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ABSTRACT

Stratification researchers have directed their efforts toward tracing the emergence of and speculating about the composition of a New Class which is forming as American capitalism expands. In their endeavors, three sets of theories occupy center stage: Expert New Class theory, Managerial New Class theory, and New Working Class theory. To empirically test each of these theories, the 1991-1992 Class and Class Consciousness data set were employed. Of the three sets of theories, Managerial New Class models offer the most promise for future research and explaining the changing nature of the American social structure. Moderate support is also provided for Expert New Class and New Working Class theories. As a consequence, future analyses must be directed toward attempts to synthesize the three approaches.
INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Marxist and Weberian stratification research is characterized by attempts to answer a crucial question: What role do professional experts and managers play in transforming the structure and culture of advanced capitalist society? Although scholars have expended a great deal of energy attempting to answer this question, the relation between the middle class and social change remains enigmatic. My central argument is that if we are to continue speculating about the composition and ideology of a "New Class" - the social spaces occupied by expert and managerial employees - we must first determine if this group truly represents a class whose worldview is distinct from the working class and cohesive enough to be considered a "class for itself" in Marxist terms.

Marx's predictions about the role that classes play in generating social change grew out of his analysis of 19th century capitalism. During the time since Marx formulated his critique, capitalism, especially in the United States, has been transformed from a competitive system of industrial production wherein ownership of productive resources was the sole determinant of power in society to a monopolistic one in which the control of other resources, particularly knowledge and organization position, have come to play an increasingly important role. This transformation has created a number of problems for social scientists (both Marxist and non-Marxist) who attempt to extend Marx's analysis to advanced capitalist societies. Although this transformation has generated numerous theoretical and empirical problems, three seem particularly thorny. First, in light of Marx's
predictions about the polarization of capitalism into a relatively small, but politically powerful, bourgeoisie and an expanding, but relatively powerless proletariat, how can the continued growth and vitality of the "intermediate" or "middle" class of experts and managers be explained? Second, given this expansion of the "middle" segment within the class structure, what is the possibility of its assuming ideological cohesiveness, or, in Marxist terms, of being transformed into a "class for itself?" Third, if this middle layer does exhibit ideological cohesiveness, what role(s) will it play in either reproducing existing class relations or generating pressure for social change?

In response to these inquiries, researchers have developed three different strategies for determining the class affiliations of professional experts and managers. The first strategy falls under the general heading of "Expert New Class" theory. Advocates of this approach argue that experts possess a "new" form of property or "cultural capital" which is rapidly displacing economic ownership as a central determinant of class. The exemplar for this position is Alvin Gouldner (1979). According to Gouldner, university education has become a form of property which can be used to separate members of the Expert New Class from both capitalists and workers. In Gouldner's version, members of the Expert New Class share in a common "culture of critical discourse" (CCD) which generates a distinct worldview through which members emphasize solving social ills through the application of rational, scientific techniques. His is an essentially
"subjectivist" view of class in which the Expert New Class emerges from a shared ideology among its members.

The second strategy falls under the general heading of "Managerial New Class" theory. Advocates of this approach highlight the fact that the spread of capitalism was accompanied by increasing bureaucratization. As a consequence, the number of bureaucratic managers also increased. Ralf Dahrendorf (1959), the exemplar of this theoretical perspective, argues that the separation of economic ownership from bureaucratic control has important consequences for class analysis. Working from a "structural" perspective, Dahrendorf argues that managers may become a class in their own right due to the control they exercise over workers. Poulantzas (1975), the Ehrenreichs (1979), and Aronowitz (1979) have attempted to expand these insights into the changing nature of the capitalist system by speculating about the structural determinants and ideological allegiance of the Managerial New Class.

The third alternative is associated with a group of researchers working from an "orthodox" Marxist perspective. For them, professional experts and managers, because they are paid by and ultimately dependent on capitalists for their livelihood, are members of a "New" Working Class. The exemplar for this approach is Charles Anderson (1974). Anderson argues that neither the spread of university education nor increasing bureaucratization has significantly altered the capitalist class structure. The central cleavage is between capitalists and workers - owners and non-owners of the means of production.
The purpose of this study is to assess the relative contributions of each of these three perspectives. Following a brief overview of the relevant literature, I employ data from the NSF sponsored 1991 - 1992 Comparative Project on Class Structure and Class Consciousness to test a number of hypotheses about the relationship between the New Class and attitudes toward the economic, political, and social status quo of contemporary American capitalist society. Erik Olin Wright's (1985) recent reconceptualization of class will serve as my structural model.
CAPITALISTS, WORKERS, AND THE INTERMEDIATE CLASSES

2.1 Introduction

Before proceeding to a discussion of the problems posed by attempting to determine the basis for the formation of a "new" class it is necessary to describe briefly how Marx envisioned the class structure and class relations of nineteenth century capitalist societies. This will permit an examination of how classes are generated and situate discussions of the "new" class within a broader context.

2.2 The Marxian Class Paradigm

Marx never set down a complete and systematic account of his theory of class. The point at which Marx began to develop his concept is where Volume III of Capital breaks off unfinished (Bottomore 1965:17). As a consequence, the full scope and import of his class theory has to be distilled from the bulk of his writings on the role classes play in generating revolutionary social change.

Although taken from different periods of his career, Marxist definitions of class have a number of distinguishing features in common (Dos Santos 1970; Wright 1979). First, classes are defined in relational rather than gradational terms. Classes are not simply viewed as being above or below other classes. They are defined in terms of social relations. Second, class relations are to be understood in reference to social relations of production rather than in terms of exchange or market relations. Market relations are relevant only in that they are determined by exploitative social relations of production. Third, definitions of class are based on the social rather than the technical organization of economic relations. Classes are
not determined solely by one's position within the technical division of labor but on the forms of social organization which emerge from economic processes. Taking these three elements together, classes can be defined as common positions within relations of production. This definition applies best to "class in itself" - the objective dimension of class formation which is understood as a structure of positions filled by people based on the ownership or non-ownership of productive property.

To identify objective class positions is only one part of the Marxian project. A second, and equally important inquiry, is to determine the role classes play in transforming society. This is a central component of Marx's predictions of an impending social revolution in which the exploiting capitalists are overthrown by the suffering proletariat. For Marx and Engels (1848), social change is inextricably tied to the struggle and conflict between classes. Within the capitalist mode of production, a critical division exists between capitalists and workers - a division between those who own and exercise control over the means, processes, and products of labor and those who are deprived of ownership or control. These two groups form the basic antagonistic classes in capitalist societies. This antagonism manifests itself as a struggle of the exploited against the exploiters, or in a broader, political sense, of the oppressed against their oppressors (Wesolowski 1979).

The transition from one type of society to another is generated by class conflict. Conflict reflects the incompatibility between different modes of
production and culminates in the victory of one class over another and the establishment of a new social order. For change to occur, members of the oppressed class must develop a shared recognition of their common situation and differential access to education, health, and other cultural goods. Only then can they act in concert with the common goal of throwing off their oppression. They must become a class conscious class - a "class for itself," (Bottomore 1965:21-22).

While the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are the major actors on the stage of history, Marx also discusses the "intermediate" classes in his theoretical works. The intermediate classes are found within all modes of exploitation: the plebeians under slavery, the vassals under feudalism, and the petty bourgeoisie under capitalism. They are transitional classes in that their roles are either increasing or decreasing in importance to the economy (Marx and Engels 1848; Hodges 1961).

We can understand the relative importance of the intermediate classes by looking at how Marx used them in his historical analysis. In describing the change from feudalism to capitalism, Marx portrayed the bourgeoisie as an intermediate class. With the application of an emerging science to the production process and the decline in economic importance of agriculture as the key source of surplus generation, the bourgeoisie replaced the nobility and landed aristocracy as the dominant class. As markets expanded and industrial production spread, the capitalist class, as owners and controllers of the new means of production, became the new elite (Wesolowski 1979).
Under earlier forms of capitalism, the primary intermediate class was composed of independent, small business owners - the petty bourgeoisie. This small class of traders and shopkeepers occupied a position between the exploiting capitalists and the exploited workers. As competitive capitalism underwent a transformation to a monopolistic or oligopolistic stage, the traditional petty bourgeoisie diminished in size. While this class continues to exist under monopoly capitalism, Marxist stratification researchers focus less on it and more on the relative expansion of the "new" intermediate class of managers and professional experts (Giddens 1973).

2.3 Summary

The above brief overview provides the foundation for the analysis in this study. For modern stratification researchers, both Marxist and non-Marxist, determining the class location of professionals and managers has proven to be an almost insurmountable task. Disagreement is rife as to what objective criterion can be used to define this group as a class and, as a consequence, how to theorize about the attitudes members adopt toward the workers below and the capitalists above. In essence, both the objective and subjective dimensions of class formation and expansion have posed difficulties which must be overcome so that stratification research does not stagnate. The remainder of this analysis is devoted to defining the objective, structural component of a "new" intermediate class of professionals and managers and attempts to determine whether such positions generate a distinct worldview.
3.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the issue of whether or not changes in the economy and social structure of the United States have generated a New Class of professional and expert employees whose worldview is different from the traditional working class. Although treatments of the "Expert New Class" are many and varied (owing, to a large extent, to the fact that speculations about the New Class issue from divergent paradigms), there is general agreement that it is composed of "knowledge workers" or "intellectuals" whose importance is increasing as capitalism expands. Hence, the creation of the Expert New Class is directly related to the spread of public universities and an increase in the proportion of the population which is college educated. Beyond this basic assertion, however, treatments of "intellectuals" as carriers of a distinct worldview share little in common.

In attempting to assess the impact that the changes in capitalism has on the future direction of class research, Dahrendorf (1959) highlights five features of "post-industrial" society which calls for a revision in the traditional class paradigm as articulated by Marx: 1) the decomposition of capital - the separation of economic ownership from control; 2) the decomposition of labor - the generation of skill based divisions within the working class; 3) the creation of a new middle class - a new class of bureaucratic managers has emerged which is increasing in importance in the economy; 4) increased rates of social mobility - recruitment to
the new middle class via advanced, university educations; and 5) the institutionalization of class conflict - class conflict is "contained" within bureaucracies and resolved through legitimate means rather than spilling over into society at large.

3.2 A New Class?

The term "New Class" was coined by Djilas in 1957 to describe the bureaucratic elite of communist Yugoslavia. Since then, a number of politicians and social scientists have employed the concept to describe the university educated segment of the class structure of advanced capitalist countries. Because of differences in both ideologies and disciplines, the present state of New Class research is muddled and inconsistent. To shed light on the problems generated by these inconsistencies, the historical development of this research will be discussed, with particular emphasis on treatments of "intellectuals" within sociology. I now turn to a brief account of how sociologists understand and explain the role of the intellectual in capitalist societies, concentrating on a number scholars whose writings continue to influence our current debates.

3.3 August Comte and the Role of the Sociologist

Comte's sociology contains statements not only about how society is to be understood and analyzed, but also about the role of the sociologists in directing these tasks. Writing as a positivist, Comte envisioned an emerging social order - a sociacracy - in which the sociologist, through the knowledge gained by the
application of scientific techniques to understand the social forces of change and stability, occupied a privileged position due to the possession of intellectual capital (Ritzer 1992).

While Comte's vision is regarded as extreme by present standards, his contribution is important because it provides the foundation for studying what Benda (1928) and others have labeled the "secular" intellectual. With the expansion of rational, scientific techniques to industry and economics, the purely "speculative", unattached intellectual is being rapidly replaced by a political and secular intellectual whose primary task is the application of ideas to the everyday workings and problems of his society. For both Comte and Benda, the modern intellectual is not an otherworldly aesthetic but a man of action.

3.4 Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge

Karl Mannheim, working from a "sociology of knowledge" perspective, portrays intellectuals as social actors who are bearers of a "synthesis" - an attempt to unify, in the Hegelian use of the term, the seemingly unconnected fragments of society into a meaningful totality. Stated differently, intellectuals attempt to construct a comprehensive paradigm from all the seemingly incommensurable, partial understandings of problems and potentials within society (Mannheim 1936:147-153). The connection between the desire for synthesis and the social position of the intellectual is a central theme in Mannheim's sociology (1939:163). Therefore

[if] it be granted that political thought is always bound up with a position in the social order, it is only consistent to suppose that the tendency towards a total
synthesis must be embodied in the will of some social group . . . the exponents of a synthesis have represented definite social strata, mainly classes who feel threatened from above and below and who, out of social necessity, take the middle ground.

Such a synthesis requires an openness to the dynamics of society and to notions of "totality." For Mannheim, history shows that this view is usually developed and disseminated by a "relatively classless stratum which is not too firmly situated in the social order" (Mannheim 1939:154). This group does not form a class in the Marxist sense of the term, nor are they aligned with any other existing class. In a heterogeneous context, intellectuals are unified by participation in a common educational heritage which progressively tends to suppress differences of birth, status, profession, and wealth and to unite the individual educated people on the basis of the education they have received (Mannheim 1939:155).

While a concept of class related to economics alone can never capture the essential character of this group as a whole, it "might describe correctly certain determinants and components of this unattached social body" (Mannheim 1939:155). Even though he avoids a systematic identification of where these synthesizers fit into the social structure, he does imply that it is possible to identify the structural locations which generate this vision of totality. However, to do justice to Mannheim, whatever strategy is employed must allow for the identification of structural determinants which lie outside of the traditional ownership - non-ownership dichotomy. Mannheim cautions that it is a mistake to assume that members of this class are conscious of their common interests just because they share similar educational backgrounds. Its cohesiveness as a class is
dependent upon its members' attempts to incorporate diverse positional insights into a unified totality. For Mannheim (1939:156-157),

there arises ... in the midst of society, which is being deeply divided by class cleavages, a stratum, which a sociology oriented solely in terms of class can only slightly comprehend. Nevertheless, the specific social position of this stratum can be adequately characterized. Although situated between classes it does not form a middle class ... [these] intellectuals, besides undoubtedly bearing the imprint of their specific class affinity, are also determined in their outlook by the intellectual medium which contains all those contradictory points of view.

For intellectuals every point of view is examined constantly to determine its relevance and contribution to a dynamic social totality (Mannheim 1939:157). In order to shape the world by putting their ideas into action, intellectuals have historically employed either of two strategies: "first, what amounts to a largely voluntary affiliation with one or the other antagonistic classes; second, scrutiny of their own social moorings and the quest for the fulfillment of their mission as the predestined advocate of intellectual interests of the whole" (Mannheim 1939:158). Using the first strategy, "free floating" intellectuals can attach themselves to any class which they consider to be in need of intellectual enlightenment and guidance. In this way, intellectuals operate in the interest of the social totality by making up for the deficiencies of one group and attempting to restore social harmony. The second strategy represents the development of class interests within the ranks of the intellectuals themselves - their own class consciousness based on their desire to create a social order in accord with their holistic picture of the world (Mannheim 1939:158-161). Thus, the ungroundedness and autonomy of intellectuals provides the condition for either their attachment to a specific class or the development of a
distinct class consciousness which is oriented to the social totality but does not find a direct correspondence in or affinities with any of the other social classes. These two possibilities for grounding - attachment to an already existing class or the formation of a new class - will be explored later in this study.

3.5 Antonio Gramsci and the Marxist Scenario

Are intellectuals an autonomous and independent social class or does every social class have its own specialized categories of intellectuals?

The first systematic Marxist treatment of intellectuals begins with the above inquiry by Antonio Gramsci (1957), one of the few early Marxists to confront the problem of the social role and class location of intellectuals. For Gramsci, capitalism (and the modes of production which preceded it) generates two distinct groupings of intellectuals. One group is generated within the ranks of the main social classes which compose a specific mode of production. These "organic intellectuals" give the social class to which they are attached a sense of homogeneity and consciousness. According to Gramsci, the capitalist is faced with the task of choosing officers and administrators who will create conditions favorable to the perpetuation and expansion of the capitalist system. Thus, the industrial expert, the lawyer, the political scientist - all these "specialists" occupy positions and engage in activities which support the economic and cultural conditions favorable to capitalist accumulation (Gramsci 1957:118). The second group consists of intellectuals who constituted a unique social stratum prior to the ascendance of the capitalist mode of production. This group preserved a historical continuity which was relatively undisturbed and uninterrupted prior to the
emergence of capitalism. The primary example of the latter were the ecclesiastics. Ecclesiastics monopolized philosophy, religious ideology, education and science under European feudalism and remained influential in those domains in spite of capitalist expansion. Although the ecclesiastics at first owed their privileged status to the feudal aristocracy for which they provided religious and political legitimacy, they eventually emerged as an "aristocracy of the robe" with many independent rights (Gramsci 1957:119-120).

These, then, are the two different types of intellectuals identified by Gramsci. To understand this division, we turn our attention to how Gramsci defined intellectuals and portrayed their role in society. As will be demonstrated later, Gramsci continues to have an important impact on attempts to determine which social classes intellectuals can potentially align with.

Gramsci next addresses the question of whether a uniform criterion can be established to determine the maximum limits for applying the term "intellectual." To validly attach this label, the researcher must examine the whole "complex of social relations in which these activities are to be found" (Gramsci 1957:120). While all men are intellectuals, not all men have the function of intellectuals in society. Gramsci thus offers a general functional criterion for determining whether the designation "intellectual" can be applied to a particular activity. Gramsci stresses that if we are going to argue that intellectuals are a new class, it must be shown that in applying their ideas to changing both social and physical reality, they are doing so from a new and integral conception of the world (Gramsci
1957:121-122). The new worldview represents the subjective dimension of class formation, provided that the conception serves as a foundation for concerted efforts to reshape society in its image. For Gramsci (1957:122),

"[t]he mode of existence of the new intellectual can no longer consist of eloquence, the external and momentary arousing of sentiments and passions, but must consist of being actively involved in practical life, as a builder, an organizer...[who] from technique-labor...reaches technique-science and the humanist historical conception, without which he remains a "specialist" and does not become a leader - specialist plus politician."

Thus, a group which begins as specialists serving the interests of capital, can, given the proper conditions for developing the ability to act in accord with a distinct worldview, become a "class for itself" with interests that may conflict with those of the capitalist who first gave it breath. In addition, Gramsci argues that once we have separated and identified the two different groups of intellectuals in society - those who are officers of the ruling class and preserve its hegemony and those whose worldview clashes with that of the dominant elite but who have interests distinct from the two great social classes - we can then examine the internal divisions within each group. At the highest level are the "creators" of science, art, and philosophy; at the lowest the "administrators" and distributors of already accumulated intellectual products (Gramsci 1957:125).

Gramsci’s ideas are important to contemporary Expert New Class analysts for a variety of reasons. First, he is one of the few early Marxists to attempt to discuss the role of intellectuals in a systematic way. Most Marxists direct their attention exclusively to the roles of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Second, Gramsci goes beyond the traditional view that intellectual administrators are merely
proxies for the capitalists. For Gramsci it is also important to understand the potential for intellectuals to become a distinct class within the capitalist mode of production. Third, given his stress on formal technical education as the objective basis of class formation, he anticipates modern Marxists whose approaches are based on the often unstated assumption that under advanced capitalism culture itself has become reified and fetishized to such a degree that knowledge can serve as a form of property.

3.6 Intellectuals in American Sociology

Most American speculations about intellectuals have stressed the growing importance of technological expertise and the potential conflict between the class of knowledge workers and the traditional owning class. Veblen (1921:23) argues that those gifted, trained, and experienced technicians who are now in possession of the requisite technical information and experience are the first and indispensable factor in the everyday work of carrying on the country's industry . . . it is a question whether the discretion and responsibility in the management of the country's industry shall pass from the financiers, who speak for the vested interests, to the technicians, who speak for the industrial system as a going concern.

Berle and Means (1932) seem to provide empirical support for the formation of an autonomous category of industrial managers and experts by calling attention to the growing divergence between ownership of the corporation, now dispersed among a multitude of stockholders, and those who actually control and operate it. These sentiments are later echoed by Dahrendorf (1959) when he discusses how the "decomposition of capital" (the separation of control from ownership) and the formation of a new class through the spread of mass higher education signals a
need to update Marx so that his concepts and ideas can be used to understand 
stratification and conflict in modern, post-industrial societies.

Another common theme in most American inquiries into the creation of a New 
Class of intellectuals is that the United States can no longer be viewed as a 
capitalist society. The leading spokesman for this position is Daniel Bell (1973). 
In his analysis of the U.S. as a post-industrial, knowledge oriented social system, 
Bell argues that the businessman and the industrial executive are rapidly being 
replaced by scientists and other "engineers" of the new intellectual knowledge. 
For Bell, the New Class is composed of scientific, technological, administrative, 
and cultural "estates." Its members are carriers of a technocratic worldview 
emphasizing the concept of "system" and a reliance on a disciplined, logical, 
calculating and instrumental approach to problem solving which is more often than 
not opposed to customary religious and intuitive modes. Several other scholars 
have followed Bell's when discussing and attempting to conceptualize the New 
Class. Moynihan (1976) views the New Class as emerging and expanding in direct 
response to the Welfare State's needs to service those segments of the population 
which have become, in effect, "wards of the state." Here, the self interest of the 
New Class in protecting its privileged position is merged with a concern for public 
welfare. Kristol (1975) argues that the New Class escapes rigorous definition but 
can be vaguely described as consisting of college educated people whose skills and 
vocations proliferate in post-industrial society and have little respect for the 
business community. Because of their expertise, they are able to exercise their
power by shaping public opinion. Podhoretz (1979) argues that the New Class, as carrier of an "adversarial culture," sees itself as part of the conscience constituency motivated by ideas and ideals about social justice. At the same time, however, its members are capable of ruthlessness in the pursuit of power, status, and wealth.

3.7 Summary

In sum, most contemporary research on the Expert New Class focuses on its "ideological" orientation and its attempts to act in the interests of the social good as opposed to supporting the interests of the traditional capitalists. At the same time, there is the perception that it attempts to secure its own advantages as an educated class of technical experts by monopolizing privileged positions at the apex of economic and political bureaucracies. The key shortcoming of each of these interpretations is that they stress the subjective, ideological dimension without first specifying those positions in the social structure which generate a unique New Class worldview. I will return to the problem of structure shortly.
STRUCTURAL INTERPRETATIONS: THE NEW MANAGERIAL CLASS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I discuss several strategies for determining the class location of the "knowledge" worker which are built on the assertion that structural location determines ideology. All concentrate on the objective foundation of class formation. They study the New Class using the assumption that advanced capitalism has created new structural positions which coalesce to form a "new" intermediate or middle class of managers.

4.2 "Structuralizing" the New Class

Determining the boundaries between an intermediate or New Class and the proletariat on one side and the bourgeoisie on the other has posed a "delineation" problem for contemporary Marxist and Weberian scholars (Wright 1980). This problem, in turn, has led to a variety of solutions. In her recent monograph, Howe (1992), in a manner similar to Wright (1980), has discussed several different theories which attempt to explain the economic, political, and ideological cohesiveness of the "new" intermediate class. What each of these share with the others is the assumption that organizational position and work place control have become sources of production which may be coequal with the ownership of the productive property discussed by Marx. They differ, however, in their interpretations of how this "new" form of property affects class placement and ideological cohesiveness.
4.3 Orthodox Marxists and the "New" Working Class

A common strategy employed by structural Marxists is to place intellectuals and managers within the ranks of an expanding, "new" working class. The majority of "orthodox" structural Marxists place technical, scientific, and professional employees in the working class. Braverman (1974) has argued that, irrespective of the fact that they may possess education credentials or manage the production process, mental laborers are merely higher paid members of the working class who are exploited in the same ways as members of the traditional working class are. As a consequence, these "new" working class researchers do not acknowledge intellectuals and managers as a distinct class with interests and attitudes significantly different from those of traditional workers. They are merely higher paid members of the proletariat.

