportunities to "objectify" individual work, demonstrate performance and satisfactorily measure performance all decline.

At the organisational level, advanced technical systems generate technical specialisation which result in functional hierarchies independent of the authoritative hierarchy. Technical competence is thus dissociated from authoritative position resulting in a 'task discontinuous status organisation'. As more people are employed in such large organisations market based 'objective' measures of achievement fall under administrative measures. Status is thus allocated independently from the market. Administrative assessment under pressure from the achievement principle develops individualised performance measures which are, in reality, substitute performance indicators.

The lack of a cumulative model of technical hierarchy in these organisations and the increase in team work (second-order work) tends to elevate non-task related aspects in the measurement that does take place. Indeed as Offe (1976:74) points out, the content of work norms often become dissociated from their instrumental context and assume non-technical motivations (eg the desire to increase mobility).
In summary Offe stresses technical complexity and organisational in the critique of the achievement principle. But argument is limited. In contrasting the role of achievement in advanced capitalism and liberal capitalism Offe asserts that individual work in the latter was assessed through the 'objective' mechanism of market price. He did not foresee that the same ideological appeal to the market can be reconstituted through the break-up of large organisations.

The achievement principle was initially an ideological device which displaced pre-existing normative (ie non-technical) systems of income distribution. Namely distribution by rank or seniority. Indeed, as noted above, Habermas highlighted the rise of the achievement principle in response to the socialist exposure of the fiction of the equality of the employment relation. Moreover there is little evidence that management had any great technical expertise during most of liberal capitalism (Pollard 1965; Braverman 1974) as we have seen. There is evidence that the use of non-market, craft-based customary production and distribution norms was widespread during the nineteenth century (Littler 1982). Indeed such norms often restricted the formation of economic market prices for 'technical' work skills and performance (Hobsbaum 1960).

In sum, achievement principle where it existed in liberal capitalism operated as an ideological device; both in the service of rising vested interests (new manufacturer class) and as a bulwark against the decline in the efficacy of older norms in face of a rising socialist challenge. That is the recasting of generalised legitimation principles occur in response to problems in securing the conditions for capitalist valorisation. They are more likely to be consistent with the practices of top management.
Section 5 Conclusion

It has been argued in this paper that the fragmentation and diversity in advanced societies is an effect of system crisis and a condition for the reformulation of the value-form of capitalism. Social diversity has provided the conditions for the expansion of the process of value-attribution in capital. The structural role of signification, by rupturing the naturalistic relation between use-value and consumption, establishes the conditions for the expansion of value. Moreover the labour resources in the process of value-attribution are thereby expanded. Since capitalist calculation based on price is unable to calculate the marginal product of different qualities of labour, more decisions are opened to the market.

This is reflected in the characteristics organisational structures and work organisation in the current period of restructuring in capitalist society. We have focused on the role of management in these changes. The role of much of management has been absorbed into the value-attribution process of capital. As a result it has become subject to the type of output controls more characteristic of operational employees. But as the nature of work changes for an increasing proportion of workers, the nature of management of those employees will also change. Management will consist of the management of an arena of social and organisational action rather than the application of bureaucratic rules as in Fordism. These characteristics reflect tendencies in capital and provide possibilities for the expansion of rational discourse. But the shift to the performance principle in the legitimation of income distribution has the potential to narrow the social and theoretical space of such a discourse.
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