This position has gained much support in recent decades. Edwards (1979), locates managers and supervisors in a "fractured" and "fragmented" working class. Using the relations between systems of control and a dual labor market, Edwards argues that "professionals," though they occupy a privileged labor market position, are, like their traditional working class counterparts, subject to control and exploitation in the work place. Similar stances have been adopted by Braverman (1974) and Oppenheimer (1973).

Anderson's (1974:171) discussion about why experts and managers fall into a "new" working class is one of the most thorough and influential. Anderson summarizes his argument as follows:
there are social and cultural differences within the working classes, particularly between the formally educated or new working class and the traditional factory work force. However, with rising educational and skill levels in the traditional working class, and the routinization of much professional and technical work, these two broad working strata are drawing closer together on many class and cultural dimensions of stratification. Although economic inequalities within the larger working class have been and may increasingly become a point of conflict and political contention, these differences do not have the character of class struggle or class animosity, nor should they have. The objective locus of struggle is, and to be effective must be, between propertied bourgeoisie and the propertyless proletariat - including both old and new working classes.

Anderson's "new" working class is composed of technicians, engineers, scientists, and the ideological employees in government, law, and the state.

Although working from a "structural" perspective, Anderson (1974) also includes a discussion of the subjective dimension of class in his analysis. He asserts that when sociopolitical issues are at the center of "new" working class research, empirical evidence shows no significant animosity between the "old" and "new" segments of the working class (1974:170),

The fact of the matter is that a very large segment of the blue-collar population would themselves have preferred to enter a white-collar career and the vast majority seek college educations for their children. And no convincing evidence exists that, on the whole, manual workers deny the legitimacy and right of upper-middle income groups to be where they are in the class structure nor are they the objects of blue-collar animosity or class hatred.

For Anderson, different political ideologies within the ranks of the working class are barriers to the generation of class cohesion and will ultimately thwart any potential for social change. For him, as for other "orthodox" Marxists, education may create ideological differences within the working class, but it does not replace ownership of the means of production as the central structural determinant of class
formation. Differences in education are not significant enough to place "knowledge workers" outside the proletariat.

In sum, orthodox Marxist scholars place "knowledge" workers in the proletariat because they are ultimately dependent on the capitalist for the wages which allow them to earn a living, they are exploited, they lack autonomy in the work place, and they participate, by applying their expertise to generate an economic surplus, in maintaining capitalism as a viable economic system. And while orthodox Marxists stress the fact that structural location shapes political ideology, they maintain that in spite of the fact that members of the expanding working class are in relative agreement on key social, political, and cultural issues, the modern working class may be ideologically fragmented due to educational differences among its members.

The central problem with the "new" working arguments is that they fail to account for changes in both the technical and social divisions of labor which accompanied the expansion of capitalism. They fail to acknowledge Marx's dictum that in advanced capitalist societies "knowledge has become a productive force."

The next group of theorists discussed attempt to incorporate both "authority" and "knowledge" as forms of property into their class models.

4.4 Milovan Djilas and the New Class

Modern New Class analysis begins with the work of Milovan Djilas (1957), the first social critic to develop and employ the term "New Class" in the 20th century. Djilas develops a historical analysis of the events leading up to and
following the communist takeover of Yugoslavia. The triumph of communism generated the growth of large scale bureaucracies. Although his critique is directed toward communism, it is applicable to advanced capitalist economies because both communism and capitalism depend upon bureaucratic organizations to fulfill their essential tasks. Djilas's critique allows us to understand the potential for social domination contained in positions at the top of these hierarchical structures. In essence, his analysis provides fertile ground for examining the possibility that a New Class of "controllers" will emerge as bureaucracies spread.

Within the communist system, property ownership takes the form of bureaucratic domination and provides the foundation for the creation of a new ruling and exploiting class whose ownership rights are exercised through the monopolistic control of national income and services (Djilas 1957:35). Although Djilas acknowledges the difficulty of identifying members of his New Class with conceptual precision, he states that (1957:39)

the New Class may be said to be made up of those who have special privileges and economic preference because of the administrative monopoly they hold.

He cautions, however, that the New Class cannot merely be equated with bureaucracy and bureaucrats, instead "only a special stratum of bureaucrats, those who are not administrative officials, make up the core of the governing bureaucracy . . ." (Djilas 1957:45). Thus, use of the concept is restricted to incumbents of top positions in administrative hierarchies. The New Class obtains its power from collective ownership which it controls and allocates for the well-being of the system as a whole. Class membership and class culture derive
from administration of the economy, the state, and humanitarian and leisure activities (Djilas 1957:45-46).

Although his analysis is directed toward a fuller understanding of the contradictions of communism, Djilas’s ideas have found wide acceptance within the ranks of New Class analysts in capitalist countries. The reason for this is Djilas’s emphasis on the role played by top level bureaucrats - the core of the New Class. Thus, his theory needs only minor adjustments before it can be applied to the U.S. and its growing population of bureaucratic managers.

4.5 Nicos Poulantzas and the "New" Petty Bourgeoisie

Another Marxist strategy is to paint intellectuals and managers as members of a "new" petty bourgeoisie. Poulantzas (1973a; 1975) argues that possessors of intellectual capital cannot be lumped with either the workers or the capitalist - they occupy an intermediate position between the two great classes. Poulantzas begins his analyses by asserting that classes, in the Marxist "relational" understanding of the concept, cannot be defined outside the class struggle. He attempts to show that classes in advanced capitalism are structurally determined at three levels: the economic, the ideological, and the political.

At the economic level, Poulantzas (1975) employs the distinction between productive and unproductive labor. The traditional working class consists of productive laborers who generate surplus. Intellectuals, because their labors do not directly contribute to surplus generation, cannot be included within the ranks of the working class. At the ideological level, Poulantzas relies on a distinction between
manual and mental labor. Intellectuals are separated from workers because workers produce surplus primarily through manual labor while the labor of intellectuals occurs in the realm of ideas. At the political level, Poulantzas distinguishes between supervised and supervisory activities. The work of intellectuals often involves either plans for or the direct supervision of manual, productive labor. As a consequence they do not share the same class location as workers. Thus, in the approach to intellectuals forwarded by Poulantzas, mental, unproductive, and supervisory actors represent a "new petty bourgeoisie" under advanced capitalism.

4.6 The Ehrenreichs and the PMC

Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich (1979), employing a somewhat different strategy, also attempt to portray intellectuals as a new class which emerged with the expansion of capitalism. Rather than relying on traditional Marxist categories, the Ehrenreichs label this group the Professional Managerial Class or PMC. The PMC constitutes a new intermediate class which is different from the capitalists, the workers, and the traditional petty bourgeoisie. The PMC consists of salaried mental laborers who do not own the means of production but whose major function within the capitalist mode of production is best described as the "reproduction" of class relations. Members of this new class have developed their own professional associations, an ideology of technocratic liberalism, and their own recruitment and training structures in the form of universities. While they may be dependent on the capitalists for their managerial positions, the Ehrenreichs argue that their
interests conflict with those of the capitalists because the capitalists thwart the
PMC's vision of a rational, technocratically organized society. However, while
they share with the workers an antipathy toward capitalist domination, they are at
odds with workers because of their objective role in reproducing and supporting
the exploitative relationship between capitalist and worker. Therefore, theirs is a
unique and expanding role in advanced capitalist societies.

4.7 Erik Olin Wright’s Contradictory Locations

A novel and controversial approach to the delineation problem was developed
by E.O. Wright (1979; 1980). Rather than forcing a fit between the new
intellectual and Marx’s traditional model, Wright, extending the ideas of Carchedi
(1977) and Poulantzas (1975), argues that intellectuals, as managers, occupy a
contradictory location between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Contradictory
locations are those that share characteristics with either the bourgeoisie or the
proletariat but are identical to neither of the two great classes. Intellectuals occupy
a contradictory location because, like workers, they are subject to capitalist
exploitation and domination. At the same time, however, they dominate and
supervise workers in the capitalist workplace and cannot be identified as working
class. Wright's strategy will be examined in detail later in this paper. His class
location map will be used to identify the structural locations of the New Class.

4.8 Summary of Marxist Interpretations

Although all of the researchers discussed above view their work as situated
within the Marxist paradigm, both their class definitions and their applications
differ markedly from traditional, orthodox Marxist approaches which focus solely
on class as determined by economic ownership. They do, however, share one
thing in common: all attempt to identify both the objective and subjective
dimensions of class formation. These dual dimensions of class analysis reflect
Marx's distinction between a "class in itself" and a "class for itself" (Bottomore
1965). Attention is now turned to non-Marxist interpretations of the role of
intellectuals in advanced societies.

4.9 Weberian and Neo-Weberian Strategies

Although the Marxists have enjoyed a virtual monopoly over theoretical
discussions about class, the Neo-Weberians have refined and extended Weber's
multi-dimensional approach to stratification and his analysis of bureaucracy to offer
their own insights into the role of the intellectual in advanced societies. Drawing
on Weber's cross cultural comparisons about the relationship between ideas and
social change, Neo-Weberian approaches both challenge Marx's basic assertions
and offer important insights about the New Class that signal a need for combining
and integrating the ideas of Marx and Weber.

For Weber, rationalization and the dominance of rational authority,
particularly as they find expression in bureaucratic organizations, are the defining
features of modern capitalism (Gerth and Mills 1946). Although Weber is often
imprecise about what rationalization is, he argues that it is closely related to the
"intellectualization" of certain segments of the social world. Intellectualization
means that there are no forces that can escape the individual's ability to understand
- one can, at least in principle, master all things. Rationalization is related to the expansion of technical means of calculation that allow us to understand and manipulate the world.

It is important to note that intellectualization and rationalization are not idealistic, disembodied social forces but are generated by a particular segment of society and applied by certain groups occupying a privileged position in the social structure. For example, in China, the literati is that segment to which members are recruited via education and it is this segment that Weber viewed as responsible for the rationalization of the Chinese administrative apparatus. In Western Europe, the Protestant Ethic which served as the moral foundation for the growth and spread of capitalism was generated within and disseminated by an educated, privileged clergy. Thus, for Weber, the educated, "intellectualized" segment of the population plays a central role on the stage of history. In addition, as rationalization and bureaucratization continue to spread, the number of people who pursue science as a vocation increases in response to the growing needs of bureaucracies to place highly qualified personnel in the offices where their skills are both needed and used.

Weber’s multi-dimensional approach to stratification can aid in our efforts to understand the role of the modern intellectual. Weber includes, in addition to the economic dimension (class), symbolic (status) and political (party) indicators in his analysis of stratification in capitalist society. While a full discussion of Weber is beyond the scope of this dissertation, his discussions of the class consequences of
"bureaucratization" and of "social closure," as elaborated by Dahrendorf (1959) and Parkin (1979), are important to our understanding of the New Class.

4.10 The New Class as a Managerial Class

The first Weberian structural placement strategy emphasizes the process by which new social spaces were created during the transition from competitive to monopoly capitalism. These theorists labor under the assumption that capitalism led to the generation and expansion of a new middle class of professionals, managers, and experts - in essence, those who control the "knowledge" that puts productive resources in action. Here, the emphasis is on "knowledge in action": managerial skills exercised downward to control occupants of subordinate positions in the workplace. This differs from the "knowledge as property" versions of New Class analysis in that these theorists emphasize the organizational and structural positions in which knowledge property is used.

4.11 Dahrendorf and Imperatively Coordinated Associations

Dahrendorf (1959) was one of the first sociologists to attempt to define the structural parameters of the "new middle class." Citing the decomposition of capital - the separation of ownership of the means of production from control of the means of production - as a central tendency in industrial societies, Dahrendorf argues that a "new class" of controllers has emerged and is expanding as their importance in the production process increases (1959:41-57). For Dahrendorf (1959:55),
it seems. . .that a fairly clear as well as significant line can be drawn between salaried employees who occupy positions that are part of a bureaucratic hierarchy and salaried employees in positions that are not.

Furthermore, Dahrendorf (1959:55) suggests that

ruling class theory applies without exception to the social position of bureaucrats, and working class theory equally generally to the social position of white collar workers.

According to Dahrendorf, bureaucrats participate in the exercise of authority over both the blue- and white-collar working class. They occupy top positions in bureaucratic organizations or "imperatively coordinated associations." They are members, in sum, of a "new" managerial class (1959:56).

Dahrendorf (1959:48-57) ends his discussion of the "new middle class" with a cautionary note. He argues that since the concept of class contains both objective and subjective dimensions, it is open to question whether managers form a class at all. While they may share common positions with regard to bureaucratic control, Dahrendorf argues that skill differences within the managerial ranks may present barriers to the development of a homogenous worldview. Instead, the "decomposition of capital" which gave rise to this strata may interact with the "decomposition of labor" - the skill differences which divide the traditional working class - to render this "new class" ideologically fragmented.

4.12 Aronowitz and the Managerial New Class

A similar treatment of the "Managerial" New Class is formulated by Aronowitz. According to Aronowitz (1979:230),

Bureaucratic domination has become a typical feature of all advanced capitalist countries. It is highlighted by the separation of administration/management
... from the performance of the everyday tasks of the organization.

Aronowitz envisions a bureaucratically dominated society in which there is a division between those who occupy positions of control and those who are excluded from such positions. He argues that it is a mistake to combine managerial and non-managerial employees within a single class because the former exercise power and control over the work of the latter. Included in his argument is the notion that expert, professional labor is becoming rapidly routinized and alienating, thus robbing experts of the one work based characteristic - autonomy - that is so often used in discussions about the creation of a "knowledge class (Aronowitz 1979:229).

4.13 Frank Parkin and Social Closure

Parkin (1979), like his Marxist counterparts, attempts to delineate the boundaries of the social stratum composed of professionals and managers. In an attempt to study Weber's "boundary problem," Parkin argues that we must understand how occupants of the middle layer use "exclusionary social closure" to protect themselves against encroachment from below (via educational credentials) and "usurpationary social closure" in an attempt to ascend to the positions of authority and control (application of their managerial expertise to economic and political problem solving). Use of "dual closure" separates members of this positively privileged propertyless class from the capitalists above and the workers below (Parkin 1979:89-109). These strategies are used to enhance the privileges and powers enjoyed by managers within bureaucratic organizations. Furthermore,
given Weber's predictions about the continuing spread of bureaucracies, this middle layer, because its members possess and apply scientific techniques to production, could very well replace the traditional capitalist class whose importance in the new social order may be on the decline.

4.14 Summary

As mentioned above, contemporary research into the possibility of the formation and persistence of a New Class can borrow form Weber in addition to Marx. From Marx, researchers must incorporate both the objective and subjective dimensions of class formation. In addition, Marx's concerns about the revolutionary role of classes in history is an important consideration. From Weber, researchers must attempt to understand how these "new class" intellectuals apply their ideas in a bureaucratic setting and how they employ social closure to protect their positions and to gain access to power.

Although the theorists discussed above differ in their arguments about how education affects class placement, all are clear about the importance of work place control in providing a possible condition for the generation of a New Class. Here, the New Class is a Managerial Class whose genesis coincided with the separation of ownership from control and the spread of bureaucratic domination within advanced capitalist societies. Education is a secondary factor which becomes important only when applied to managerial tasks.

Managerial New Class theorists come closest to preserving the basic Marxist class concerns while at the same time attempting to account for the impact of
"domination" as the foundation for a new property relation. They remain within the general parameters of a Marxist paradigm because: 1) their discussions of class formation are based on property ownership; 2) they view class in relational terms - controllers v. controlled; 3) class relations are conflictual; and 4) class conflict generates social change. As such, they offer a viable alternative to "subjectivist" interpretations where the relational and formation characteristics are down played.
5.1 Introduction

The preceding discussion highlighted the fact that New Class research is being conducted from a number of different paradigms. To aid in the interpreting the full scope of New Class analysis, I divided New Class theory into "subjectivist" approaches and "structuralist" approaches. In the former, emphasis is placed on education as a new form of property which creates a unique worldview among those who possess university credentials. In the latter, the emphasis is on the structural positions which permit knowledge to be exercised downward to control workers. For New Class research to expand, efforts must be made to integrate the two approaches. More time must be devoted to determining how structural positions, defined with reference to either education or bureaucratic control, generate a distinct New Class worldview. Attention is now turned to the work of Alvin Gouldner. Gouldner attempts, incorporating insights from both Marx and Weber, to explain the emergence of the New Class in relation to both ideological and structural changes within advanced capitalism.

5.2 Alvin Gouldner and Intellectuals

Gouldner's treatment of the emergence of a New Class in advanced capitalism received its most systematic expression in *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class* (1979). To concentrate on this work alone, however, diminishes the impact of Gouldner's contribution to both sociology and New Class theorizing. An examination of Gouldner's contributions to our understanding of the New Class
shows a remarkable consistency with his earlier treatments of the social role of sociologists and his later works on the social origins of Marxism. In this chapter I present an overview of Gouldner's sociology. This will allow us to understand both the formation of a worldview which distinguishes the New Class from other classes and the internal contradictions it generates.

5.3 The Crisis in Western Sociology

The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology (1970) is a seminal work in the subdiscipline usually referred to as the "sociology of knowledge." In it Gouldner argues that an understanding of the success or failure of social theories must be preceded by an analysis of the institutional context in which they emerge and the social role of the theorist who constructs them. To understand and use a theory, we must determine what assumptions about individuals and society guided the theorist (Gouldner 1970:3-19). Starting form this premise, Gouldner examines the central contradiction within sociology: the tension between academic sociology and Marxist sociology.

Academic sociologists view society as fundamentally sound and slowly maturing. Any resultant problems can be remedied by technical engineering (Gouldner 1970:21). Gouldner equates this vision of society with Parsonian Functionalism, the dominant theoretical perspective in sociology during the 1950's and early 1960's (Gouldner 1970:26). Parsonian functionalists occupied influential positions in academia. Most were bureaucratic experts who directed their energies toward non-economic social problems (Gouldner 1970:161). Their ideology of
"continuity and convergence" was well suited to professional and technical careers.

According to Gouldner (1970:20),

Academic sociology was developed in the United States by university academicians who were oriented toward the established middle class, and who sought pragmatically to reform rather than systematically rebel against the status quo.

Another feature of academic sociology is its assumption that the sociologist, like Mannheim's unattached intellectual, is autonomous. Autonomy is defined by Gouldner as the worldview of the academic sociologist - the assertion that sociology can be pursued entirely in terms of its own objective, technical standards, free from the influences of the surrounding society. For Gouldner (1970:55), the academic sociologist thinks of these as free technical decisions and of himself as acting in autonomous conformity with technical standards, rather than as a creature molded by social structure and culture.

This stance is paradoxical and contradictory. While the academic sociologist views his subjects as shaped by social forces, he pictures himself as outside the arena of, and hence unaffected by, the broader social context.

The second contradiction moving sociology toward a crisis is the coexistence of Academic sociology and Marxist sociology. Although these groups share a common sociological discourse, both their assumptions about society and their visions of the role of the sociologist differ markedly. Although Marxists share the vision that modern western society was indeed something "new" in history, they relate social problems to the conflicts generated by but not solvable within the capitalist framework. What is needed is a new form of social organization where
the problems that characterize capitalism would be solved because their source -
the capitalist mode of production - would be eliminated. According to Gouldner
(1970:22),
Marxism was born by unattached intelligentsia, by political groups and parties
oriented toward lower strata groups who were in rebellion against an emerging
bourgeois society that excluded them.

This critical line of demarcation between practitioners of an ostensibly
common discourse will find a more refined expression in his later discussion of
intellectuals. Members of the New Class of intellectuals will be divided between
those who adopt the technical language of a single paradigm and those whose
activities are yet to coalesce into a common problem solving strategy. Also, the
notion of autonomy from the larger social context will be critiqued using a "left
Hegelian" perspective. Thus, Western sociology, although representing an
academic discourse aimed at explaining the new society that was emerging in the
19th and 20th centuries, contains conflicting assumptions about social reality and
the role of the sociologist in interpreting and changing it. Academic sociologists
operate within a single dominant paradigm which supports the existing order.
Marxist sociologists, on the other hand, seek to transform the social structure.
These opposed interpretations reflect key differences in the social position of the
theorist - either firmly embedded in the institutional order or excluded and
somewhat unattached. These themes are extended in Gouldner's discussions about
the worldview of the New Class and the divisions within it.
5.4 Action and Synthesis

In *For Sociology* (1973), Gouldner provides more clues about the inner dynamics of the New Class, once again using the attitudes of social scientists in a way that anticipates what he will later characterize as the Culture of Critical Discourse. Here the reader is presented with a discussion of the concept of "totality." For Gouldner, the central problem facing sociology is interrelating ideas and action, theory and practice. To solve this problem, Gouldner advocates the creation of theoretical collectivities or organizations in which synthesis is the central task (Gouldner 1973:80). By engaging in praxis, putting their theoretical understanding into action, sociologists can play an emancipatory role and liberate reason from the social forces which cripple it. The social scientist must show his fellow men that they can exercise control over the forces which appear external and outside their domain of influence (Gouldner 1973:102).

Gouldner’s discussion of emancipation rests upon the assumption that social scientists, and other intellectuals, participate in a discourse generating a communal identity and consciousness which makes collective action both possible and potentially effective in bringing about social change. Knowledge, for Gouldner, is the product of a speech community created by men. It is mutually intelligible because it is based on shared experiences that allow them to use and construe their knowledge on the basis of shared meanings and expectations. Their commitment to a common language and the capacity to employ it practically defines them as a distinct community (Gouldner 1973:104). A willingness to wed theory and
practice endows them with the potential for either supporting and maintaining the status quo or creating conditions for the emergence of a new social order.

These arguments place Gouldner within a tradition whose origin can be traced to Comte and his positivist project. For Comte, sociology was a master discipline which could yield both an understanding of social stability and generate the knowledge needed for those who wanted to change society to conform to the dictates of reason and rationality. The modern social scientist, both for Comte and Gouldner, is the carrier of human emancipation and the guardian of a new society (Gouldner 1973:106-107). According to Gouldner (1973:144), this becomes possible because the sociologists works with a holistic perspective which permits an appreciation of society as a system, thus

the men coming together are not technicians hierarchically linked in a bureaucratic chain of command, with each working in isolation at his own specialized bit of research. They are, rather, scholars, in open and intense contact with others in his collective, each working on problems of his own choosing and as he pleases, but with the common commitment to understanding the concrete totality of modern society.

The social scientific intellectual is not an isolated specialist but a scholar working toward an integrated understanding of the social totality - the antithesis of the bureaucratic specialist whose view of the world extends no further than his office. Rather than practicing their discipline as isolated specialists, sociologists participate in a community whose members share both a common language and a commitment to use their knowledge for the social good. As such, sociologists are confronted with the tasks of ensuring their reproduction as an enlightened community and
entering into dialogue with others in their society in order to understand both
stability and point to the best methods for generating social change (Gouldner
1973:114).

Recognition of these dual needs - reproduction of intellectual culture and
interaction with the broader social context - will later be incorporated into
Gouldner's discussion of the contradictions created in the New Class when its
desire to protect its privileged status confronts its desire to be the representative for
universal social welfare.

For Gouldner, theory is a rational discourse about society which advances
interests in the world, knows the interests it advances, and provides an
extraordinary language for adjudicating conflicting truth claims (Gouldner
1973:116). Marxist and Academic sociologies are the primary examples. Such
concerns, however, can and will be extended to any intellectual enterprise.
Whether in sociology or in other disciplines, the creation and development of
theory is more likely to occur when theorists are related primarily to a diffuse
movement rather than a sharply bounded, loyalty demanding organization
(Gouldner 1973:118). Contained in this view is the implication that the scientific,
technocratic ideology has a created potential that was absent from the writings of
the early intellectuals whose views were suppressed when they did not support, or
posed a direct threat to the legitimacy of, restrictive political and religious
institutions.
To understand the ambiguous role of the intellectual it is necessary to mention briefly the dual orientation toward theory and practice that has been a feature of sociology since its inception in the nineteenth century. Social scientists have a vital interest in the future of society and the world. They also have an important role in generating and disseminating rational discourse and providing the social conditions favorable to the application of their ideas. One of the reasons that intellectuals form alliances with other social strata or classes is to abolish impediments to the spread and application of reason. Thus, when intellectuals align with or champion the causes of other segments of society, especially the working class, they are doing so to preserve their own interests. The theorist, according to Gouldner, often engages in political action in ways that bring him into conflict with established authority, political institutions and the dominant culture. And, above all, they attempt to use their knowledge and expertise to create conditions favorable for human emancipation and rational social organization (Gouldner 1973:119-121).

In sum, For Sociology (1973) represents a refined restatement of Gouldner’s earlier position in The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology (1970) and anticipates his discussions about the role of and contradictions within the ranks of the New Class. It must be stressed, however, that here Gouldner is much more prescriptive - pointing to the potential for social change and the responsibility social scientists must take as carriers of that potential. This last observation is crucial for understanding Gouldner’s claim that the New Class is a flawed universal class.
5.5 Ideology and Technology

In The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology (1976), Gouldner traces the emergence of an educated middle class which stands in a position of conflict between the capitalist class and the propertied middle class (the old petty bourgeoisie). Gouldner tacitly acknowledges that the increasing tendency within bureaucratic societies is a separation between ownership, located within the ranks of a relatively small bourgeoisie, and administration and control, the "property" of the educated middle class (1976:130-131). This however, is not his focal concern. Instead, he directs his discussion toward the conflict within the ranks of the middle class itself - between the propertied middle class and the educated middle class.

Gouldner argues that once the capitalist class established their hegemony, the propertied and educated segments of the middle class grew increasingly apart and hostile. The conflict emerged as education spread and the individual utilitarianism of the propertied middle class confronted the social utilitarianism of the educated middle class. Members of this growing scientific and humanistic segment sought to secure their privileges through the acquisition and monopolization of professional statuses. In keeping with their social utilitarian ideals, the emerging professions were dedicated primarily to the technical application of knowledge to solving a variety of social ills. These seminal Welfare State policies posed a threat to the individual utilitarian work ethic of the traditional petty bourgeoisie (Gouldner 1976:132).
Emerging from the initial efforts of the educated middle class to carve out their own occupational niche, the modern Welfare State has exacerbated these tensions. For Gouldner (1976:132-133),

[the Welfare State is . . . directly advantageous to the professional, educated sector of the middle class which can pursue careers as functionaries, staff experts, and servicers of the State. The Welfare State, then, constitutes itself as an alliance between the state apparatus . . . and the operations are financed by taxation costly to the propertied middle class, and thus more likely to be resisted by them.

Along with and because of their education, members of the educated middle class become a class both "in and for" themselves. Not only do they share in a new type of property, education, but they also develop their own culture of critical speech. This "grammar of rationality" is the shared ideology of a secular intelligentsia. It reflects a suspicion of motives and actions based on the traditional property rights of the bourgeoisie and the individualist, profit oriented utilitarianism of the propertied middle class. For Gouldner the new educated professional middle class stands in an antagonistic relation to both the bourgeoisie and the old middle class. In addition, it possesses a worldview which emphasizes the creation and implementation of programs that serve its own interest (Gouldner 1976:132-133).

Gouldner's concentration on the subjective or cultural dimension of classes are precursors of his treatment of New Class intellectuals as participants in a culture of critical discourse. Before moving on to an examination of intellectuals as a New Class it is necessary to take a brief look at Gouldner's discussion of the state of contemporary Marxism.
5.6 The Crisis in Marxism

Gouldner treats another group of intellectuals, the Marxists, in *The Two Marxisms* (1980). Here, just as he did for western sociology in the 1970's, Gouldner examines the contradictions inherent in Marxism. Gouldner (1980:14) argues that

Marxism has a nuclear contradiction and that this generates and recurrently reproduces at least two boundaried subsystems of elaborated theory . . . Scientific Marxism and Critical Marxism.

The contradictions are most evident in the ways members of each subsystem assess technology, culture, and politics.

Gouldner (1980:39) bases his division on the way members of each group view Marx's relationship with Hegel and Hegelian Dialectics. Critical Marxists conceive of Marxism as a critique rather than science; they stress the continuity between Marx and Hegel and . . . the young Marx's emphasis on alienation.

Critical Marxists are also less likely to have faith in the application of science and technology to bring about Marx's predictions for the future. Rather, theirs is best viewed as an approach which engages in a "humanistic" critique of the spread of rationalization and its impact on the survival of capitalism (Gouldner 1980:43).

The Scientific Marxists view the humanists' stance with suspicion. They base their analyses on the mature Marx of *Capital* rather than on the young writings characterized by the *Manuscripts* - the rigorous scientific analyst as opposed to the young philosopher - critic (Gouldner 1980:39). Here, science, technology, and Marxism are intimately linked. Technical expertise is wed with the means of
production to compete with capitalism and at the same time to accomplish Marx’s project (Gouldner 1980:42-43).

In addition to holding different views about the promise and the limitations of technical engineering, Critical Marxists and Scientific Marxists differ in their politics. These differences are "linked to Scientific Marxism’s stress upon instrumental measures and to Critical Marxism’s concern with ultimate values" (Gouldner 1980:44). To Gouldner, Scientific Marxists’ reliance on instrumental measures is translated into a great commitment to their party and rational political action to bring about their desired aims. As such, they risk losing touch with the emancipatory ends sought by socialism in order to protect the means - the organizational instrument - or, more precisely, the vanguard party. Critical Marxists, on the other hand, although not abandoning the party, identify more with socialism’s emancipatory ends. For the Critical Marxist there is always some way to exert pressure against the status quo, some way to hasten the revolution. For the Scientific Marxist, on the other hand, there are greater concerns about generating a scientific understanding of the present with the intent of orchestrating a program for building a future once the contradictions of capitalism reach crisis proportions (Gouldner 1980:45-46).

Gouldner’s critique of Marxism in The Two Marxisms, like his earlier treatment of western sociologists, contains several themes which are later incorporated into his examination of intellectuals and the New Class. First, although Marxists are linked as a group because they share a common discourse,
there are important differences within this knowledge community. Second, each camp differs in its reliance on and the faith it puts in science and technology to bring about Marx's predicted future. Finally, each differs in their views about both the content and the effectiveness of political action, especially in their acceptance of the communist vanguard and its party bureaucracy. I now turn my attention to the focal point of this study and to the culmination of Gouldner's sociological project: an interpretation and prediction about intellectuals as members of a New Class.

5.7 Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class

Gouldner's treatment of intellectuals as members of a New Class finds its most systematic expression in The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class (1979). In it, he argues that education has become a form of "cultural capital" which is displacing older forms of economic ownership as a key determinant of class. This section is an overview of Gouldner's theoretical discussion of intellectuals as a New Class.

The spread of mass higher education, expanding markets for new ideas, and the secularization of knowledge are the social forces that provided the seeds for the creation of a New Class within advanced capitalist societies. These coalesced to generate a rational ideology which permeated the social fabric and quickly undermined traditional bases of knowledge. Along with the spread of this rational/scientific worldview, the conditions were ripe for the emergence of a new category of knowledge producers - the intellectuals - whose common interests in
the application of expertise signalled, for Gouldner, the coming together of a once highly diverse group into a distinct class (1979:2-4).

To examine the genesis and actions of the New Class, Gouldner adopts what he labels a "left Hegelian" perspective which roots ideas in specific social groups and reflections of group interests. Gouldner argues that knowledge systems are important in generating social outcomes. Rather than viewing these "ideas" as free floating, disembodied essences, they are considered to be "the ideology of special social classes" (Gouldner 1979:5). Gouldner also, like Hegel, takes dissonance and contradiction as "natural" features of social reality. These contradictions are found within the ranks of the New Class as a response to social pressures from the outside (Gouldner 1979:5-6).

Gouldner begins his treatment of the New Class by reviewing and criticizing other discussions about the social role of the twentieth century intellectual. Here, Gouldner's attempt to incorporate other schemes demonstrates his desire to work within a larger tradition but at the same time to transcend its boundaries by offering a comprehensive, "totalizing" theory of his own. A brief description of these earlier conceptualizations allows us to understand the theoretical context in which Gouldner is working. It also highlights a common weakness in most speculations about the class placement of intellectuals - Gouldner's included - the tendency to define the New Class with reference to the ideas or knowledge they possess.
One set of treatments of the New Class paints its members as benign technocrats - a historical knowledge elite who use their powers in ways that guarantee the greater social good (Gouldner 1979:6). The exemplar for this view is Daniel Bell (1973) and his treatment of intellectuals in post-industrial society. For Bell, the class base shifted as the U.S. was transformed from an industrial society, in which ownership of productive property provided the objective conditions of class formation, to a post-industrial one, in which the objective bases of class formation have expanded to include technical expertise gained primarily through university education (1973:358). Scientists and researchers become the key actors in this new social scheme. Bell acknowledges, however, that in actual political situations, scientists are unlikely to engage in concerted action as one monolithic, cohesive group. Under these circumstances, scientists are likely to divide along different ideological lines (1973:359).

Bell defines class "not as a specific group of persons but a system that has institutionalized the ground rules for acquiring, holding, and transferring differential power and its attendant privileges" (1973:361). In the post-industrial social structure of the U.S., there are three modes of power and hence class formation. The first is inherited and entrepreneurial property. This is the historic mode of property which Marx and others considered to be the foundation for class formation. While this type remains important, it is no longer the central basis for the generation of classes. The second mode is political office and party affiliation. Bell fails to discuss this in detail but there are hints that in this mode, Weber’s
discussions of party as a dimension of stratification find modern expression. The third mode of placement, and the one that is becoming central, is technical skill acquired through specialized, advanced education. The rise of this power is associated with an increased, societal wide reliance on knowledge and technical planning in the military, politics, economy, and other sectors of the society (Bell 1973:361-362).

The coexistence of these three different modes of power make it difficult for researchers to speak with certainty about the social structure of post-industrial society because the three class forming power bases interpenetrate and overlap (Bell 1973:361). Bell acknowledges, however, that the increasing reliance on technology in society creates conditions favorable for the creation of a new technical and professional intelligentsia, composed of expert employees and managers. Even though members do not have the common interests sufficient for them to coalesce into a well defined, political class, they do share some important interests - namely applying their technical expertise to solve social problems and ensuring equality and open access to education (Bell 1973:362). Thus, the new intelligentsia represents a rational force in society which operates to bring about a more rational social order.

Other proponents of this "benign technocrat" view include Berle and Means (1932) and Galbraith (1967). The former point to the increasing importance of managers as opposed to owners while the latter emphasizes the increasing power of those whose technical expertise gives them a new type of power to oversee the
application of modern industrial technology (Gouldner 1979:6). While none talk specifically about these as a New Class, each acknowledges that education and rational work place control can be interpreted as "new" forms of property which endow possessors with a privileged position in the new social order.

Gouldner's critique of the "benign technocrat" position provides the starting point for his own analysis of the New Class. Gouldner argues that Berle and Means, Galbraith, and Bell ignore the egoistic pursuits of the New Class and the desire of the new intellectuals to pursue their own special interests. In addition, these approaches fail to deal adequately with the potentially hostile relationship between the intellectuals and the old, moneyed elites above them and the workers below. In other words, the benign technocrat position fails to do justice to either the relational qualities of class or the tendency of classes, once formed on the basis of property ownership, to act in the pursuit of their own interests rather in the well-being of society as a whole (Gouldner 1973). Gouldner's theory of the New Class is constructed, in part, to surmount these deficiencies.

A second strategy for dealing with the social location and social role of intellectuals is to view them not as benign technocrats but as a new elite. In this portrayal, intellectuals form a New Class on the basis of ownership of a "new" property - education - and use this property to exploit others. Building on Pareto (1935), advocates of this approach view New Class intellectuals as those who occupy positions at the apex of bureaucratic organizations and, as a consequence, are able to exercise a disproportionate amount of influence and control over others
in their particular social sphere. They compete against old propertied elites for control over key social resources and exploit those below who are subject to their commands and are excluded from their ranks because they lack the requisite "new" property (Gouldner 1979:6-7).

Gouldner argues that treatments of the New Class as intellectual elites are faulty for two basic reasons. First, this group differs from the old elite because they do not suffer the same limits on their power as the old capitalist class. While the old elites' powers derived from ownership of productive property alone, and while their actions were limited to protection of their property, the new intellectual elite can potentially align with any organization because their property rights could be protected no matter what political organization they favored and supported. Second, members of the intellectual elite, at least ostensibly, work on the behalf of all members of society. Thus, their exploitative actions are checked by their professed social concerns (Gouldner 1979:6-8).

The third set of ideas that has important implications for contemporary discussions of the New Class is Talcott Parsons’s treatment of intellectuals. For Parsons, the professions represent those occupations that would qualify for New Class status. Professionals serve as a moral corrective in advanced capitalism because they contain the potential for uplifting the "venal" interest in money making to one that expresses the social welfare of the group as a whole. Thus the ideal typical professional operates in the social interests using a basic norm of altruism as a guideline (Gouldner 1979:6-7).
According to Gouldner, Parsonian explanations suffer due to the contention that professionals are essentially altruistic and moralistic. Gouldner views the money of the old class and the education of the new as standing in a relation of potential conflict over how the economy and other segments in society should operate. In addition, each is ready to exploit the other, and those below in the ranks of the working class, to attain their own advantage. In this way, the professionals cash in on their credentials and the old class protects its profits against encroachment from the New Class. Neither, according to Gouldner, is a fundamentally moral kind of activity (Gouldner 1979:7).

Gouldner criticizes in order to transcend. Incorporating components of other New Class analyses, Gouldner (1979:1) defines the New Class as composed of intellectuals and technical intelligentsia - not the same - [who] enter into contention with groups already in control of the society’s economy.

Gouldner relies on the concept of "paradigm" in the Kuhnian sense (1970) to define the two divisions of the New Class. The technical intelligentsia "concentrate on work within the paradigm(s) of their discipline, exploring its inner symbolic space, extending its principles to new fields, fine tuning it" (Gouldner 1979:48). In contrast to the activities of the technical segment, humanistic intellectuals "are those whose fields of activity more commonly lack consensually validated paradigms, may have several competing paradigms, and ... do not take normal science with its single dominating paradigms the usual case" (Gouldner 1979:48-49).
Before analyzing these divisions in detail, it is necessary to understand what factors unify intellectuals to permit their designation as a New Class. For this, three inquiries are necessary: 1) what is the objective basis for New Class formation; 2) does the New Class possess a subjective, communal identity or cohesive worldview; and 3) how is the New Class related to other classes in the social structure?

Members of the New Class own cultural capital (Gouldner 1979:27). Cultural capital is acquired through investments in education. Gouldner envisions education in a specific and unique way. Although all members of society possess cultural capital, members of the New Class differ both quantitatively and qualitatively from others. Quantitatively, the New Class possesses "a relatively great stock of it, and a relatively larger part of its income derives from it." Qualitatively, "its culture is a special one." For Gouldner (1979:27),

the New Class of intellectuals and intelligentsia is distinguished by the fact that it is also a speech community. They speak a special linguistic variant, an elaborated linguistic variant . . . characterized by an orientation to a qualitatively special culture of speech: to the culture of careful and critical discourse (CCD).

For Gouldner, therefore, education and the culture of critical discourse (CCD) that it generates serve as the basic foundation for the New Class. Possession of an educational credential to compete on the market and derive income is the objective basis for the New Class. This is an important quantitative difference from other classes in the social structure. To determine whether the New Class is also a "class for itself," I turn to a discussion of the worldview that distinguishes it from
those outside its ranks. Before doing so, however, it is important to note that Gouldner conflates the objective and subjective dimensions when he argues that CCD is both a form of property and a worldview. I will return to this problem when I attempt to anchor Gouldner’s ideas in Wright’s (1985) class locations map.

The next question concerns the existence of a worldview which sets the New Class apart from other classes in society. For Gouldner (1979:73), the culture of the New Class is a shared ideology of the intellectuals and intelligentsia and is thus a shared ideology about discourse. Apart from and underlying the various technical languages (or sociolects) spoken by specialized professions, intellectuals and intelligentsia are commonly committed to a culture of critical discourse. Embedded in this CCD is the requirement that validity claims be adjudicated in reference to impersonal, rational criteria rather than by reliance on the societal position of the speaker. It thus "de-authorizes all speech grounded in traditional societal authority" (Gouldner 1979:28). When wedded with the ideology of professionalism, this class is able to claim that due to its general expertise in all social processes, it is technically and morally superior to the capitalists. While the capitalist is motivated by the profit motive and thus engages in irrational, exploitative practices, members of the New Class claim that they are applying technical skill with a concern for society at large (Gouldner 1979:19).

Closely tied to this objective, rational adjudication process is a second key element of the ideology of the New Class: autonomy. This desire for autonomy can be understood in two distinct, but closely related, ways. First, the autonomy
of the New Class is overtly political in nature. Here, autonomy allows the New Class to assert its independence from the political interests of the old business class. While the old business class pursues its profits, the New Class acts independently in pursuing ends which benefit the social whole rather than one particular interest group in society. It is, in sum, responsive to Welfare State policies designed to ameliorate social problems. Second, because of the cultural capital gained through education, members of the New Class view themselves as better equipped than the capitalist class to run the affairs of society or at least control their own work situation free from outside interference. New Class intellectuals seek to ensure their autonomy by relying on professionalism and credentialing as means of certifying their authority and autonomy (Gouldner 1979:27-37). According to Gouldner (1979:33-34),

the deepest structure in the culture and ideology of the New Class is their pride in their own autonomy . . . any authority that demands obedience or any tradition that demands conformity without reflection is experienced as a tyrannical violation of the self . . . autonomy or self-groundedness becomes one of the central ideals of modern intellectuals' notion of rationality . . . the stress on autonomy is the ideology of a stratum that is still subordinated to other groups whose limits it is striving to remove.

Through credentialing the New Class is able to restrict access. Through professionalization the New Class can justify its claims that it is technically and morally superior to the old business elite. Through autonomy it is able to control its work situations and put its ideas into action.

Another way in which CCD enhances New Class unity is that it operates in the same way as any other language - it structures reality so as to allow a common
perception of events to emerge. It also permits communication between and among members of the New Class. Through these networks members develop a feeling of solidarity (Gouldner 1979:29-31).

To summarize, Gouldner argues that cultural capital, acquired through advanced education, represents a new form of property and provides the objective foundation for the emergence of a New Class. This cultural capital foundation leads to the formation of a distinct New Class worldview in which autonomy is the central project of the New Class. Reliance on CCD legitimatizes the New Class’s efforts to increase their autonomy in the work place and their independence from the strictly monetary interests of the old business elite. How these characteristics of the culture of the New Class determine the ground rules for its relation to both the capitalists and the workers will be discussed in the next section.

5.8 Class Relations

Gouldner’s treatment of the New Class in ostensibly relational terms reaffirms his indebtedness to both Marx and Hegel whose use of the dialectic permitted them to understand the social world and its various components in fundamentally relational terms. Gouldner begins his discussion about class relations by highlighting the relational character of CCD - those who speak it and the others about whom they speak. According to Gouldner (1979:59),

CCD treats the relationship between those who speak it, and the others about whom they speak, as a relationship between the judges and the judged.

With this statement, we see that the CCD stands in a relationship of ideological domination to those below whenever intellectuals put their ideas into action.
To appreciate the implications of the above, we must understand the goals the New Class seeks. The New Class is engaged in action aimed at increasing its proportionate share of the national product, creating conditions conducive to increasing their autonomy, and producing and reproducing conditions favorable to each of these. To accomplish this the New Class is prepared to remove or restrict the profits of the old business elite (Gouldner 1979:19-20).

The relation between the old business elite and the New Class is a conflict between those who own the means of production and those who have possession of those means because they have the technical expertise to put those means into action and to insure their smooth operation (Gouldner 1979:12). While at first acting in ways favorable to the profit orientation of the old class, the New Class eventually becomes more aware of its own interests and comes to view the capitalist profit motive as an impediment to a smoothly operating, rationally organized economy. Further, the old class’s claims to legitimacy are based on the mere ownership of surplus producing property. This offends the New Class requirement that all truth claims be legitimated with reference to the standards of CCD - all must be defended with reference to their objective, rational features and outcomes. All authoritative claims are potentially open to challenge and it is often members of the New Class who challenge the truth claims of the old (Gouldner 1979:44-45). Property, as ownership of the means of production - the foundation of old class power, blocks the ascendance of the New Class because it proves a barrier to the organization of society based on rational principles (Gouldner
Finally, to achieve its ends, it is often willing to cultivate an alliance with the working class against the old elite (Gouldner 1979:17).

Although the New Class can potentially align itself with the workers, there are significant differences between it and the working class. Like the working class, the New Class relies on wages paid by the old business class as a source of income. However, it is unlike the working class in that its wages are based upon the application of technical skills in the work place which are gained through the acquisition of education as cultural capital. This further separates them from workers because they also possess the potential for autonomy in the application of their ideas (Gouldner 1979:20). Furthermore, members of the New Class are usually exercising direct control, as technical experts, over workers in the work place (Gouldner 1979:12-13).

Given the above, Gouldner (1979:20-21) argues that the New Class is truly new:

it is neither identical to the old working class nor the old moneyed class; while sharing elements of both, it also has characteristics possessed by neither . . . [I]ike the working class, the New Class earns its living through its labor in a wage system; but unlike the old working class, it is basically committed to controlling the content of its work and its work environment . . . neither is it the old bourgeoisie . . . [but] a new cultural bourgeoisie whose capital is not its money but its control over valuable cultures.

To appreciate the above treatment, and to round out my discussion of the New Class, the next section is devoted to Gouldner’s claim that the New Class must be viewed as a "flawed" universal class (Gouldner 1979:7). The two divisions of the New Class will also be discussed. I will demonstrate later how Gouldner’s
discussion of the New Class as "flawed" parallels Wright's (1980) discussion of "contradictory" class locations.

To understand Gouldner's argument that the New Class is a flawed universal class it is necessary to return once again to his Hegelian roots. Hegel's discussions of the state include a treatment of the three estates which compose it: the peasantry, the commercial class, and the universal class of public servants (Avineri 1972:106-107). Hegel's universal class is the only class in society whose principal concern is knowledge and includes civil servants, teachers, doctors, and lawyers. Its primary role is to mediate the particular interests of the other classes and the generation of a notion of totality as the transcendence of all particular interests (Avineri 1972:108).

Building on Hegel, Gouldner argues that the New Class contains the promise of human emancipation within contemporary society. CCD is an ideology which predisposes the New Class to apply its expert knowledge to the problems encountered by all groups within society. By emphasizing education, the New Class places a premium on understanding issues in relation to their objective content rather than in terms of any specific, class based special interest. It possesses no desire to either block the evolution of the means of production or to use them exclusively for their profitability. The New Class is also opposed to censorship, it tends to be cosmopolitan and open to new ideas, and favors social programs that ameliorate the injustices caused by traditional capitalist domination (Gouldner 1979:83-89).
The universality of the New Class tends is most evident when it approves of and adds legitimacy to various Welfare State policies (Gouldner 1979:18-19). Here, their education and the social roles they play orient them toward and express an obligation to the collectivity (Gouldner 1979:65). The New Class views itself as the embodiment of social justice and social welfare - through its struggles against the profit oriented, old elite it perceives its actions as paving the way for a more humane social order based upon the requisites of rationality as opposed to profitability (Gouldner 1979:85-87).

Throughout his work, Gouldner stresses that the New Class is pitted against the old class for control of society. Because of this, Gouldner argues that the New Class often uses Welfare State strategies to its own advantage and as a consequence is in part an elitist, self interested group. I turn now to a brief presentation of this feature of the argument.

To shed light on the "flawed" nature of this universal class, it is necessary to turn briefly to Marx and his discussions about the relation between class and ideology as presented in The German Ideology (1981:65-66). According to Marx, each new class which puts itself in the place of the one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society . . . it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones.

Following a similar line of reasoning, Gouldner argues that by criticizing the old elites, the New Class is laying the groundwork for a new domination. Although it begins its quest by presenting its interests as representative of the
interests of all who are subject to the domination of the old elite, it is, in reality, attempting to subject all social processes to the ostensibly rational dictates of CCD. As such, the New Class is the nucleus of a new domination by possessors of cultural capital. Its overemphasis on rationality can eventually inhibit emotion, play, and passion in service to the domination of rational, objective truth. It is flawed due to its paradoxical tendencies toward both emancipation and elitism (Gouldner 1979:83-84).

Gouldner affirms that position within bureaucracy, whether one controls or "possesses" the means of production, leads to an internal fragmentation of the New Class. He portrays the conflict between the New Class and the old classes as "a contest for control over the machinery of production and administration . . . a contest between the class which has legal ownership of the mode of production and the class whose technical knowledge increasingly gives it effective possession of the mode of production," (Gouldner 1979:12). Paraphrased, this is a restatement of the nearly century old argument about the separation of ownership from control and the tensions it generates. It also serves as the foundation for Gouldner's assertion that the New Class could conceivably become a new ruling elite as its influence, via bureaucratic control, spreads throughout various institutional sectors (1979:14-15).

This separation also renders experts and intellectuals truly a "new" and "contradictory" class. For Gouldner (1979:20), as for Wright, the New Class is a new class: it is neither identical to the old working class nor the old moneyed class; while sharing elements of both, it also has
characteristics possessed by neither. Like the working class, the New Class earns its living through its labor in a wage system; but unlike the old working class, it is basically committed to controlling the content of its work and its work environment.

In sum, the New Class owns cultural capital (education), exploits workers in the workplace (via possession of organizational assets), and ultimately helps the capitalists legitimate the prevailing mode of production as modern and scientific (Gouldner 1979:12). It must be emphasized, however, that the New Class is "contradictory" and "flawed" in its allegiance with the old classes, both capitalist and proletariat (Gouldner 1979:17),

[one basic strategy of the New Class is to cultivate an alliance with the mass working class . . . to sharpen the conflict between that mass and the old class, and to direct that alliance against the old class and its hegemonic position. Furthermore, for Gouldner (1979:20),

[the] New Class . . . embodies any future hope of working class self management and prefigures the release from alienated labor.

In spite of a predicted allegiance between the old working class and the New Class on some issues, its structural situation is one in which the New Class exploits workers in the same way as the capitalist did prior to the decomposition of capital in most institutional settings. Within these institutions, "the New Class manage[s] the means of production and administration," (Gouldner 1979:49). Further (1979:52-53),

[if] the technical sub-elite of the New Class have the makings of a benign elite, they nonetheless remain an elite. They have no intention of instituting a social order in which all are equal regardless of their cultural capital. Contributing to the increase of the social surplus by the increased productivity of their cultural capital they do not tolerate "workers' control" and they do not believe in equality.
Once again, Gouldner’s argument about the relationship between the "old" classes and the New Class is conceptually close to Wright’s stance that positions within the New Class are contradictory.

Although CCD unifies the New Class, there are two important subdivisions identified by Gouldner. Although both are committed to and share in a common CCD, and both reject the ideology of the capitalist class, they do so in different settings, to different degrees, and in different ways (Gouldner 1979:48).

The technical intelligentsia is that component whose intellectual interests are fundamentally technical and are aimed at elaborating the dominant paradigm within their specific field (Gouldner 1979:48). Members of this segment "manage the new means of production and administration; they also acquire at-hand control over the new means of communication and of violence" (Gouldner 1979:49). They are usually found at the apex of bureaucratic organizations, both public and private, which have been increasingly scientized and therefore increasingly reliant on the intelligentsia’s expertise to ensure the smooth functioning of the organization (Gouldner 1979:50).

Although these experts are managing bureaucracies, Gouldner argues that it is a mistake to compare them to old line bureaucrats. Unlike them, members of the intelligentsia have more cultural capital and more technical skills. They also have much more mobility between bureaucracies since CCD is not specific like the knowledge of the old line bureaucrats. Furthermore, the intelligentsia, as managerial experts, control members of the bureaucratic working class. This
relation reinforces the tendency for the New Class intelligentsia to establish and maintain a distance between them and the ordinary workers. In this respect Gouldner has noted that intellectuals preserve their elite status and favor an expert non-expert division of labor as a rational basis for inequality (Gouldner 1979:49-53).

While the technical intelligentsia represent the elitist tendency in the New Class, the "humanistic intellectuals," the second of the two divisions, may be closer to exhibiting truly universal concerns. Humanistic intellectuals are characterized, in part, by their lack of a dominant disciplinary paradigm. Rather than being exclusively technical and scientific in their orientation, humanistic intellectuals tend to be much more critical and hermeneutic. Whereas members of the intelligentsia seek to distance themselves from and control workers, humanistic intellectuals tend to be more sympathetic to the working class and favor more egalitarian relations such as the establishment of conditions that allow workers to control their work environments. Although both factions of the New Class are alienated due to their blocked ascendance, the intellectuals are more alienated because they are more often excluded from positions of control where they can apply their technical skills and their status erodes as the reliance on science and technology increases. The gap between their cultural capital and their ability to use it increases as capitalism and bureaucratization advance (Gouldner 1979:48-49).
The New Class is thus a flawed universal class because of both external and internal contradictions. Externally, even though it ostensibly represents social welfare and equality, its efforts to ascend to power make it hostile to true equality and therefore its members engage in a variety of strategies to protect their elite positions. Internally it is divided into two different components, each with its own interests and each playing a different role in society.
6.1 Introduction

One of my central tasks, and a necessary one before we can speculate about the political-economic worldview of the New Class, is to identify its structural location. To analyze the New Class and its worldview, we must first define its structural determinant ("class in itself"). When this is accomplished we can ask questions about whether or not it has attained ideological cohesiveness ("class in itself") and whether it reinforces the interests of the status quo or represents the potential for revolutionary social change. To identify the structural foundation of the "New Class," I will incorporate insights from the structural class models discussed above.

6.2 A Problem

Given Gouldner's Hegelianism, it is no surprise that he neglects a systematic discussion of the structural determinant and location of the New Class. This same limitation led Marx to reject Hegelian Idealism in favor of a materialist conception of history and class formation. The notion that a determination of class structure precede discussions of class consciousness is the foundation for any sociology practiced from within the "social facts" paradigm, both non-Marxist and Marxist varieties (Ritzer 1983). This section is devoted to defining "structure" as it is used in sociology. In addition, I will argue that a structural dimension must be incorporated into Gouldner's theory before speculating about the content of a New Class worldview.
Sociologists understand social structure as a system of social relations among differentiated parts of a society or group (Blau 1977). Structure therefore represents a system of objective relations which impart their relational properties to individuals whom they preexist and survive (Bourdieu 1973). Structure does not consist of individuals but expresses the sum of interrelations in which individuals stand with respect to one another. These relationships have a material character which is largely independent of individual control or conscious action. In addition, structuralists do not assume that individuals are logical or non-logical, rational or non-rational per se. They see logic and rationality as properties of social systems, not as characteristics of individuals. The structuralist views forms of social organization as being of critical importance in sustaining or transforming a particular system of ideas (Mayhew 1980). These assertions have important implications for the analysis of New Class theory.

I argue here that an identification of the structural locations which generate New Class attitudes is an essential step in understanding the role and ideologies of experts and managers in capitalist America. Failing to situate the ideological worldview of the New Class on a structural foundation hampers any attempt to understand how this class is related to either the old economic elite or the traditional working class. Furthermore, it obfuscates attempts to understand either the formation of the New Class or the historical role it plays in preserving or upsetting the capitalist system.
One persistent difficulty encountered when we attempt to expand our understanding of the New Class is the confusion generated by the tendency to confine most New Class theories to the ideological, subjective dimension as opposed to the objective, structural dimensions of New Class formation and dynamics. New Class theory is "suspended" in the realm of ideas - it has yet to be anchored in the objective relations between parts of the social structure. The aim of this chapter is to anchor Gouldner's New Class theory in the structural locations class map developed by Wright (1985).

The requirement that an identification of class locations must precede discussions of subjective, class ideologies is highlighted by Szymanski (1983:628) in his critique of both Marxian and mainstream sociological "subjectivist" conceptualizations of class, subjectivist conceptualizations of class suffer from the inability to understand where class consciousness, shared class beliefs and identifications, or prestige comes from . . . [by] taking classes as more or less given by their ideas and behavior, such approaches mystify the processes of class formation and transformation, thereby obscuring rather than clarifying the social forces at work in generating class structure (as well as the future transformation of classes).

6.3 Specifying the Structural Position of the New Class

Several issues are raised when attempting to determine the location of the New Class in the social structure of Capitalist America and serve as a framework for the remainder of this analysis. The first issue involves identifying the broadest possible objective basis for New Class formation. In the present study, university education serves as one possible foundation along the lines suggested by Gouldner.
Organization position serves as the other following the rationale of Dahrendorf (1959) and Aronowitz (1979). Once the objective dimension is identified, the next issue is whether the New Class possesses a distinct view of the world. To resolve this issue, several attitude variables will be examined, specifically those dealing with the capitalist economy and solutions for social problems in the United States. In addition, to determine the magnitude of the difference between the New Class and the traditional working class below, New Class attitudes will be compared to those of the working class. They will also be compared, albeit indirectly, to those of the capitalist class. The third set of issues is whether the New Class contains internal contradictions. To examine the contention that the New Class is composed of both Humanistic Intellectuals and a Technical Intelligentsia, an inquiry will be made into whether the New Class is internally divided based on differing degrees of authority within bureaucratic settings.

To resolve the above issues, it is first necessary to discuss the class locations map constructed by Erik Olin Wright (1985) in which education and organization dimensions are included as factors in the class formation process. In other words, my analysis of the ideology of the New Class will be preceded by a determination of its location in the social structure of American capitalist society.

My rationale for structuring my research design this way is twofold. First, New Class theorists often direct their attention to delimiting the "ideological" boundary between the New Class and the traditional working class before identifying its structural location (Brint 1984). As such, their endeavors have
important implications for answering the questions I raise about the relation between social class and the development of a distinct, cohesive worldview.

Second, because many researchers conflate the effects of educational property and organization property, they fail to specify which is the most important for class formation and action. By dividing my discussion into tests of "expert" theories and tests of "managerial" theories, I hope to lend clarity to this debate.

6.4 Erik Olin Wright's Class Models

The work of Erik Olin Wright can be interpreted as an exercise in "demystification." Mapping the class structures of advanced capitalist societies is his central task. For Wright, "classes are defined as common positions within the social relations of production, where production is analyzed above all as a system of exploitation" (1979:17). Further, for Wright (1985:9-10),

class structure refers to the structure of social relations into which individuals . . . enter which determine their class interests . . . [t]he point to emphasize here is that class structure defines a set of empty places or positions filled by individuals or families.

Wright (1985:144-145) is emphatic in defending the position that class position shapes class interests,

Class location is a basic determinant of the matrix of objective possibilities faced by individuals, the real alternatives people face . . . one's location within the structure of class relations is an important mechanism determining forms of consciousness ... class locations objectively structure the interests of actors.

Before proceeding, it must be noted that Wright is not alone in his efforts to map the class structure of advanced capitalist society. His scheme, however, is the most inclusive and extensive. Like most structuralists who modify traditional class
models to account for the productive changes which have occurred over the last century, Wright attempts to identify the class positions of technical experts, managers, and professionals before speculating about their ideological cohesiveness. Although members of these diverse occupations are similar because they possess advanced education or credentials, Wright, unlike Gouldner and other "subjectivist" class theorists, refuses to assume that common consciousness automatically arises from "ownership" of university diplomas or positions within bureaucracies.

The problems posed by possession of advanced educations and the separation of economic ownership from workplace control have played pivotal roles in the generation of the contemporary class schemes discussed so far in this dissertation. How does education affect an individual's class placement? Does it displace economic ownership or does it interact with it in such a way that "new" classes are created? Does a diploma guarantee access to a higher class position? Does occupancy of a position of domination in the workplace assume the form of property? Can one's position in the hierarchy of bureaucratic control translate into class consequences? Different theories yield different answers.

6.5 The New Class as a Contradictory Class

In his critique of the approaches discussed above, Wright (1980; 1985) argues that employees whose primary role in the economy is the control of both knowledge and other workers occupy "contradictory locations" between the major classes. They are contradictory relations "in the sense that they are simultaneously
in more than one class; their interests are internally incompatible combinations of the interests of different classes" (Wright 1979:41).

Using economic ownership, authority, and job autonomy as class defining criteria, Wright (1979) argues that knowledge possessors and controllers fall outside the working class because the former, by applying their expertise to the production process, participate with capitalists in controlling the work place. However, in spite of possessing "knowledge as property" and enjoying work place autonomy and control, they are not coequal with the capitalists because they remain wage earners and are ultimately dependent on capitalists to make a living. Thus, for Wright, knowledge producers and controllers occupy structural locations which are objectively torn between worker and owner.

According to Wright (1979), the most intensely contradictory locations between the capitalist class and the working class are occupied by managers and experts. Managers are in control of the production process and other employees. Experts are imbedded within the hierarchy and may have some control over their own work but do not control the productive process. Both have "one foot in the bourgeoisie and one foot in the proletariat," (Wright 1979:44). For Wright, their contradictory nature makes it difficult to predict whether they will align with the capitalists or the workers.

By extending Wright's reasoning to the subjective realm of class analysis, I expect to find little or no ideological cohesion among employees occupying
"contradictory" structural locations. Instead, such locations should produce contradictory ideological orientations among their occupants.

6.6 Class Exploitation

In response to a number of criticisms of his earlier model, Wright (1985) reconceptualized his approach and substituted "exploitation" for "domination."

Wright has developed a typology of social classes which incorporates three distinct class defining dimensions: economic ownership, organization assets, and skill assets.

Wright (1985) begins with four assumptions that differentiate his model from other Marxist and non-Marxist ones. The assumptions built into the model are: (1) classes are positions (not individuals); (2) classes are viewed in relational as opposed to gradational terms; (3) there is an intrinsic antagonism between classes; and (4) this antagonism is rooted within the productive relations of advanced capitalism.

Within this frame of reference, Wright (1985:77) constructs a model of the class structure of post-industrial, monopoly capitalist society that stresses exploitation - "the economically oppressive appropriation of the . . . labor of one class by another." In his conceptualization, Wright begins with Marx’s primary criterion for dividing society into two great classes - the ownership of productive resources. The "owner" classes include the bourgeoisie, small employers, and the petty bourgeoisie. The "non-owner" classes are subdivided based on two other forms of exploitation. The first of these is organization assets (control over the
technical division of labor) that enable those who exercise control in the work place to make claims on the social surplus generated by workers; the second is exploitation based on the possession of skills/credentials that are used to increase the efficiency and production of workers. Here, both organization assets and skill assets are viewed as "secondary" forms of exploitation. The addition of these two criteria generates nine non-owner class categories.

Economic ownership is the major dimension of exploitation and domination within capitalism and creates a primary division between owners and non-owners of the means of production. This is the central dimension in both Marxist and non-Marxist treatments of classes in capitalist societies (Wright 1985).

Organization assets are included to identify pivotal lines of demarcation in the technical division of labor. An unequal distribution of this asset takes the form of hierarchical control and reflects the ability or inability to exploit other workers in the work place (Wright 1985:80). This is an important dimension to include when studying the New Class, especially the potential divisions within it. In addition, the incorporation of an "organization" dimension allows us to assess the impact of work place domination, an alternative "new" property, in providing the objective formation of the Managerial New Class and the generation of a distinct worldview.

Along these lines, Edwards (1979) has demonstrated that the segment of the labor market that supplies bureaucratic organizations with technical experts has characteristics that differentiate it from other segments, specifically in relation to increased compensation for the possession of educational credentials. While
education continues to play a pivotal role in the class formation process, Edwards, like Poulantzas combines education with organizational domination to speculate about the potential emergence of a distinct class of controllers.

The skill asset is included to help uncover the class consequences of the structural division between skilled and unskilled, credentialed and non-credentialed employees (Wright 1985:66). Including this structural dimension allows researchers to identify the location of the Expert New Class and the generation of a distinct worldview. In reference to skill based divisions, Bowles and Gintis (1976) have demonstrated the importance of understanding how the structure of education is reflected in and is a reflection of class positions. This has direct repercussions for the acquisition of technical expertise and recruitment into positions of control which usually accompanies it.

This particular feature of Wright’s model (his addition of organization assets and skill/credential assets to the more traditional economic ownership variable) makes it particularly useful for New Class research for several reasons. First, because the New Class is defined by Gouldner and others as the possessors of higher education, Wright’s model allows us to determine whether the structural locations defined by possession of skill assets and skill based exploitation generate a unique Expert New Class worldview. Second, the inclusion of organizational assets as work place control permits Managerial New Class researchers to identify a set of alternative positions which could lead to the development of a coherent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Managers</th>
<th>Semi-Credentialed Managers</th>
<th>Uncredentialed Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Supervisors</td>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Supervisors</td>
<td>Uncredentialed Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Non-Managers</td>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Non-Managers</td>
<td>Uncredentialed Non-Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Wright's Employee Cells (Wright 1985)
intellectuals' emphases on "knowledge in action in processes of production and worldview. Since Poulantzas, the Ehrenreichs, and Gouldner all stress intellectuals' emphases on "knowledge in action in processes of production and administration", they implicitly conflate the effects of education and management in the work place. Wright's scheme, because it uses skill assets and organization assets as separate determinants of class, allows for a clearer assessment of the relative impact of each of these secondary forms of exploitation. Third, we can use each of the secondary forms to determine the extent to which the New Class, however defined, is homogenous or heterogenous. This is an important consideration to take into account when attempting to resolve the debate about whether professionals and experts are a cohesive New Class whose members share a common worldview. To what extent do their attitudes converge and to what extent do they differ from both blue and white collar workers? Fourth, because Wright's exploitation approach contains traces of his earlier "contradictory locations" framework, especially as it applies to non-owners who possess organization and skill assets, it permits New Class researchers to use these "structural" ambiguities to explain why the New Class is ideologically cohesive or ideologically fragmented.

Since I adopt the basic assertion that structural position shapes ideological orientation, it is expected that the contradictory locations that define the New Class will generate an inconsistent, fragmented cultural and political-economic ideology. Recall that this interpretation is rooted in Marx's discussion of the
"intermediate classes" - transitional classes within a particular society in that they are either rising to prominence or decreasing in importance (Hodges 1961). Only then did it cease to be an intermediate class. Under advanced capitalism the concept "intermediate class" applies to technical and professional occupations (Wesolowski 1979). For Gouldner and others the New Class is an intermediate one which is becoming more important as capitalism advances.

Anchoring discussions of the New Class in a structural model is important for several reasons. First, Wright begins with the basic assertion that class analysis must begin by identifying the structural determinants of class formation. These structural determinants can be ownership of a variety to types of property: ownership of the means of production, educational credentials or skills, and organizational control assets. Second, Wright attempts to deal with the interaction between technical expertise and organizational control. Third, and in a related way, these two "new" forms of property are used to speculate about the objective formation of a "new" class whose relation to both workers and the capitalist system is ambiguous and contradictory.

The impact of the above observations is important to New Class theory. While Gouldner's and other "subjectivist" treatments of the New Class are centered around the formation of a distinct New Class worldview, Wright provides a way to anchor the New Class worldview in specific structural locations within the system of capitalist class relations. It also allows us to assess empirically the contributions
of Managerial New Class theory because of the inclusion of the organization asset dimension. This enables us to bring New Class theory down to earth.

6.9 A Further Complication: Sector of Employment

One persistent criticism of New Class theory and the Neo-Marxist approaches discussed above is the failure to account for the potential class differences between state and private sector employees. For Cohen and Howard (1979:84),

[t]he failure to distinguish between technicians, managers . . . and state employees of all sorts can be traced to the concept of monopoly capitalism. It leads to the erroneous conclusion that all these groups share a class interest because they exercise control over the working class . . . the political relation between civil servants and the state takes precedence over the fact that, like managers and corporate technicians, these mental workers receive a salary.

For Cohen and Howard, state employees are not exploited nor do they generate surplus in the way managers and experts indirectly do. Instead, theirs is a kind of domination over the consumers of state services (1979:84-85).

Wright (1985) also introduces sector of employment as a possible complicating factor in his class locations model. He acknowledges that there is an essential difference between state managers and experts and their counterpart in the corporate or private sector. State sector employees "embody a principle of class organization which is quite distinct from capitalism and which potentially poses an alternative to capitalist relations," (1985:89). In the state sector, managers are less likely to have their fortunes tied to the capitalist class. He acknowledges, however that it is difficult to determine the extent that state employment influences class location because many private corporations have interests tied directly to the state.
By extension, employees of those corporations may have interests closely tied to the state.

Gouldner mentions, but does not highlight the differences between private sector and state intellectuals. He does imply, however, that humanistic intellectuals, because they favor Welfare State interventions, will align their interests with the interests of the state. It should be noted that this is not used to subdivide the New Class because Gouldner is working from the position that university education is the central determinant of the New Class.

Because of the possibility that sector of employment can impact the development of a New Class worldview, it will be included in the empirical analyses of this study. The rationale is that since New Class research is so muddled, any dimension which could shed light on its genesis should be included. This is especially true in relation to those items which deal with state intervention.
ANALYTICAL STRATEGIES

7.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters were devoted to an overview of a variety of New Class theories and other speculations about the class positions and worldview of experts and managers. Attention is shifted now to discussions of the data set that permits an empirical assessment of New Class theories.

7.2 The Class Consciousness Data Set

The data set used in this analysis is the 1991 - 1992 Class Structure and Class Consciousness Survey conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley. It is a nationwide, random - digit telephone survey in which 2,488 respondents were interviewed about their work experiences and attitudes about work place policies, social policies, and political-economic issues. The target population was all English-speaking adults, living in households with telephones, within the United States, Alaska and Hawaii excluded (Hout, Wright, and Sanchez-Jankowski 1992).

This data set is an updated version of the Comparative Study of Class Structure and Class Consciousness conducted in 1980 by the University of Wisconsin Institute for Research on Poverty. Like its predecessor, the 1991 - 1992 survey is particularly useful to sociologists working in the field of stratification, especially those interested in analyzing the ideologies of social classes. Here, emphasis will be placed on a select set of variables that permits an analysis of the cultural and political-economic components of a New Class worldview.
In my analysis, using the rationale employed by Wright (1985), I confine my attention to white males who are presently employed. This yields a sample size of 775. Females and African Americans are excluded from the analysis to avoid the problems generated by non-asset based exploitation.

A common strategy used when attempting to adjudicate between competing models of class formation is to restrict analysis to white males. This is not to suggest that neither race nor gender are insignificant dimensions of social stratification and inequality, but instead reflects a problem in accounting for the interaction between "asset-based" and "non-asset-based" exploitation and oppression.

Why are property relations privileged in the analysis of classes? Wright (1985) argues that the concept of class should be restricted to productive relations and not extended to include all possible exploitative social relations for two reasons. First, class theories are also theories about social change and historical development in which technology and other sources of productivity play pivotal roles. It is assumed that whatever directionality history has is the result of changes in the means of production. As such, control over a society's productive forces and the exploitation it generates have strategic significance in class-based interpretations of historical change (Wright 1985:97). Once the key sources of class based exploitation are identified, researchers can proceed with an examination of how both race and gender operate in conjunction with class. These forms of "non-asset-based" exploitation can be included to determine the extent to which
they subdivide classes and how they operate to restrict access to and movement between classes.

The second reason for restricting my analysis to white males is that my aim is to determine the relative explanatory power of three different class models in relation to the generation of and adherence to a "technocratic" worldview. Since each of the models compared here is asset based, none incorporate either race or gender. The theorists who generated these class models do not say anything about the relative importance of class exploitation and oppression over racial or gender oppression. Instead, they direct their energies to identifying positions in the class structure in relation to ownership or non-ownership of productive assets. Once these structural positions are identified and mapped out, inquiries can be made as to how both race and gender operate to restrict access to productive assets and the race-based and gender-based composition of existing social classes (Wright 1985:98). I will return to issues of the interaction between asset-based and non-asset-based exploitation in the conclusion of this paper.

7.3 Attitudes and the Subjective Dimension of Class

The most problematic aspect of studying class is developing a strategy for determining whether a particular class possesses a coherent worldview. For purposes of analyzing the New Class, what are the dependent variables which serve as indicators of a distinct New Class worldview? In the present study, using the rationale employed by Wright (1985), I employ sixteen Likert type attitude questions.
Rajecki (1982) has argued that when attitudes are used in sociological analysis, researchers are highlighting three components: affective states, cognition, and behavioral tendencies. The affective component represents one's emotional reactions toward an attitude object. The cognitive component represents beliefs, facts, and information about the attitude object. The behavioral component includes the behaviors associated with the attitude object.

In this study, emphasis is placed upon the affective and cognitive components of attitudes. When new class theorists discuss the worldview of a hypothesized new class, they direct their efforts toward understanding how members of the new class react to existing social and economic conditions and their beliefs about capitalism and non-capitalist economic alternatives. They also acknowledge that attitudes influence behaviors but recognize the difficulty of relating attitudes to class based action. As a consequence, their discussions focus on the generation of a new class worldview as opposed to new class "consciousness." The former represents an aggregate of attitudes while the latter implies both the presence of shared perceptions and beliefs about shared material circumstances and a willingness to act in concert to change those circumstances. For Wright (1985:144),

[the] assumption in adopting attitudes as a criterion is that they are not in fact epiphenomenal, that they have real consequences for class action, and that . . . they are determined by class location. This implies that behind [the] use of attitudes is a causal argument about the forms of conscious subjectivity . . . and class location.
According to Wright (1985:142-147), even though class analysis is a macro theory of social relations and social change, that theory must be linked to a micro theory of the way class locations affect individual perceptions. Thus, individual level variables are appropriate criteria for assessing the relevant merit of competing class formation schemes and assessing whether class occupants are relatively homogenous or heterogenous in their worldviews.

Wright (1985:143-144) asserts that even if attitudes are employed, they are at best related loosely to the concept of class consciousness - an awareness on the part of class actors of their historical role in preserving the status quo or ushering in a new social order. In my analysis of the New Class, I have intentionally avoided using the concept of class consciousness.

The rationale for this omission is that New Class theorists, both subjectivist and structuralists, stress that this class is in the process of "becoming" - it has yet to attain "class consciousness" in the Marxist sense of the term but is in the process of developing a distinct worldview. Its subjective awareness of its historical role is not fully developed but remains in a seminal stage.

7.4 Theoretical Hypotheses and Dependent Attitude Variables

Recall that Gouldner and others attempt to specify a number of features of a distinct "New Class" worldview:

1) hostility toward the profit motive as the primary guideline for making business decisions;
2) hostility toward the power of corporations run by capitalists who use their economic capital to influence government policy makers to act in their own interests rather than in the interests of society as a whole;

3) adoption of favorable views about Welfare State policies designed to ameliorate problems of poverty, illiteracy, and crime;

4) a tendency to favor a division of labor in which experts make important business decisions and the workers do the actual labor; and

5) the potential for developing strategies which will lead to improved conditions for members of the working class.

These assertions are also important features of the Ehrenreich's (1979) and Bell's (1973) "technocratic" worldview and are indicative of positions taken by Kristol (1966) and Moynihan (1976) in their discussions of the New Class. I therefore employ them to test both subjectivist and structuralist New Class theories.

Below I present the dependent variables used in the remainder of this study to approximate those attitudes that are indicative of the New Class worldview. The following questions will guide my analysis:

1) whether owners of "skill" assets differ significantly from other employees along a number of attitude items to the extent that they can be considered a class which is in the process of emerging and developing a distinct worldview - Expert New Class Theory;

2) whether owners of "organization" assets differ significantly from other employees along a number of attitude items to the extent that they can be
considered a class which is in the process of emerging and developing a
distinct worldview - Managerial New Class theory;
3) whether owners of skill or organization assets are similar to non-owning
employees, in that they do not own property that would lead to the generation
of a distinct worldview - New Working Class theory;
4) whether skill differences, organization asset differences, or differences in
the sector of employment generate internal divisions within the ranks of the
New Class (however defined).

The following attitudinal items are chosen for inclusion in my model as
dependent variables. All employ Likert response formats with scores of 1 =
Agree Strongly, 2 = Agree Somewhat, 3 = Disagree Somewhat, and 4 =
Disagree Strongly. To aid in interpreting the results of my statistical tests, I will
discuss the applicability of the items under six headings.

Work Place Issues

Researchers who characterize the New Class by its "technocratic" worldview
stress the importance that members attribute to maintaining an Expert - Non-Expert
Division in the work place. Two items will be used as indicators of this New
Class trait:

EXPERT

In any industrial society it will always be necessary to have a division between
those experts who make decisions and people who carry out those decisions.
CONTROL

If given the chance, the non-management employees at the place where you work(ed) could run things effectively without bosses.

Poverty Issues

According to New Class theorists, members of the New Class hold favorable views toward Welfare State policies. Among these are efforts by the state to implement government sponsored programs to alleviate the harmful effects of poverty. Included are programs to increase job and education opportunities for the poor. Gouldner uses this to defend his contention that the New Class operates from a perspective that focuses on the "totality" of social forces. Hence, members of the New Class are more likely to view the causes of poverty as contradictions within the social system rather than as rooted in individual deficiencies. Those outside the New Class, by contrast, would be more likely to blame the individuals for creating their own circumstances.

The five items listed below are used to determine the New Class's orientation toward poverty.

INTELLIGENCE

One of the main reasons for poverty is that some people are not intelligent enough to compete in this modern world.

OPPORTUNITY

One of the main reasons for poverty is lack of education and job opportunities for the poor.
WORK ETHIC

One of the main reasons for poverty is that many poor people simply do not want to work.

POLICY

One of the main reasons for poverty is government policies.

NECESSARY

One of the main reasons for poverty is that in every society some people have to be on the bottom and some on the top.

Crime Solutions

Following the same reasoning as above, solutions to social problems such as crime can also be used to determine whether or not members of the New Class favor Welfare State policies designed to reduce crime by increasing job and education opportunities. Once again, the alternative approach to the problem would be more punitive than ameliorative.

Three items are used to determine the New Class’s orientation toward solving the crime problem.

PUNISHMENT

In order to reduce crime, the courts should give criminals tougher punishments.

DISCIPLINE

If parents disciplined their children more firmly, there would be less crime.
OPPORTUNITIES

In order to reduce crime, education and job opportunities for the poor have to be increased.

Worker Affinities

If we view the New Class as in the process of "becoming," some members will align with the working class against the political and economic status quo. Three items are used to determine the extent to which the New Class adopts favorable attitudes toward working class issues.

CORP HURT

Corporations benefit owners at the expense of workers and consumers.

SCABS OK

During a strike, management should be prohibited by law from hiring workers to take the place of strikers.

STRIKE

Striking workers are generally justified in physically preventing strikebreakers from entering the place of work.

Economic Issues

New Class researchers, Gouldner and the Ehrenreichs in particular, argue that members of the New Class are hostile to the profit motive and view it as an irrational reason for organizing the production process. Furthermore, New Class experts are hostile to the power of large corporations driven by the profit motive. Two items are included as indicative of the economic worldview of the New Class.
PROFIT

It is possible for a modern society to run effectively without the profit motive.

CORP POWER

Big corporations have far too much power in American society today.

Political Views

Most New Class theorists argue that members of the New Class tend to be more liberal than conservative in their political views. One item is used to measure the political orientation of the New Class.

POLITICAL

We hear people talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Imagine a seven-point scale in which people who think of themselves as extremely liberal score 1 and people who think of themselves as extremely conservative score 7. And 4 is the midpoint. Where would you place yourself on this scale?

7.5 Dummy Variable Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression Analysis is a statistical technique which permits the researcher to analyze the relationship between a dependent (criterion) variable and a set of independent (predictor) variables. More specifically, it allows for the control of factors in order to evaluate the contribution of a specific variable or set of variables to any observed changes in the dependent variable. By analyzing the results of the regression equation, the researcher can examine the relative impact of each predictor on the criterion variable (Kim and Kohout 1978:320-321). Although variables in multiple regression are usually measured at the interval or ratio level,
the creation of "dummy" variables allows the researcher to incorporate nominal
variables into the regression equation. To create a set of dummy variables, each
category of the nominal variable is treated as a separate variable. Arbitrary scores
are then assigned depending on the presence of the absence of characteristics in
each of the categories (Bohrnstedt and Knoke 1982:386-399). Using Wright's
class model, dummy variables will be used to represent various combinations of
the predictor variables - Skill Assets and Organization Assets.

These newly created class variables are called dummy variables because their
scores have no meaning other than representing a particular category in the original
variable. Using arbitrary values of 0 and 1 allows the researcher to treat nominal
variables as interval level variables. When constructing the equation one dummy
must be excluded. This is necessary since the inclusion of all dummies would
render the regression equation unsolvable because in such a situation the last
dummy variable is completely determined by the remainder of the variables already
entered into the regression equation. When all the predictors in any one model are
dummy variables, the regression constant is the mean score of the reference
category on the particular dependent variable and the score on each predictor are
adjustments to the mean for each of the dummy variables. In effect, this becomes
a multiple differences of means test. The excluded category becomes a reference
category from which the effects of all other dummies are judged (Kim and Kohout
1975:374). Two measures generated by the regression equation are useful for
interpreting the impact of class on the dependent variables in this study. B, the
regression coefficient for each class category, is the difference between in the predicted Y for each class category when compared to the reference category (Kim and Kohout 1975:374-375). In addition, the regression equation can also be used as a measure of the overall utility of the predictors in explaining variation in the dependent variables. Here, the Adjusted R - square is used to determine the proportion of variation explained when some or all of the predictors are entered into the equation (Kim and Kohout 1975:330-332).
THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL HYPOTHESES

8.1 Introduction

In order to determine the extent to which experts and/or managers represent a New Class distinct from both the capitalists above it and the workers below it, I turn to Erik Olin Wright's Exploitation Model and a selection of attitudinal variables from the Class and Class Consciousness data set. Wright's (1985) class operationalizations are presented in the Appendix. Three distinct versions of "New Class" theory are tested using Wright's scheme. First, I will empirically assess Expert New Class theory, focusing on owners of skill assets. Second, I will test an alternative Managerial New Class theory in which managers, regardless of their possession of advanced university education, represent the core of the Managerial New Class. Third, I will test the assertion that both experts and managers are members of a "new" working class. Because Gouldner offers the most systematic account of the characteristics of a New Class worldview, his ideas will serve as the subjective dimension in each of the three tests.

Test 1 is divided into two parts. In part one I test the proposition that education (operationalized here as respondents occupying Wright's "expert" categories) serves as the objective foundation for New Class formation in the United States. As highlighted in previous chapters, identification of the type of property ownership that determines structural placement is an essential first step in any analysis of classes. Property ownership is a necessary foundation for the
development of a worldview which reflects the economic and political interests of that class. Class based action can occur when such a worldview emerges.

In part two, Wright's "organization" assets will be added to the analysis. Gouldner suggests that position within bureaucratically controlled organizations has an effect on the internal unity of the New Class. Here, both Gouldner and Wright are expanding Dahrendorf's (1959) argument that authority is operating along with ownership/non-ownership of the means of production in determining class position and dynamics. Organization assets, a "secondary" form of exploitation, are introduced as a proxy for the possible internal fragmentation within the ranks of the New Class - the "technical intelligentsia" and "humanistic intellectuals." I now turn to an examination of the theoretical and empirical hypotheses which will be tested in this study.

8.2 Test 1: Education as the Foundation of a New Class

Gouldner contends that knowledge, the product of formalized higher education, provides the foundation for the generation of the Expert New Class. For Gouldner, "an investment in education is not simply a consumable . . . [it] is cultural capital, the economic basis of the New Class" (1979:27). In addition, "higher education in the public school becomes the institutional basis for the mass production of the New Class of intelligentsia and intellectuals" (1979:3).

Not only Gouldner's, but most Expert New Class theories begin with the assertion that education has replaced or become as important as ownership or non-ownership of the means of production in creating classes and determining the
relationship between them. Education is "cultural capital," (Gouldner 1979:22). In the "new" society, power passes from those whose incomes derive from money investments or landed property to those with "human capital . . . [with] relatively advanced education" (Gouldner 1979:11).

Employing Wright’s exploitation model, the New Class is operationalized as owners of "Skill Assets." Using my selection of attitudinal items from the 1992 Class and Class Consciousness Survey, I will employ dummy variable multiple regression analysis to determine whether respondents in Wright’s three "Expert" categories differ significantly from respondents in the non-Expert categories. The three Expert categories will be collapsed into one Expert New Class category using the rationale that we must begin with the broadest possible objective base before we examine possible cleavages within it. Non-Experts, those who do not own skill assets, will serve as the reference category. The first theoretical hypothesis to be tested is:

H 1: If advanced education is the foundation for a New Class, then respondents in the "Expert" category should differ significantly from respondents in non-expert employee categories on a number of social, economic, and political attitude items.

The following empirical hypotheses are generated by the above theoretical hypothesis:

h 1.1: If experts do indeed form a New Class distinct from other employees then respondents in the Expert category should differ significantly
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from respondents in the non-Expert category concerning the favorability of an Expert - Non-Expert division of labor in the work place. Experts should have more favorable attitudes toward the maintenance of such a division than non-experts do.

h 1.2: If experts do indeed form a New Class which seeks to explain and reduce the harmful effects of poverty and crime through the application of technical knowledge and social engineering, then respondents in the Expert category should be more likely to view the source of social problems as symptomatic of underlying faults in the social system - lack of education and job opportunities - rather than placing blame on individuals' deficiencies - lack of intelligence, poor work ethic - or viewing such problems as inevitable in society.

h 1.3: If Experts, as members of a New Class, have the potential for becoming a new elite which controls the modern means of production, then, due to their "blocked ascendence," they should be more hostile toward extant capitalist concerns - the profit motive, corporate power - than non-experts are.

h 1.4: If Experts do indeed form an elite New Class distinct from workers, Expert respondents should be less favorable toward non-management employees running businesses without bosses than respondents from the working class.
1.5: Respondents in the Expert category should be more liberal in their political views than respondents in the non-expert categories.

1.6: If the New Class is indeed "flawed," "contradictory," and in the process of "becoming," its social, economic, and political ideology should be contradictory and inconsistent.

The above hypotheses are the first step in this analysis: determining whether or not the possession of education as capital provides the necessary objective foundation for the formation of a coherent ideology which support the subjective distinctions between Gouldner's hypothesized New Class and the other classes of advanced capitalism.

8.3 Test 2: Fragmentation within the New Class

In this section, I employ "organization" assets to divide the New Class of experts based on the positions they occupy in bureaucratic organizations. Given Gouldner's arguments about the contradictory nature of the New Class, I hope to explore organizational variations within the Expert category to determine which segment, if any, best represents the New Class worldview.

To accomplish this, "organization assets" will be used to approximate the division between the "technical intelligentsia" and "humanistic intellectuals." According to Gouldner, the New Class is "flawed" because it is internally divided. Although united by their advanced education and their Culture of Critical Discourse (CCD), each segment plays a different role in advanced capitalist society (Gouldner 1979:4).
The "technical intelligentsia" plays a pivotal role in controlling the institutions of advanced capitalism (Gouldner 1979). Members of the intelligentsia center their efforts on the development of the paradigm that dominates their specialty, practice Kuhnian "normal science" by solving technical puzzles, and favor mechanistic theories. In addition, members of the "technical intelligentsia" have a preference for "conservative" Republican party agendas and its policies, have no intention of instituting a social order in which all are equal regardless of their cultural capital, and will not tolerate worker control in the work place. They are, for Gouldner, managers of the new means of production, violence, and administration. In essence, the seeds of a new elite.

"Humanistic intellectuals" represent the marginal segment of the New Class because their role is not essential to the organization and administration of advanced capitalism (Gouldner 1979). Unlike the "technical intelligentsia," "humanistic intellectuals" view their task as critical and emancipatory, they lack consensually validated paradigms, and are alienated because of the sharp disparity between their "high" culture and their limited incomes and lack of political influence. Furthermore, "humanistic intellectuals" affiliate themselves with the Democrats and their liberal social programs, are interested in instituting worker control in the work place, sympathize with working class concerns, and are in general excluded from positions of management and administration.

Although Gouldner's discussion of these two fragments of the New Class is the most problematic aspect of his theory, Wright's model permits us to test
Figure 3. Hypothesized Organizational Asset Divisions within Gouldner's New Class of Intellectuals/Experts.
empirically a number of his assertions. First, Gouldner is clear that the "technical intelligentsia" occupy, in Wright's scheme, positions which score positive on the organizational asset dimension. "Humanistic intellectuals," on the other hand, rank negative on organizational assets. This provides a rough operationalization of the structural division within the New Class. Second, in spite of Gouldner's over-reliance on Kuhnian concepts (which defy operationalization), he does provide sufficient information about the New Class to permit researches to explore its internal ideological fragmentation: political party affiliation, acceptance or rejection of worker control, and working class sympathies (especially toward unions). The tests in this section are organized around the following theoretical hypothesis:

**H 2:** Experts (the technical intelligentsia) who own organizational assets will exhibit statistically significant differences from Experts (the humanistic intellectuals) who lack organizational assets along a variety of attitudinal dimensions.

The empirical hypotheses used in the first set of regression equations will be used in this section also. The essential difference is the way Wright's model is employed. Recall that in the first part, the three expert categories were collapsed into one and the six non-expert categories were collapsed into another. For this part of the study, I confine my tests to respondents in the Expert category. In addition, I create an "organization" division to compare experts who own organization assets to experts who lack organization assets. In essence, my
hypotheses are now aimed at determining the extent to which organization assets affect the ideological cohesiveness of the New Class. Experts lacking organization assets serve as the reference category in this regression analysis. The following empirical hypotheses will be tested:

h 2.1: If Experts do indeed form a New Class which is "flawed" and "contradictory," especially in the way they view the traditional working class, then they should display contradictory attitudes toward efforts to improve the working and economic conditions of workers. "Humanistic Intellectuals" should exhibit statistically significant differences from the "Technical Intelligentsia" for the attitude items EXPERT, CONTROL, SCABS OK, and STRIKE. The former should be more sympathetic toward worker issues; the latter should be less favorable toward worker issues.

h 2.2: If the New Class is divided and inconsistent in its political party affiliations, then "humanistic intellectuals" should exhibit a clear preference for liberal politics and the "technical intelligentsia" should exhibit a clear preference for conservative politics.

8.4 Test 3: The New Class in an Organizational Context

Gouldner is representative of the dominant position in New Class research - the New Class is an "ideological" class whose members are united due to their advanced educational backgrounds. The alternative model tested here stresses the relational and structural components of class and posits that if a New Class has
indeed emerged then it is composed primarily of managers whose role in advanced
capitalism is becoming increasingly important. Here, emphasis is placed on one’s
position within bureaucratic organizations when placing respondents within the
New Class. Although organization is important in Gouldner’s scheme, he stresses
that it is a secondary form of "property" which subdivides the New Class. In the
alternative "Managerial" New Class theory, education is secondary and control
over others in the work place is primary. Djilas (1957) and Dahrendorf (1959) are
exemplars for this latter version.

Recall that Djilas (1959) first used the term New Class to refer to a growing
elite segment of the Yugoslavian population which occupied positions of control
within the newly created communist bureaucracies. Bureaucratic control
represented a "new" type of property which introduced new complications when
attempting to understand the class structure of any advanced society.

The impact of Dahrendorf’s Marxist - Weberian argument that Imperatively
Coordinated Associations - bureaucratic organizations - are playing an increasingly
important role as society moves into its post-capitalist phase continues to be
influential is stratification research. The argument, in essence, is that the authority
attached to bureaucratic positions is replacing ownership and non-ownership of the
means of production as a central class defining criterion (Dahrendorf 1959).
Aronowitz (1979), Poulantzas (1973b), and the Ehrenreichs (1979) are also
associated with this interpretation.
In Wright's scheme, organizational assets are combined with ownership to generate an exploitation-based, multi-dimensional map of the classes in monopoly capitalism. It should be noted that Wright's earlier "Domination" model was criticized for mixing Marxist and Weberian paradigms. Wright's critics accuse him of placing other forms of domination, here, work place authority, on the same level as class domination. This obscures the distinctiveness of class oppression and exploitation. The "Exploitation" model represents a reaction to such criticisms.

In the "exploitation" model employed here, Wright reconceptualizes authority as ownership of "organization" assets. Organization assets are used to subdivide the large population of non-owners. Although by replacing "domination" with "exploitation" Wright attempts to move away from Weberian class analysis and closer to traditional Marxist versions of the class scheme, much of what is accomplished is done via "definitional fiat" (Burnris 1989). Although the language has been changed, the main argument remains intact - managers occupy contradictory positions where subordination and superordination are mixed in a single position.

A further note on the relation between Wright and Dahrendorf has implications for this study. The positions both Djilas and Dahrendorf identify as "New Class" are, for Wright, not true classes in the Marxist sense. Rather, they are positions in the social structure that could generate a distinct worldview and, alone or in combination, become important forces for social change. In this section, I attempt to determine the extent to which observed differences in organizational assets
among both expert and non-expert employees can be used to define the structural location of the New Class.

If these positions are contradictory, how are we to deal with the potential alliances which can be forged between the new class and the old classes? According to Wright, dominant exploiting classes attempt to align with the New Class in order to neutralize the potential threats by tying new class interests to capitalist ones. High salaries, stock options, and granting work place control to members of the New Class are some of the strategies employed by the capitalists to ensure the allegiance of the New Class. These strategies, when combined, create the perception among members of the New Class that their career trajectories will permit access into the ranks of the dominant class (Wright 1985:125). There is also a possibility that the New Class will align with the mass of workers. This, for Wright, is more difficult because the mass of workers share few characteristics with, and are therefore less "attractive" to, managers. However, under conditions of "degradation" - deskilling, proletarianization, routinization of authority - it is possible that members of the New Class will perceive their interests to be more in line with workers than with capitalists (Wright 1985:125-126).

Employing Wright's exploitation model once again, the New Class is operationalized as owners of "Organization Assets." Using my selection of attitudinal items from the 1992 Class and Class Consciousness Survey, I will employ dummy variable multiple regression analysis to determine whether respondents in Wright's three "Organization Assets" categories differ significantly
Figure 4. New Class as Hypothesized Managerial/Controller Class
from respondents in the non-Organization assets categories. The three
Organization categories will be collapsed into one Managerial New Class category
using the rationale that we must begin with the broadest possible objective base
before we examine possible cleavages within it. Non-Managers, those employees
who do not own organization assets will serve as the reference category. The first
theoretical hypothesis to be tested is:

H 3: If ownership of organization assets is the foundation for the New Class,
then respondents in the "Manager" category should differ significantly
from respondents in non-manager employee categories on a number of
social, economic, and political attitude items.

The following empirical hypotheses are generated by the above theoretical
hypothesis:

h 3.1: If managers do indeed form a New Class distinct from other employees,
then respondents in the Manager category should differ significantly
from respondents in the non-Manager category concerning the
favorability of an Expert - Non-Expert division of labor in the work
place. Managers should have more favorable attitudes towards the
maintenance of such a division than non-managers do.

h 3.2: If managers do indeed form a New Class which seeks to explain and
reduce the harmful effects of poverty, crime, and illiteracy through the
application of technical knowledge and social engineering, then
respondents in the Manager category should be more likely to view the
source of social problems as symptomatic of underlying faults in the social system - lack of education and job opportunities - rather placing blame on individuals' deficiencies - lack of intelligence, poor work ethic - or viewing such problems as inevitable in society.

h 3.3: If Managers, as members of a New Class, have the potential for becoming a new elite which controls the modern means of production, then, due to their "blocked ascendance," they should be more hostile toward extant capitalist concerns - the profit motive, corporate power - than non-managers are.

h 3.4: If Managers do indeed form an elite New Class distinct from workers, they should be less favorable toward non-management employees running businesses without bosses than non-managers.

h 3.5: Respondents in the Manager category should be more conservative in their political views than respondents in the non-manager category.

h 3.6: If the New Class is indeed "flawed," "contradictory," and in the process of "becoming," its social, economic, and political ideology should be contradictory and inconsistent.

The above hypotheses are the first step in this analysis: determining whether or not the possession of organization assets as capital provides the necessary objective foundation for the formation of a coherent ideology which supports the subjective distinctions between the hypothesized New Class and the other classes of
advanced capitalism. The second step is to determine whether this class is internally divided or ideologically cohesive.

Recall that Dahrendorf (1959:48-57) ends his discussion of the New Class with a cautionary note. He argues that since the concept of class contains both objective and subjective dimensions, it is open to question whether managers form a class at all. While they may share common positions with regard to bureaucratic control, Dahrendorf argues that skill differences within the managerial ranks may present barriers to the development of a homogenous worldview. Instead, the "decomposition of capital" which gave rise to this strata may interact with the "decomposition of labor" - the skill differences which divide and fragment the traditional working class - to render this "new class" ideologically fragmented.

Here the approach taken to the internal fragmentation of the Managerial New Class is similar to the strategy Gouldner employs to speculate about the "flawed" nature of the Expert New Class. In the "Managerial" version, differences in education can prevent the development of a cohesive worldview. The tests in this section are organized around the following theoretical hypothesis:

H 4: Expert Managers, as owners of both organization and skill assets, will exhibit statistically significant differences from Non-Expert Managers along a variety of attitudinal dimensions.

The empirical hypotheses used in the first set of regression equations will be used in this section also. The essential difference is the way Wright's model is
Figure 5. Hypothesized Skill Asset Divisions within the New Class of Managers/Controllers
employed. Recall that in the first part, the three manager categories were collapsed into one and the six non-manager categories were collapsed into another. For this part of the study, I confine my tests to respondents in the Manager category. In addition, I create an "expert" division to compare managers who own skill assets to managers who lack skill assets. In essence, my hypotheses are now aimed at determining the extent to which skill assets affect the ideological cohesiveness of the New Class. Managers lacking skill assets serve as the reference category in this regression analysis.

It should be noted that the empirical hypotheses used in this part of the analysis are largely exploratory. Although aimed at determining whether or not the Managerial New Class is ideologically cohesive, neither Dahrendorf nor other advocates of this approach are specific about the characteristics of its worldview. As a consequence, I will borrow from Gouldner once again to operationalize the worldview of the "Managerial" New Class. This is consistent with the Ehrenreich's (1979) discussion of the PMC and its "technocratic" worldview.

The following empirical hypotheses will be tested:

h 4.1: If Managers do indeed form a New Class which is "contradictory," especially in the way they view the traditional working class, then they should display contradictory attitudes toward efforts to improve the working and economic conditions of workers based on skill divisions within it.

h 4.2: If the New Class is divided and inconsistent in its ownership of skill
assets, then there should be statistically significant variations in attitudes toward poverty solutions and crime solutions.

h 4.3: If the New Class is contradictory, this should be reflected in fragmented political party affiliations.

8.5 Test 4: The "New" Working Class Alternative

The majority of "orthodox" structural Marxists place technical, scientific, and professional employees in the working class. Recall that Anderson (1974) has argued that, irrespective of the fact that they possess "knowledge property" and/or manage the production process, mental laborers are merely higher paid members of the working class who are exploited in the same ways as members of the traditional working class are. As a consequence, "new" working class researchers do not acknowledge experts and managers as a distinct class with interests and attitudes significantly different from those of traditional workers. They are merely higher paid members of the proletariat.

In this part of my study, I test the following theoretical hypothesis employing all nine employee cells in Wright's model,

H 5: If Experts and Managers are members of a "New" working class, then the attitudes they have toward a number of political and social issues should not differ significantly from respondents who lack both skill assets and organization assets.

Employing the full sample of respondents and all of the employee cells in Wright's model permits the determination of two things: first, whether a New
Class of Experts and/or Managers is developing a distinct worldview; second, how Skill Assets and Organization Assets interact in the New Class formation process. Employees who lack both skill and organization assets will serve as the reference category in this set of regression equations. The following empirical hypotheses will be tested in this part of the analysis.

**h 5.1:** If neither ownership of skill assets nor ownership of organization assets are central determinants of class, then both experts and managers should exhibit no statistically significant differences from traditional workers - respondents who own neither skill nor organization assets.

**h 5.2:** If ownership of skill assets or ownership of organization assets are important determinants of class, then statistically significant differences on scores for attitude items will increase as skill assets and organization assets increase - as respondents move further away from those who own neither skill assets nor organization assets.

The findings for each set of regressions are presented in the next chapter.
EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

9.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the findings of the statistical tests conducted to determine whether a New Class of experts or managers is emerging with a distinct worldview or whether they are best viewed as segments of a "new" and growing working class. In addition, two separate tests are conducted to determine whether the New Class (however defined) is internally cohesive and homogenous or whether its worldview is contradictory and heterogenous or fragmented. To resolve this issue, sector of employment and an organization dummy variable are introduced into the "Expert" New Class equation while sector of employment and a skill asset dummy variable are added to the "Organization" New Class equation. Finally, sector of employment is combined with Wright's (1985) employee class locations map to determine which cells in his model come closest to exhibiting differences between the working class.

Table 1 displays the intercorrelations among the dependent variables used in this study.

9.2 New Class as an "Expert" Class

The results of the regression of the attitude items used as a proxy for the Expert New Class worldview on the dummy variables representing Wright's class/skill assets scheme are presented in Table 2. The entire sample is employed here. These findings allow us to determine the extent to which Experts, as owners
Table 1. Intercorrelations Among Variables in the Analysis

| Variable              | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  | 24  | 25  | 26  | 27  | 28  |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| LO_GOWNR              | 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| EXPSUP                | 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| EXPNMAN               | 0.96| 0.94| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| SMWONER               | 0.95| 0.93| 0.99| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| SEMISUP               | 0.92| 0.89| 0.98| 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| UNCRDMAN             | 0.91| 0.88| 0.97| 0.97| 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| WORKER               | 0.89| 0.86| 0.95| 0.95| 0.97| 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| POLICY                | 0.87| 0.85| 0.94| 0.94| 0.96| 0.97| 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| SCABS OK             | 0.85| 0.83| 0.92| 0.92| 0.94| 0.96| 0.97| 0.98| 1.00|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

Note: The table shows the intercorrelations among variables with a significance level of .05. The correlation coefficients range from -1.00 to 1.00, with values close to 1.00 indicating a strong positive relationship, values close to -1.00 indicating a strong negative relationship, and values around 0 indicating no significant relationship. The variables include Owner, Exper, Expert, Necessary, Profit, Manager, Semisup, Control, Intelligence, Corp Power, Corp Hurt, Opportunity, Opportunities, and Policy.
of skill assets, form a subjectively cohesive class with a worldview that differs in statistically significant way from non-Experts.

Work Place Issues

The two variables that measure attitudes toward the work place division of labor are EXPERT and CONTROL. As demonstrated here, the class categories employed do not affect responses to either of these indicators of a New Class worldview.

Poverty Source

The five items included here measure attitudes toward the source of poverty. Of the five, New Class operationalized as skill asset positions accounts for the statistically significant variation in the score for one item - source of poverty as lack of a work ethic. Class differences have no statistical significant consequences for the INTELLIGENCE, OPPORTUNITY, POLICY, or NECESSARY items.

For the WORK ETHIC item, class explains only .5% of the variance in respondents attitudes. New Class experts are slightly less likely to interpret the cause of poverty as lack of a work ethic than respondents who fall outside the New Class (B = .3208).

Crime Solutions

Of the three items employed as indicators of attitudes about the best ways of reducing crime, class accounts for the statistically significant variation in only one item - PUNISHMENT as a means of reducing crime.
## Table 2. Regression Results of "Skill" Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables - All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PLACE</th>
<th>POVERTY SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERT</td>
<td>EXPERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1176</td>
<td>.0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Experts (Constant)</td>
<td>2.1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R²</strong></td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.2316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>WORKER AFFINITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3567*</td>
<td>.0855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Experts (Constant)</td>
<td>1.4133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R²</strong></td>
<td>.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC ISSUES</th>
<th>POLITICAL VIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1590</td>
<td>.1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Experts (Constant)</td>
<td>3.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R²</strong></td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.1255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B is twice the standard error.
Class has no statistically significant impact on either the OPPORTUNITIES item or the DISCIPLINE item. Class explains only 3% of the variations in respondents' attitudes about punishment. New Class Experts are less likely to view an increased emphasis on punishment as a solution to the crime problem than respondents who fall outside the ranks of the New Class (B = .3567).

Worker Affinities

Of the three items falling under the broad heading of Worker Affinities, class accounts for statistically significant variations in the scores for two items - SCABS OK and STRIKE. Class has no statistically significant impact on the CORP HURT variable.

Class explains only .06% of the variation in the SCABS OK variable and 1% of the variation in the STRIKE item. New Class Expert respondents are more likely to support the hiring of "scabs" to replace striking workers than respondents outside the New Class (B = .4351). New Class Experts are also less likely to support striking worker's attempts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines and entering the place of work (B = .3031).

Economic Issues

Two items are used to determine class attitudes toward economic issues - CORP POWER and PROFIT. Class has no significant impact on either.

Political Views

One item is used to determine the impact of class on the development of political orientation. As indicated here, class has no statistically significant impact
on the generation and adoption of specific political ideology. The implications of this finding will be discussed later.

9.3 Sector and Organization Divisions within the New Class

The analysis presented in Table 3 is conducted to determine whether Sector of Employment and "ownership" of Organization Assets subdivide the New Class of Experts and prevent the development of a cohesive worldview along the lines suggested by Gouldner (1979). Here, my selection of attitude measures are regressed on Sector and Organization dummy predictors. Rather than employing the full sample, I focus only on respondents who possess skill assets.

Of the sixteen dependent attitude variables included in this analysis, Sector accounts for statistically significant variations in the scores for only two items - SCABS OK (a Worker Affinities indicator) and CORP POWER (an Economic Issues indicators). Sector has no statistically significant impact on any of the Work place items, Poverty Source items, Crime Solutions items, Political Views or the remaining Worker Affinities and Economic Issues items. The organization asset dummy variable has no statistically significant impact on any of the dependent variables in the table.

Sector accounts for only .09% of the variation in the SCABS OK item. New Class respondents in the public sector are less likely to approve of the hiring of "scabs" to replace striking workers than their private sector counterparts are (B = -.7276). They are more likely to adopt the position that corporations wield too much power in society (B = -.4667).
Table 3. Regression Results of "Sector" and "Organization Asset" Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables - Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORK PLACE EXPERT</th>
<th>WORK PLACE CONTROL</th>
<th>INTELLIGENCE</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>WORK ETHIC</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>NECESSARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R^2</strong></td>
<td>-.0123</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>-.0031</td>
<td>-.0108</td>
<td>.0061</td>
<td>-.0166</td>
<td>-.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.6735</td>
<td>.2567</td>
<td>.4308</td>
<td>.6253</td>
<td>.2760</td>
<td>.8266</td>
<td>.4013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>SCABS OK</th>
<th>CORP HURT</th>
<th>STRIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R^2</strong></td>
<td>.0260</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>.1169</td>
<td>-.0049</td>
<td>.0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.1036</td>
<td>.2923</td>
<td>.2532</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.4719</td>
<td>.1172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ECONOMIC ISSUES PROFIT</th>
<th>CORP POWER</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj R^2</strong></td>
<td>.0296</td>
<td>.0537</td>
<td>.0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.0864</td>
<td>.0256</td>
<td>.2115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B is twice the standard error.
9.4 New Class as a "Managerial" Class

The results of the regression of the attitude items used as a proxy for the New Class worldview on the dummy variables representing Wright’s class/organization assets scheme are presented in Table 4. The entire sample is employed here. These findings allow us to determine the extent to which Managers, as owners of organization assets, form a subjectively cohesive class with a worldview that differs in a statistically significant way from non-Managers.

Work Place Issues

The two variables that measure attitudes toward the workplace division of labor are EXPERTS and WORKER CONTROL. As demonstrated here, the class categories employed have a statistically significant effect only on the Control item.

Class accounts for .6% of the variation in attitudes toward worker control in the workplace. Managers are less likely to agree with the proposition that, if given the chance, non-management employees could organize work effectively without the input of bosses than non-managers are (B = .1844).

Poverty Source

The five items included here measure attitudes toward the source of poverty. Of the five, New Class operationalized as managerial/organization asset positions accounts for the statistically significant variation in the scores for three items - source poverty as a necessary consequence of social organizations. Class differences have no statistically significant consequences for the WORK ETHIC item or the POLICY item.
Table 4. Regression Results of "Organization" Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables - All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PLACE</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>NECESSARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.0293</td>
<td>.0718</td>
<td>.2171*</td>
<td>.0782</td>
<td>-.0124</td>
<td>.1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.0837</td>
<td>.0890</td>
<td>.0842</td>
<td>.0469</td>
<td>.0754</td>
<td>.0807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.0064</td>
<td>-.0005</td>
<td>-.0015</td>
<td>.0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.6384</td>
<td>.0278</td>
<td>.0150</td>
<td>.0241</td>
<td>.4123</td>
<td>.8694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POVERTY SOURCE</th>
<th>PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>CRIME SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>ECONOMIC ISSUES</th>
<th>POLITICAL VIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B SE</td>
<td>.0543</td>
<td>.2454</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>.1869*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>-.0012</td>
<td>.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.3924</td>
<td>.6884</td>
<td>.6127</td>
<td>.0973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B is twice the standard error.
Class accounts for .7% of the variation in the INTELLIGENCE item, .6% of the variation in the OPPORTUNITY item, and .5% of the variation in the NECESSARY item. Managers are less likely than non-managers to view the source of poverty as a reflection of lack of intelligence ($B = .2171$), lack of opportunities ($B = .1768$), or as necessary in society ($B = .1604$).

Crime Solutions

Of the three items employed as indicators of attitudes about the best ways of reducing crime, class makes no statistically significant contribution to explain the observed variation in scores between managers and non-managers.

Worker Affinities

Of the three items falling under the broad heading of Worker Affinities, class accounts for statistically significant variations in the scores for two items - SCABS OK and STRIKE. Class has no statistically significant impact on the CORP HURT variable.

Class explains 3% of the variation in the SCABS OK variable and 3% of the variation in the STRIKE item. New Class Managers are more likely to support the hiring of "scabs" to replace striking workers than respondents outside the New Class ($B = .4205$). At the same time, New Class Managers are also less likely to approve of striking worker's attempts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines and entering the place of work ($B = .3812$).
Economic Issues

Two items are used to determine class based attitudes toward economic issues - CORP POWER and PROFIT. Class position has a statistically significant impact on both.

Class explains .8% of the variation in attitudes toward the profit motive and 2% of the variation in attitudes toward corporate power. Managers are more likely than non-managers to agree that the profit motive is a positive factor in the operation of the economy ($B = .1869$) and less likely to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power in influencing social processes ($B = .2448$).

Political Views

One item is used to determine the impact of class on the development of political orientation. As indicated here, class has no statistically significant impact on the generation and adoption of a specific political ideology.

9.5 Sector and Skill Divisions within the New Class

The analysis presented in Table 5 is conducted to determine whether Sector of Employment and "ownership" of Skill Assets subdivide the New Class of Managers and prevent the development of a cohesive worldview along the lines suggested by Dahrendorf (1959). Here, my selection of attitude measures are regressed on Sector and Skill Asset dummy predictors. Rather than employing the full sample, I use only those respondents who possess organization assets.
Table 5. Regression Results of "Sector" and "Skill Asset" Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables - All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PLACE</th>
<th>POVERTY SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERT</td>
<td>INTELLIGENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>.1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Skill</td>
<td>2.1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>-.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.4158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>WORKER AFFINITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUNISHMENT</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>.1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>.4979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>.0560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC ISSUES</th>
<th>CORP POWER</th>
<th>POLITICAL VIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>-.3204</td>
<td>.1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>.0236</td>
<td>.1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Skill</td>
<td>3.3122</td>
<td>.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>.0240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.1322</td>
<td>.0137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B is twice the standard error.
Of the sixteen dependent attitude variables included in this section, Sector accounts for statistically significant variations in the score for only one item - CORP POWER (an Economic Issues indicator). Sector has no statistically significant impact on any of the Work place items, Poverty Source items, Crime Solutions items, Political Views or the remaining Worker Affinities and Economic Issues items. The Skill asset dummy variable has a statistically significant impact on one item also - PUNISHMENT (a Crime Solutions item). Skill has no statistically significant impact on any of the Work place items, Poverty Source items, Worker Affinities, or Political views.

Economic Issues

Of the two economic attitude items - CORP POWER and PROFIT - class has a statistically significant impact on attitudes toward corporate power only. Sector explains 2% of the variation in the score for this dependent variable. Public sector New Class managers are more likely than their private sector counterparts to adopt the position that corporations have "too much" power in society ($B = - .4495$).

Crime Solutions

Of the three crime solution items - PUNISHMENT, OPPORTUNITIES, and DISCIPLINE - class has a statistically significant impact on attitudes toward punishment only. Skill differences account for 5% of the variation in scores for this dependent variable. Expert managers are less prone than their non-expert counterparts to agree with the assertion that increasing punishment of offenders is a solution to the crime problem ($B = .4947$).
9.6 "New" Working Class Theory

Table 6 presents results of dummy variable regression employing each of Wright’s nine employee categories. This table is incorporated to determine the extent that New Class locations (both experts and managers) vary from traditional working class positions. The entire sample of employees is employed here. Employees who lack both skill and organization assets are the reference category.

Work Place Issues

The two variables that measure attitudes toward the work place division of labor are EXPERT and CONTROL. As demonstrated here, the class and sector categories employed have no statistically significant effect on either of the work place issues items.

Poverty Source

The five items included here measure attitudes toward the source of poverty. Class differences have no statistically significant consequences for any of the poverty items. Sector differences do not produce any statistically significant differences either.

Crime Solutions

Of the three items employed as indicators of attitudes about the best ways of reducing crime, sector makes no statistically significant contribution to explain the observed variation in scores. Class accounts for statistically significant differences for one item - PUNISHMENT - and accounts for 4% of the observed variation.

Two class locations, Expert Managers and Uncredentialed Managers, are
significantly different from the working class. Expert Managers are less likely than workers to agree with the statement that increasing punishment is an effective means of reducing crime ($B = .4048$). Uncredentialed Managers are slightly more likely than workers to agree with the statement that increasing punishments will reduce crime ($B = -.2961$).

Worker Affinities

Of the three items falling under the broad heading of Worker Affinities, class accounts for statistically significant variations in the scores for two items - SCABS OK and STRIKE. Class has no statistically significant impact on the CORP HURT. Sector has no statistically significant impact on any of the worker affinities items.

Class explains 5% of the variation in the SCABS OK variable and 4% of the variation in the STRIKE item. Expert Managers ($B = .6860$), Expert Supervisors ($B = 1.0531$), Expert Non-Managers ($B = .4428$), and Semi-Credentialed Managers ($B = .4834$) are more likely to support the hiring of "scabs" to replace striking workers than respondents in the traditional working class. Expert Managers ($B = .5934$), Semi-Credentialed Managers ($B = .5376$), Uncredentialed Managers ($B = .4749$), and Expert Non-Managers ($B = .4832$) are less likely to support striking worker's attempts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines and entering the place of work than respondents in the working class. The implications of these findings will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Table 6. Regression Results of "Sector" and Class Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables - All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PLACE</th>
<th>POVERTY SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Managers</td>
<td>-.0154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Managers</td>
<td>.0865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Managers</td>
<td>-.0383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Supervisors</td>
<td>-.0769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Supervisors</td>
<td>.3518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Supervisors</td>
<td>-.1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Nonmanagers</td>
<td>-.6181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Workers</td>
<td>.0941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Workers</td>
<td>-.0865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.4123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* B is twice the standard error.

(Continued)
Table 6. Regression Results of "Sector" and Class Predictors on Select Dependent Attitude Variables—All Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRIME SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>WORKER AFFINITIES</th>
<th>ECONOMIC ISSUES</th>
<th>POLITICAL VIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUNISHMENT</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>SCABS OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Managers</td>
<td>.1026</td>
<td>-.0495</td>
<td>-.0635</td>
<td>-.1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Managers</td>
<td>.4048*</td>
<td>.1839</td>
<td>.1941</td>
<td>.6860*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Managers</td>
<td>-.0335</td>
<td>.0257</td>
<td>-.0999</td>
<td>.4834*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Supervisors</td>
<td>-.2061*</td>
<td>-.0561</td>
<td>-.1420</td>
<td>.0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Supervisors</td>
<td>-.2025</td>
<td>.2616</td>
<td>.3922</td>
<td>1.0531*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Supervisors</td>
<td>-.3717</td>
<td>.4801</td>
<td>.1598</td>
<td>-.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Nonmanagers</td>
<td>.2078</td>
<td>-.2287</td>
<td>-.1498</td>
<td>-.1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Credentialed Workers</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>-.0130</td>
<td>-.1458</td>
<td>.4428*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialed Workers (Constant)</td>
<td>1.4844</td>
<td>1.5694</td>
<td>1.8025</td>
<td>2.3708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>.0442</td>
<td>.0227</td>
<td>-.0039</td>
<td>.0502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.2945</td>
<td>.4909</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B is twice the standard error
Economic Issues

Two items are used to determine class based attitudes toward economic issues - CORP POWER and PROFIT. Class position and Sector have a statistically significant impact on the CORP POWER item, explaining 2% of the observed variation.

Public sector employees are more likely than private sector employees to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power in society (B = -.1742). Expert Managers (B = .3114) and Semi-Credentialed Managers (B = .3248) are less likely than workers to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power in influencing social processes.

Political Views

One item is used to determine the impact of class on the development of political orientation. As indicated here, neither class nor Sector has a statistically significant impact on the generation and adoption of a specific political ideology.

The implications these findings have for class theory are discussed in the next chapter.
10.1 Introduction

The findings presented in the previous chapter are analyzed in relation to the three assertions which represent different approaches to explaining the class location of experts and managers:

1) Respondents in the "Expert" category will exhibit statistically significant differences from Non-Expert employees on a number of attitude items used as proxies for a "technocratic" - New Class worldview;  
2) Respondents in the "Manager" category will exhibit statistically significant differences from Non-Managerial employees on a number of attitude items used as proxies for a "technocratic" - New Class worldview; and  
3) Neither respondents in the "Expert" categories nor respondents in the "Manager" categories will exhibit statistically significant differences from working class respondents on a number of attitude items.

The first is an interpretation of Gouldner's Expert New Class theory, the second is an interpretation of Dahrendorf's and Aronowitz's Managerial New Class theory, and the third is an interpretation of Anderson's "New" Working class theory. In the sections below I discuss the empirical findings presented in the previous chapter in reference to each of the above.

10.2 The New Class as an Expert Class

Recall that for Gouldner (1979), New Class Experts will exhibit statistically significant differences from Non-Expert employees in relation to several social,
economic, and political issues to the extent that they can be said to be carriers of a distinct, class based worldview. Two class categories were employed in dummy variable regression analysis to determine the extent to which Experts differ from Non-Experts.

Work Place Issues

Gouldner hypothesizes that members of the New Class favor the adoption of an Expert - Non-Expert division of labor in the work place. Experts attempt to protect their authority and autonomy by preventing workers from controlling their own work. Through each of these strategies, members of the New Class are both putting their skills into action and protecting their positions of privilege in the work place by engaging in social closure.

The findings in Table 2 fail to support Gouldner's contentions. Respondents in the expert category are not statistically different from non-experts in reference to either the EXPERT item or the CONTROL item.

Poverty Solutions

In his discussion of the generation of a New Class worldview, Gouldner emphasizes both the notion of "totality" and favorable attitudes toward Welfare State policies to ameliorate a variety of social policies. The attitude items chosen to test this assertion can be divided into those in which responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the individual (lack of a work ethic and/or intelligence), and those in which blame (and solutions) is placed on the social system (lack of opportunities, inadequate government policies, and poverty as inevitable). For
Gouldner, New Class experts are more likely than non-experts to favor "systems based" solutions which are geared toward increasing opportunities or changing existing government policies.

The findings in Table 2 indicate that the Expert - Non-Expert class division produces statistically significant differences for the Work Ethic item only - New Class Experts are less likely to interpret the source of poverty as located in the poor's lack of a work ethic. There are no statistically significant differences between Experts and non-Experts on any of the other "individual" or "system" items.

The above provides only limited support for Gouldner's New Class theory. Although Experts differ from non-Experts in the expected direction for WORK ETHIC, there are no statistically significant class based differences along any of the other items. Given Gouldner's arguments, statistically significant differences are expected for the other items, especially given the New Class's ties to the Welfare State.

Crime Solutions

Extending Gouldner's arguments about the "totality" and Welfare State orientations of the New Class, the crime solutions items are divided into "individualist" and "system based" approaches also. It is expected, once again, that respondents in the Expert New Class will adopt favorable attitudes toward the system based solutions and unfavorable attitudes toward the "person blame"
solutions. The OPPORTUNITY item is used as a proxy for the former and PUNISHMENT and DISCIPLINE as proxies for the latter.

The findings indicate that the Expert - Non-Expert division is statistically significant in explaining the observed variation in the PUNISHMENT item only. Since Experts are less likely to view increasing punishment as an acceptable solution, Gouldner's assertions are supported. This support is, however, limited. Class divisions produce no significant variation in the system based variable - OPPORTUNITY - or the other "person blame" item - DISCIPLINE.

Worker Affinities

In his discussion of the relationship between the New Class and the traditional working class, Gouldner highlights the internal contradiction within the New Class and the inconsistent, contradictory nature of its worldview. On the one hand, members of the New Class, in their efforts to ascend to positions of control in the new economy, align with workers against the exploitative strategies of the old economic elite. At the same time, however, they attempt to protect their positions of autonomy and privilege by distancing themselves from worker concerns.

The impact of class differences on three "worker affinities" items - SCABS OK, STRIKE, and CORP HURT - are discussed in this section. The Expert - Non-Expert class division accounts for statistically significant variations in scores for the SCABS OK and STRIKE items. New Class Experts are more likely to support hiring "scabs" to replace striking workers than non-experts are.
Class Experts are also less likely to support strikers in their efforts to prevent non-strikers from crossing picket lines.

These findings fail to support Gouldner’s assertion that the New Class worldview contains contradictory views of the working class. Instead, members of the New Class of Experts exhibit no affinities with and no sympathy for striking workers who are trying to improve working conditions through collective action.

Economic Issues

Gouldner argues that Experts in the New Class are hostile toward the profit motive as the primary goal of corporate organization and hostile towards the power wielded by corporations driven by profit. PROFIT and CORP POWER are employed to determine whether class location produced any statistically significant inter-class variation for these items.

The Expert - Non-Expert division failed to produce any statistically significant variation on either of the economic issues items. These findings fail to support Gouldner’s assertion that members of the New Class view the profit motive and corporate power as barriers to the reorganization of society based on technical-rational principles.

Political Views

According to Gouldner, membership in the New Class will, in general, affect political views. Once again, the empirical findings fail to support Gouldner’s contentions. Class produces no statistically significant variation in political views.
10.3 Sector and Organization Divisions within the New Class

The analysis presented in Table 3 is conducted to determine whether Sector of Employment and "ownership" of Organization Assets subdivide the New Class of Experts and prevent the development of a cohesive worldview. Here, my selection of attitude measures are regressed on Sector and Organization dummy predictors. Rather than employing the full sample, I focus only on respondents who possess skill assets.

"Organization assets" and Sector of Employment are used to approximate the division between the "technical intelligentsia" and "humanistic intellectuals." Although united by their advanced educations and their Culture of Critical Discourse (CCD), each segment plays a different role in advanced capitalist society, and, consequently, generates different ideological orientations (Gouldner 1979:4). Gouldner is clear that the "technical intelligentsia" occupy, in Wright's scheme, positions which score positive on the organization asset dimension. "Humanistic intellectuals," on the other hand, rank negative on organization assets. This provides a rough operationalization of the structural division within the New Class. Sector of employment is also included as an alternative means of subdividing the New Class along the lines suggested by Wright (1985).

Of the sixteen dependent attitude variables included in this analysis, Sector accounts for statistically significant variations in the scores for only two items - SCABS OK (a Worker Affinities indicator) and CORP POWER (an Economic Issues indicators). Sector has no statistically significant impact on any of the Work
Place items, Poverty Source items, Crime Solutions items, Political Views or the remaining Worker Affinities and Economic Issues items. The organization asset dummy variable has no statistically significant impact on any of the dependent variables in the table.

Expert respondents in the public sector are more likely to approve of the hiring of "scabs" to replace striking workers than their private sector counterparts are. They are also more likely to adopt the position that corporations wield too much power in society. If Sector is used a proxy for a division between the "technical intelligentsia" and "humanistic intellectuals," it provides only slight support for Gouldner's contention that the New Class is internally fragmented.

The lack of statistically significant differences in the variables when organizational assets are employed casts serious doubt on the applicability of Gouldner's theory. According to Gouldner, control of administrative apparatuses is the hallmark of members of the "technical intelligentsia." They are, in essence, managers who employ their expertise in overseeing the production process. "Humanistic intellectuals" are excluded from the managerial ranks. As the results in Table 3 indicate, the Expert New Class is not ideologically fragmented due to differences in organization/managerial assets.

10.4 The Expert New Class - A Critical Assessment

Gouldner's version of New Class theory, as presented in The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class (1979), is based on Marx's assumption that knowledge has become a new productive force - in essence, a new form of
property. Hence, it can be viewed as a basis for the formation of the New Class—technical and humanistic experts who are united by a common set of ideas, a Culture of Critical Discourse. For Gouldner, the New Class is first and foremost an "idea" class defined by a common interest in substituting a rational, technocratic order to replace the irrational, profit oriented social order of the bourgeoisie. This technocratic orientation is hypothesized to be rooted in a distinct New Class worldview characterized by an orientation toward the social "totality" and favorable attitudes toward Welfare State policies constructed to ameliorate social problems through social engineering. Although united by a common technical discourse, Gouldner argues that the New Class is internally fragmented into two segments with different degrees of authority, political orientations, and alienation—the "technical intelligentsia" and the "humanistic intellectuals." The assessment presented below identifies a number of weaknesses in Gouldner's portrayal of the Expert New Class.

10.5 Education - An Objective Foundation of Class Formation?

To assess the utility of Gouldner's New Class theory I began with the assertion that any analysis of class must begin by identifying the objective foundation of class formation. This reflects Marx's distinction between "class in itself" and "class for itself" and Weber's distinction between "class" and "social class." For both theorists, these objective circumstances are expressed as property ownership. For Gouldner and other Expert New Class theorists, college diplomas have become new forms of class defining property.
Wright's (1985) structural locations class model was employed to anchor Gouldner's New Class theory because it includes both "skill/education" assets and "organization" assets. In relation to Gouldner's theory, the former were used to identify those structural locations which define the New Class and the latter were used to determine lines of internal fragmentation. In addition, Wright's utilization of the concept of "contradictory" locations, when applied to intellectual/mental labor, overlaps Gouldner's discussion of the ideological fragmentation of the New Class.

Using Wright to "anchor" Gouldner's "left" Hegelian theory of the New Class, the first set of hypotheses and regressions tested the assertion that owners of skill assets exhibit statistically significant differences from non-owners along a number of attitude items which were used as indicators of a New Class worldview. Of the sixteen dependent variables used, the Skill - Non-Skill division accounted for statistically significant variations in the scores for only four. In addition, the amount of variation accounted for using this division was small in comparison to the other models tested in this study.

Given these findings, it is questionable whether "knowledge as property" provides an adequate objective foundation for the formation of a New Class. The differences in attitudes between Experts and Non-Experts are not as significant as Gouldner presents them. While some differences do indeed exist in relation to the lack of a work ethic as a cause of poverty, stiffer punishments as a way to reduce crime, and affinities with striking workers, the worldviews of Experts and Non-
Experts are more similar than they are disparate. Their attitudes converge on a variety of economic and work place issues, political views, crime solutions, poverty sources, and working class affinities items included in the analysis.

One possible reason for the general convergence in attitudes between experts and non-experts is that class theories that focus on advanced education alone fail to take full account of how that knowledge is used in the production process itself. In other words, New Class theorists such as Gouldner fail to comprehend or explain how ideas are put into action in the work place. If knowledge is a productive force, then discussions about a New Class of mental laborers must reconceptualize the "relational" aspect of class processes. Here, the usefulness of skill based exploitation as conceptualized by Wright is also open to criticism. Wright (1985:95) acknowledges as much by arguing that

[w]hile the ownership of skill assets may be the basis of exploitation . . . it is much less clear that it is the basis of a class relation, except insofar as skills . . . enable one to gain access to other kinds of assets. Experts may have distinct interests from non-experts, but they are not clearly constituted as a class in relation to non-experts.

To comprehend the impact of "skill" based exploitation, researchers must first examine the interaction between skills, organizational control, and economic ownership (Wright 1985:96).

A second possible explanation for the relative inability of the Expert - Non-expert distinction to generate significantly different worldviews is that the primary form of exploitation - ownership of the means of production - remains central to the advanced capitalist mode of production. Here, the works of Anderson (1974)
and other "new" working class theorists add important insights to studies of the Expert New Class. Irrespective of the fact that Experts may "own" cultural capital - advanced educations - they must still sell their skills to the capitalists for a wage in order to survive. Using this rationale, we expect few statistically significant differences between the worldviews of Experts and non-Experts because the former share with the latter positions of subordination to and exploitation by the capitalist. By extension, shared objective conditions generate common worldviews.

Wright (1989:331-332) acknowledges the difficulty researchers encounter when they attempt to determine the class location of educated employees and argues that neither the "skill exploitation" approach nor the "contradictory locations" approach have offered promising or satisfactory solutions to the problem. His skill exploitation approach is based on the "problematic" claim that "surplus appropriated by skill/credential owners necessarily constitutes exploitation of others, and thus undermines the relational character of the class category built around skills (1989:331).

Rose and Marshall (1989:262) have taken the position that the skill/credential asset defines market capacity only. They assert that Wright is overly eager to incorporate Weberian insights into the Marxist paradigm and as such overlooks his own requirement that classes for Marxists must always be conceptualized in relational terms. Skill exploitation, if it operates at all, misses the relational mark. Abercrombe and Urry (1983:82-83) make the point that the possession of
credentials is a market, not a class, relation. I will return to these criticisms in the conclusion of this dissertation.

10.6 Sector and Organization Divisions within the New Class

In Table 3, Sector of Employment and Organization assets were used to subdivide the New Class. The organization assets were used as a proxy for Gouldner's division between the "technical intelligentsia" and "humanistic intellectuals." Sector of employment is also incorporated to divide experts along the lines suggested by Wright (1985; 1989).

My findings show that the inclusion of organization assets have no statistically significant impact on any of the dependent variables. Organizational differences within the New Class do not generate ideological fragmentation. As such, the findings fail to support Gouldner's assertion that the New Class is internally divided between Expert controllers and Expert subordinates.

A possible explanation for this finding is offered by Wright (1989:331-338). Experts, whether in positions of domination or subordination, tie their career aspirations to movement upward in bureaucracies where they are employed. If they are not yet in positions of domination, they remain aware that by applying their skills within the bureaucratic setting, they will eventually rise to positions of control. As a consequence, they are more likely to interpret their situation of subordination not as "exploitative" or "alienating," but as a temporary stop on their climb upward. A similar position is adopted by Edwards (1979) in his discussion
of the career trajectories and inter-firm mobility of educated professional employees.

Sector of employment has also proved to be a problem for Marxists attempting to explain how state employment affects class formation. Wright (1985; 1989) has consistently treated state sector and private sector employees as contradictory locations. However, there is little evidence to suggest that sector has any significant impact on class formation.

Although Gouldner does not explicitly argue that state intellectuals and private intellectuals are separate segments of the New Class, his discussion about "humanistic intellectuals" overlaps with his discussion of state interests. In my findings, Sector generates statistically significant variations in only two variables - SCABS OK and CORP POWER. State sector employees are more likely to approve of hiring scabs and more likely to view corporations as having too much power. While these are indeed New Class worldview characteristics, Sector has no impact on the remaining fourteen items. This minor differences between state and private sector experts is not enough to create divisions within the New Class.

10.7 Summary of Arguments about the Expert New Class

Given the above, researchers can no longer work under the untested assumption that education is a "new" form of property. Instead, they must reassess and recast their arguments to determine the relative importance of university credentials in relation to more traditional notions of economic ownership and organizational control. Efforts must be made to determine how educational
differences translate into class differences. Until this is accomplished, discussions about the distinct worldview of the Expert New Class are premature. Further, a more concentrated effort must be made to determine just how education affects the relational character of class formation and dynamics. Following Wright (1985), not only must we continue to relate education to structure, but we must also determine exactly how education leads to work place exploitation and political oppression.

10.8 An Assessment of New Managerial Class Theories

The findings from Table 4 show that the Managerial version of New Class theory produces statistically significant variations in attitudes between managers and non-managers. The findings for each of the dependent attitude variables are analyzed below to determine the relative strength of this version of New Class theory.

Work Place Issues

The Manager - Non-Manager class division produced no statistically significant variation in the scores for the EXPERT variable. For the CONTROL variable, however, there are statistically significant differences between Manager’s and non-Manager’s attitudes toward instituting worker control in the work place. Managers are more likely to disagree with the proposition that workers can run the work place effectively without bosses.

Given Dahrendorf’s (1959) and Aronowitz’s (1979) discussions about the role of bureaucracies in potentially generating a New Class, this finding is not
Managers gain their privileged position by exercising control over workers with imperatively coordinated associations. To favor the institution of worker control would be anathema to their interests in exercising social closure to secure their privileges by controlling workers.

Poverty Source

Of the five items included under this category, the manager - non-manager division produced statistically significant variations in the scores for three items - INTELLIGENCE, OPPORTUNITY, and NECESSARY. Managers are less likely than non-managers to view the source of poverty as a lack of intelligence, a lack of opportunities, or as necessary. These inconsistent findings demonstrate the contradictory nature of the Managerial New Class's world view.

Discussions of the "technocratic" worldview (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 1979) and the New Class worldview (Gouldner 1979) stress the systems oriented, Welfare State orientation of the New Class (however it is defined). If the New Managerial Class were to develop a worldview as hypothesized, then they should be more likely to interpret the source of poverty as a lack of opportunities. However, managers do exhibit traces of this technocratic worldview because they are less likely to view poverty as necessary or as the lack of individual intelligence. In other words, they do exhibit some "system" orientation in that they view poverty as something that can remedied in society.
Crime Solutions

The manager - non-manager class division produced no statistically significant differences on the scores for any of the Crime solutions items - DISCIPLINE, PUNISHMENT, and OPPORTUNITIES. This is surprising in that, once again, the technocratic worldview does not extend to crime issues divided along "system based" solutions (OPPORTUNITIES and PUNISHMENT) and "individual blame" interpretations (DISCIPLINE). Managers are expected to be more favorable toward system solutions than non-managers are. This can be used as evidence that at least as far as the crime issue is concerned, the worldview of managers is contradictory.

Worker Affinities

Of the three items included in the category Worker Affinities, the manager - non-manager class division produced statistically significant variations in the scores for two items - STRIKE and SCABS OK. Managers are less likely to support strikers' efforts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines and more likely to support hiring scabs to replace striking workers than non-managers.

These items offer further evidence that managers are a New Class whose domination over workers generates the potential for conflict with the working class. As expected, given the theoretical discussions presented above, managers have developed a worldview which coincides with their structural position over non-managerial employees. Because they control workers in the work place, managers are unlikely to develop sympathies toward those they control and exploit.
This is especially true when striking workers interfere with the smooth operation of the production process.

Economic Issues

The manager - non-manager class division produces statistically significant variations in the scores for both Economic Issues items - CORP POWER and PROFIT. Managers are less likely to agree that corporations have too much power or that the economy could run effectively without the profit motive than non-managers are.

These findings are important for two reasons. First, they demonstrate that Managers are attempting to reproduce the means of their ascendence - overseeing both the generation of profits and the workings of bureaucratic corporations. Second, it indicates a tendency to align ideologically with the capitalist class on economic issues. This latter point illustrates that even though they are structurally torn between capitalist and worker, they are more ready to identify themselves with the former as opposed to the latter.

Political Issues

The manager - non-manager division produces no statistically significant variation in the political views item. Political attitudes are not affected by the class placement strategy employed here.

10.9 Skill and Sector Divisions within the Managerial Class

The findings presented in Table 5 are generated when Sector of Employment and Skill assets are introduced to examine the divisions within the New Managerial
Class. Because Dahrendorf (1959) and Wright (1985) assert that skill differences within the New Class make discussions of ideological cohesiveness problematic, Wright's Skill Assets are introduced to determine how they affect the New Class worldview. Sector is also introduced as a potential line of cleavage between public and private sector managers.

The introduction of the Skill - non-skill division produces statistically significant variations in the score for only one of the sixteen attitude items - PUNISHMENT - a crime solutions issue. Expert Managers are less likely than their non-expert managerial counterparts to agree with the statement that crime can be reduced by increasing punishments.

The skill based differences hypothesized by Dahrendorf (1959) to fragment the New Managerial class are not significant in this model. As such, managers appear to be a relatively cohesive group. Combined with the findings presented in Table 4, the New Managerial Class seems to be the best candidate for extending class research beyond traditional concepts of economic ownership.

Sector differences generate statistically significant variations in the score for one item only - CORP POWER - an Economic Issue. Managers in the public sector are more likely than their private sector counterparts to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power. Once again, because significant variations are generated for only one of the sixteen items included in the study, Sector of Employment differences do not affect the ideological unity of the New Managerial Class.
10.10 Critical Summary of the New Managerial Class Theory

The findings discussed so far indicate that Organization Assets are a stronger determinant of class formation than Skill assets are. Of the sixteen dependent variables employed in my analysis, the New Expert Class model advanced by Gouldner produces statistically significant variations in the scores for only four items. The New Managerial Class model advanced by Dahrendorf (1959) and Aronowitz (1979) produces statistically significant variations in the scores for eight items. In addition, when Skill and Sector differences are introduced, they have relatively little impact on the internal homogeneity of the New Managerial Class.

These findings bolster Dahrendorf's claim that ruling class theory should be applied to bureaucratic managers while working class theory should be applied to non-managerial employees (1959: 55). In addition, it also supports his contention that as capitalism and bureaucracies expand, class conflict will become "institutionalized" (1959:65). Institutionalization is a byproduct of bureaucratization. Within bureaucracies class conflict is played out in the daily encounters between the controllers and the controlled. Rather than spilling over into society, conflict is controlled and confined within the organization and is regulated by the acknowledged legitimacy of bureaucratic rules which regulate workers' upward mobility, balance attempts at worker control with managerial interests, and regulate collective bargaining. Conflict groups play out their strategies according to the rules laid down by bureaucratic authority (1959:65-67).
These findings also support a central tenant of Aronowitz’s (1979) class theory - managers should be viewed as a "class-in-formation." Although they remain dependent on the capitalists they represent, they could congeal as a class under a set of social conditions in which ownership is further separated from control - when they create a self contained bureaucracy which runs and is ruled by the New Managerial Class in its own name. Such circumstances have yet to emerge, so this class continues to operate in the interests of capital (1979:218-220).

Wright’s arguments about the contradictory character of managers also finds some support in this analysis. According to Wright (1989:338-339), seeing managers as a contradictory location between capitalists and workers does not preclude discussions of developing a New Managerial Class ideology but instead draws attention to the ways they are tied to capitalist interests. For him, managers are much more likely to forge alliances with the capitalist class against workers.

Further implications of the New Managerial Class theory will be discussed in the final chapter. Attention is now turned to the final class placement strategy for experts and managers - "New" Working Class theory.

10.11 New Class or New Workers?

The empirical analyses conducted in Table 6 test the assertion by "orthodox" Marxists that both managers and experts are members of a "new" and expanding working class because they are ultimately dependent on capitalists for their wages and are thus exploited in the same ways that members of the traditional working class are. These theorists reject the argument that "knowledge" and "organization
"assets" have become new forms of property whose emergence coincided with the expansion of capitalism (Wright 1985:38; Anderson 1974).

To test this assertion all nine employee cells in Wright's model were used. Sector was also added as a complicating factor. Employees lacking both skill assets and organization assets - the traditional working class - was used as a reference category. If the "new" working class theorists are correct in their assertions, the number of items whose scores vary from working class reference category should be minimal.

10.12 Sector, Organization, and the "New" Working Class

Of the sixteen attitude items included in Table 6, sector of employment produces statistically significant results for one item only - CORP POWER - an economic issue. Public employees are more likely to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power than private sector workers are. Once again, empirical evidence shows that sector has no impact on the class formation process.

My findings show that Expert Managers have scores on four items that are significantly different from the scores for workers. Expert Managers are less likely than workers to agree with the proposition that punishment reduces crime, less likely to support strikers physically preventing strikebreakers from crossing picket lines, and less likely to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power. Expert managers are also more likely than workers to support hiring scabs to replace strikers.
Semi-credentialed managers exhibit statistically significant variations from the scores for workers on three items. Semi-credentialed managers are less likely than workers to support strikers' in their efforts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines and less likely to agree with the statement that corporations have too much power. They are more likely to support hiring scabs than workers are.

Uncredentialed managers exhibit statistically significant variations from the scores of workers on two items. They are less likely than workers to support strikers in their efforts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines. They are more likely than workers to support increased punishments as a solution to crime.

My findings indicate that managers at all skill levels exhibit attitudes that differ from those of workers. This trend decreases in robustness as the skill levels of managers decrease. Expert managers are more unlike workers than semi-credentialed managers are. Semi-credentialed managers are more unlike workers than uncredentialed managers are. Here, skill assets are interacting with organization assets to produce differences between managers and workers.

Turning to the skill dimension, my findings indicate that in addition to the differences between expert managers and workers, expert supervisors and expert non-managers also exhibit statistically significant variations from workers. Expert supervisors and expert non-managers are more likely to support hiring scabs to replace strikers than workers are. Expert non-managers are also less likely to support strikers in their efforts to prevent strikebreakers from crossing picket lines.
These findings demonstrate that Skill assets have some impact in separating experts from other employees. Once again, this is most evident for expert managers. Expert supervisors and expert non-managers also exhibit statistically significant differences from workers for at least one Worker Affinities item.

Although not significant for the majority of the other items, these findings cast some doubt on the applicability of "new" working class theories to managers and experts. Although for the majority of items there are no significant differences between workers and either experts or managers, there are differences in the items that have the most direct consequences for worker concerns. Managers and experts, in general, do not support striking workers. This is more so for managers than experts. The differences between experts and workers, however, should not be diminished. Experts, by virtue of the exploitation they engage in (Wright 1985) or because of their superior market capacity (Abercrombie and Urry 1983), exhibit statistically significant differences in attitudes from workers when questions are asked about sympathies for striking workers.

10.13 Summary of "New" Working Class Theories

Advocates of the "New" working class approach argue that education differences are not to be interpreted as a new form of property but are merely factors that generate an educated fraction of the working class that is just as exploited as the traditional non-expert working class is (Anderson 1974). Anderson's "new" working class is composed of technicians, engineers, scientists, and the ideological employees in government, law, and the state.
The findings for experts lends some support to this view. Experts, with the exception of expert managers, do not differ significantly from workers for the attitudes used in this analysis as indicators of a New Class worldview. The only significant differences that emerge are related to strikes and strikers. While these are important differences because they relate directly to working class sympathies, they represent only one category of items and two out of sixteen indicators. The group that differs markedly from workers is managers, regardless of their skill level.

The applicability of "new" working class theory to managers finds much weaker support. Managers exhibit a clearer pattern of differences which distinguishes them from workers. Expert Managers appear to represent the core of a New Class due primarily to the ownership of organization assets.

The reason for the differences between managers and workers is that to include the controllers and controlled, or exploiters and exploited within the same groups obscures the relational and conflictual quality of class dynamics. Dahrendorf (1959), Poulantzas (1973a), the Ehrenreichs (1979), Wright (1979; 1985) have all argued, using Marxist concepts, that managers and workers represent two distinct classes in society who stand in a relation of domination and subordination in both the work place and society.

10.14 Summary of "New" Class Theories

In this chapter I discussed the relative contributions of three different theories about the class position and worldview of managers and experts: 1) Expert New
Class theory (Gouldner); 2) Managerial New Class theory (Dahrendorf); and 3) "New" Working Class theory (Anderson). Of the three, Managerial New Class theory appears to offer the most promise for understanding the emergence of a new class under advanced, monopoly capitalism.

"New" Working Class theory, however, also offers promise, provided that it takes into account the differences between controllers and controlled in the work place. Expert New Class theories appear to offer the least promise for New Class research. The implications of these findings are discussed in the next chapter.
CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE SPECULATIONS

11.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to measure the relative contributions of three different types of "new" class research to our understanding of the changing class structure of late twentieth century capitalist America. Three different class models were used to determine whether a "new" class of intellectuals and/or managers emerged with a worldview which sets them apart from traditional workers. The relative contribution of each approach is assessed below. It is followed by a number of suggestions for the further expansion of New Class research.

11.2 Subjectivist Interpretations - The Expert New Class

Gouldner (1979) and contemporary advocates of this position are building on the foundation laid by Mannheim (1939) and Gramsci (1957) in their discussions of the class locations and allegiance of twentieth century intellectuals. For them, if a new class is emerging in capitalist societies, it is composed primarily of intellectuals. These are "owners" of a new form of property which has become a productive force in advanced capitalism - education or cultural capital. As capitalism becomes more reliant on their technical expertise, intellectuals are becoming increasingly important to and indispensable to the economy.

Although these researchers portray intellectuals as a class, they fail to specify the structural positions that they occupy. Instead, they offer a subjectivist approach in which class is an "ideological" construct. Members are united by an
advanced, university education which makes them a language community whose members emphasize technical solutions to social problems.

While these theorists have made an important contribution to arguments about the content of a unique, New Class "worldview," they have failed to discuss adequately or examine the objective, structural foundation which gives rise to this class. They have, in effect, examined the "class for itself" component before adequately addressing how structural locations and relations generate the ideas that unite members of this class. They have failed to discuss "class in itself."

Wright's (1985) structural, exploitation model was used to "anchor" discussions of the Expert New Class. His "skill asset" class determinant was used to operationalize the broadest possible objective determinant for Expert New Class formation. It was used to determine the extent to which experts differ from non-experts along a number of dimensions, all dealing with attitudes toward social issues.

Using Wright to test empirically a number of Gouldner's hypotheses about the Expert New Class's worldview, I demonstrated that if indeed an Expert New Class is emerging, it has yet to develop a cohesive worldview that is significantly different from non-experts. As a consequence, discussions about the Expert New Class as an ideologically cohesive class are premature.

To enrich their theories, Expert New Class researchers must make their assumptions explicit. First, they must demonstrate exactly how education operates as property to generate class differences. Rather than assuming that university
educations automatically unite respondents who own them, they must incorporate in their analyses discussions of the potential incomesurability of divergent intellectual paradigms. Paradigms serve a variety of functions which separate rather than unite intellectuals. They not only distinguish intellectual disciplines from each other, but they also subdivide disciplines from within. If these differences were more fully appreciated by Expert New Class researchers, then they could deal more adequately with the process that divide rather than unite intellectuals.

A second possible explanation for the lack of major differences between experts and non-experts borrows from Rose and Marshall (1989). According to them, education is not a type of property that directly translates into class consequences; instead, it is a type of property that increases the market capacity of its owners. It is also something that members of the working class, through various forms of financial assistance, are able to achieve. Since the researchers in this study all argue that education operates like ownership of other productive assets, they are mistaking market capacity for property and defining class in a way that violates the basic assumption of Marxist research.

Third, even if an Expert New Class is emerging, more time must be devoted to examine the potential lines of cleavage within its ranks. Although Gouldner (1979) and others have attempted to address potential divisive factors, their fragmentation schemes are not supported by my findings. Using Wright's (1985) organization assets to approximate the divisions between the "humanistic intellectuals" and the "technical intelligentsia," my empirical findings indicate that
organization assets create no significant divisions within the Expert New Class. Expert Managers do not differ significantly from their non-managerial counterparts.

There is a body of literature that can be used to account for this effect. Weber argues that entrance into bureaucratic positions is through education. Education trains bureaucrats to perform the tasks attached to the positions they occupy. In the modern work place, employees with college educations have the potential for selling their labors in a labor market from which the unskilled are excluded. Since those at the bottom possess the ability to climb up the corporate ladder and aspire to do so, the differences between expert managers and non-managerial experts are minor. Even if they are at the bottom, they are working in an environment in which aspirations toward the top position of control are realistic so long as one follows the bureaucratic guidelines for marching up the corporate ladder (Edwards 1979).

In sum, relative to alternative explanations about the class locations of educated employees, the Expert New Class theory is the weakest. This weakness raises a number of issues that Expert New Class theorists must address in the future.

First, they have to reassess the general importance of education as a class determinant. Wright (1985) may be closest to the mark when he argues that this is, at best, a secondary form of exploitation. Given my other findings, it may be best viewed as a "tertiary" form of exploitation operating only in conjunction with,
but with less of a class impact than, organization assets. Where education is important, it appears to be education in action - "praxis" - in the work place: the knowledge used by managers to exploit non-manager employees.

Second, the impact of diverse but co-existent paradigms must be reassessed. Here, Gouldner (1979) can serve as a foundation. Although he acknowledges that paradigms divide the New Class, he recognizes and discusses only two divisions. If we incorporate a fuller understanding of paradigms (Kuhn 1970; Ritzer 1992) and how they operate, we can better explain why intellectuals have not coalesced into a class for itself.

11.3 Managerial New Class Theories

The diverse group of theorists lumped together under the heading of Managerial New Class theorists, both Marxist and Weberian, share an important characteristic - all focus on knowledge as it operates downward to control workers. Here, the group that represents the greatest potential for class formation is the group composed of managers. The strength of this approach is that it highlights the relational character of class by focusing on the relationship between controllers and controlled.

Whether articulated as managerial - mental labor (Poulantzas 1975), technocratic - managerial control (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 1979), or imperative coordination (Dahrendorf 1959), managerial activities in the work place, founded upon structural differences in the ability to control and exploit workers, translated into direct social consequences outside the work place.
My findings indicate that this approach to theorizing about the potential emergence of a new class offers the most promise. The foundation is well laid and includes insights from a number of diverse paradigms. For stratification researchers, both Marx and Weber continue to serve as important sources of information.

Dahrendorf (1959) and Wright (1979) have highlighted the importance of organization position and control assets as important sources of class cleavage. Parkin (1979) has argued that managers, once they become ensconced, are able to restrict access to others through social closure operating downward. Aronowitz (1979) and Albert and Hahnel (1979) have argued convincingly that the managerial segment represents the core of a potential new class.

The managerial new class is a fairly homogenous group. Education differences do not appear to be as important as general managerial skills. Irrespective of whether or not they possess education credentials, or work in the public or private sector, managers are significantly different from non-managers in relation to the attitude items used in this analysis. In addition, they appear to be much more sympathetic toward capitalism than researchers suggest. They are not carriers of a technocratic, totalizing worldview but reproducers of capitalist culture (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 1979).

The primary objection to this approach is that it is too "Weberian" for many Marxist scholars. Orthodox Marxist argue that to mistake managerial authority with class forming property violates the assumption that class is a category defined
in terms of ownership or non-ownership of the means of production and not a function of the place one occupies in the technical division of labor in the workplace (Wright 1976).

The problem with the orthodox Marxist approach is that it fails to acknowledge the possibility that the decomposition of capital has created a new set of social spaces. Whether one views this as a "contradictory" class (Wright 1979) or a "class in formation" (Aronowitz 1979), managers are different from workers. Just how different they are ideologically from capitalists is still open to speculation because capitalists are under-represented in most survey research.

There are several avenues open for future research in this area. First, Marxists must continue to refine their discussions about how bureaucratization influences class formation. Wright (1985) has made an important contribution to this issue with his incorporation of organization assets as a possible determinant of class. Marxists need to take a closer look at their Weberian counterparts. Researchers from both camps have to engage in a conscious effort at paradigm integration so that New Managerial Class research can be expanded.

Second, researchers must spend more time understanding the interaction between education assets and organization assets as class determinants. While managers as a group are the broadest possible foundation of this new class, more time must be spent identifying the core of this class and examining how managerial skills in general interact with particular intellectual paradigms. It appears from my analysis that an examination of the core must begin with expert managers.
Third, it is possible that when it comes to identifying "secondary" forms of exploitation (Wright 1985), organization assets are superior to skill assets in identifying class differences. Once again, efforts must be directed toward explaining exactly how the two interact to generate classes and class fragments. Education appears to be a tertiary as opposed to a secondary factor.

11.4 "New" Working Class Theory

For the "new working class" theorists neither managerial nor educational assets serve as the critical determinants of class. Working from the assumption that managers and experts align themselves with workers because they are exploited the same way traditional workers are, Anderson (1974) argues that New Class research is misplaced and misdirected. If there is indeed anything "new" about the class structure and class relations, it is the expansion of an educated segment of the working class.

The "new" working class approach gains some support in this analysis. My findings show that when Wright’s (1985) entire model is used, neither managers nor experts are significantly different than workers for the majority of items. Where differences do exist, they are most pronounced for Expert Managers - those engaged in two secondary forms of exploitation. Furthermore, this group is most sympathetic to the traditional values of capitalism.

Anderson (1974) does acknowledge that highly placed corporate managers are similar to capitalists, but does not go any further. Once again, this demonstrates the inability of researchers working within an orthodox Marxist perspective to
appreciate at least the potential complications introduced by the expansion of education and organization property. To remedy this shortcoming they must return to Marx’s discussion of the intermediate classes and begin acknowledging the potential for new class formation present within the managerial ranks.

While managers are not workers, they are not capitalists either. Even though they may perform the functions of capital (Carchedi 1977), they do not enjoy the hegemony or security of the capitalists class. Even though they control and supervise workers, they are still dependent on the surplus they generate for the capitalists for their incomes. They remain a "contradictory" class which seems more ready to align with the interests of capital as opposed to the interests of labor.

This approach also holds promise for future research for two important reasons. First, "new" working class theorists must continue to question the assumption that either organization assets or skill assets are important new forms of class defining property. In relation to the former, they are borrowing, albeit unwittingly and sometimes grudgingly, from Weber. In Weber’s discussion (Ritzer 1992), bureaucrats are incumbents of positions, not "owners" in Wright’s sense. New Working Class theory thus holds the promise of opening an avenue of understanding between true economic ownership and authority. Although Wright (1979) originated his contradictory approach attempting to do the same thing, his efforts to respond to his critics led him away from dealing with the interaction
between authority and ownership. This part of his earlier theory has to be restored.

Second, and in a related way, the "new" working class theorists challenge the assumption that education leads to social mobility (Dahrendorf 1959). Their approach is better suited to studying the process of "proletarianization" (Oppenheimer 1973) - the process by which technical, expert activities are routinized and degraded to the point that they are no longer different from the traditional activities of traditional workers. In light of the glut of educated workers and continued "deskilling" (Braverman 1974), New Working Class theory continues to offer important insights to our analyses of classes.

11.5 Limitations

One of the central limitations of traditional class research has been its inability to address other forms of exploitation and oppression. This is especially problematic when attempting to explain the persistence of racial and gender based exploitation in the United States. These limitations can be traced to Marx's argument that class identifications and relations are rapidly erasing and replacing differences based on ascribed characteristics - race, ethnicity, and gender (Marx and Engels 1848).

Arguments about the diminishing salience of race have recently been formulated by Wilson (1978) for the case of African Americans. In Wilson's view, recent changes in the American economy have made it difficult to discuss the African American experience without stressing its class based foundation. Citing
civil rights legislation, state intervention, and the increasing participation of African Americans in higher education and professional labor markets, Wilson argues that the "declining significance of race" signals a need to reconceptualize racial discrimination and inequality in terms of class based exploitation (1978). For Wilson, the same social forces that created the modern African American underclass operate to increase the number of whites who find themselves in a state of poverty - deindustrialization, shrinking labor markets for the unskilled and semi-skilled, and a movement of jobs from urban centers to the suburbs. Increasing numbers of African Americans and whites find themselves excluded from positions of economic power. At the same time, however, grants and loans for higher education, civil rights protections, and urban concentration have given African Americans, especially professional and semi-professionals, more political and economic opportunities than they enjoyed in the past. Wilson's argument, in essence, supports Marx's (1848) contention that as capitalism advances, class is the primary basis for social inequality.

Wilson's argument about the declining significance of race has been criticized for being naive and myth-like. Albert and Hahnel (1979) view race as a "core" component of the American stratification system which operates in conjunction with class. For them, race is important to consider and to incorporate into traditional class analysis for two reasons. First, race continues to determine a person's chances of gaining access to the primary means of social mobility - education. As such, it is an important factor to take into account when speculating
about how people come to occupy the class position they do. Second, race is central in discussing how people develop conceptions about themselves in relation to others. As a consequence, discussions about the formation of class based psychology and consciousness cannot proceed without being cognizant of the interactions between race and class (1979).

In addition to incorporating race into discussions of social inequality, the impact of gender differences must also be assessed. Stratification researchers have generally operated under the assumption that as capitalism expands, the structural barriers to mobility for women will erode (Rothman 1993:10). Once again, Marx's argument that capitalism erases all socially significant differences except those based on ownership of productive property is used as the primary rationale for discussing gender inequality in class terms.

Gender, according to Albert and Hahnel (1979), is another core characteristic which must be included in stratification analysis to develop a more accurate picture of inequality in capitalist America. In a way similar to race, gender determines access to socially valued resources and determines chances for movement between classes. It also shapes individual psychology and group consciousness.

This study was limited to an analysis of the class position of white males in order to determine which of three competing class models offers the most promise for future research. My findings indicate that of the three, the Managerial New Class approach is the most valuable for understanding and explaining changes in the class structure of the United States at the end of the twentieth century. Future
research should be directed toward determining how both race and gender
differences affect entrance into the ranks of the Managerial New Class. Inquiries
must be made about the gender and racial composition of this new class and about
how persisting systems of gender and racial discrimination operate to restrict
access to its ranks. Incorporating these two additional dimensions of inequality
into discussions of class represents an important step toward gaining a fuller
understanding about how socially important divisions are generated and
perpetuated.

My use of attitude items from the Class and Class Consciousness data set to
speculate about class based action and behavior suffers from the same limitation
that plagues most class researchers - linking attitudes with action. Most theoretical
discussions of class, especially within Marxist sociology, focus on class based
action as the central determinant of social change. Determining the relationship
between attitudes and behaviors is, however, problematic. Although attitudes are
assumed to be important determinants of behavior, the two do not correspond
perfectly. Other personal characteristics such as motives, values and personality
traits can interact with attitudes to influence behavior in unexpected ways. One
way of overcoming this limitation is to design questionnaires in which the attitude
items are specific and directly relevant to the specific behavior a particular
researcher is measuring.
11.6 Inside Every Marxist . . .

The last quarter century of stratification research was marked by attempts to incorporate Weberian discussions about the spread of bureaucracy and bureaucratic authority into the traditional Marxist paradigm. That group of researchers known as the "Neo-Marxists" have struggled with two issues. First, they attempt to determine how workplace control, as a structural phenomenon, translates into class consequences. Second, they attempt to understand how the growing segment of the population with university diplomas affects the class structure. Both issues were addressed in this dissertation.

My findings about managers show that more energy should be directed to gaining a fuller understanding about the relation between bureaucratization and class formation. Whether conceived of as "authority," "domination," or "exploitation," the exercise of control in the workplace has a direct impact on the structure of class relations in capitalist America. This is supported by a number of empirical studies which indicate that relations of domination and subordination in the workplace translate into different socialization outcomes (Kohn 1969) and family dynamics (Rubin 1976). They also are both a reflection of and consequence of different experiences in school (Bowles and Gintis 1976).

An effort must be made to integrate Marxist and Weberian paradigms in a more explicit way. Granted that Marx and Weber differ in their approaches to class, those differences are not so dramatic that their insights cannot be combined to create an integrated stratification paradigm. From Marx, researchers must
continue to view class as founded upon property ownership, stress the relational character of class dynamics, and highlight the potential conflict between different classes. From Weber, researchers must continue their attempts to determine how both the spread of bureaucracies and technical education interacts with traditional economic ownership to alter the class structure of advanced capitalist societies.

As we move toward the twenty first century, sociologists are faced with the task of updating the theories of Marx and Weber. Capitalism has undergone profound changes since the time when these thinkers first advanced their ideas. A stubborn refusal to acknowledge these changes and remain embedded in the Marxian or Weberian orthodoxy threatens the future of class research. Both camps must be willing to abandon their defensive postures and engage in dialogue rather than debate the relative merits of conforming to rigid, traditional interpretations.

Ideally, this dialogue will be characterized by efforts to identify potentially new forms of property which are emerging in advanced capitalist countries. New Class researchers appear to have made important contributions to this dialogue when they highlight the growing importance of education and organization control. Their projects represent a first step. Future research can add clarity to our understanding of class relations and dynamics provided that it makes explicit how "old" property interacts with "new" property to generate a new set of structural arrangements.
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## APPENDIX

### OPERATIONALIZING WRIGHT'S EXPLOITATION MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets in the means of production</th>
<th>Self employed</th>
<th>Number of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Employers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets in organization control</th>
<th>Directly involved in making policy decisions for the organization</th>
<th>Supervisor with real authority over subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-management</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets in scarce skills/talent</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education credential</th>
<th>Job Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>B.A. or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>less than B.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>B.A. or more</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>B.A. or more</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncredentialled</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>less than B.A. or</td>
<td>Non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>less than B.A. or</td>
<td>autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual non-crafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Wright (1985:150).
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