

Appendix 1: On the study of social change and teacher's work:

In this study we used as a theoretical tool a model for analysis of social classes and layers in relation to power and control over assets and employees based on the works of Eric Olin Wright (1985; 1997). This framework was constructed in order to capture variations over time and place in modern societies and to deal with implications of class locations for the occupational lives of individuals. Furthermore, it was constructed in order to deal with the >problem of the middle layers= in social analysis, which is very suitable to our focus on teachers. A special focus is on questions of authority, sanctions, and expertise needed for work. In line with other recent theories on social classes, the rationale behind the model is to investigate to what extent the differentiation of power and control within current mode(s) of production has changed the nature of the class structure.

Wright's original class model is based on three sources of power and control in the work situation: (1) *ownership of capital*, (2) *control over physical capital*, i.e. control of the physical means of production, (3) *control over labour*, i.e. control, supervision, and discipline within the labour process. From this assertion, it is possible to identify three social classes. The *working class* lacks control over these three assets, while the *bourgeoisie* (capital owners) exerts control over all of them. A third class is the *petty bourgeoisie*, with the ability to control capital but not the work of others - with minor exceptions. These main positions are supplemented, however, by strata that have double and *contradictory class locations*: between the working class and the bourgeoisie we have locations of managers and supervisors who have no control over capital but control the work process; between the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie we have small employers, who have few employees but nevertheless also take part in the work process, and between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie we have the semi-autonomous employees, who have a considerable control over their own work but not over that of others. Such contradictory locations are of crucial importance if we want to understand social changes in a longer time perspective.

Within this model, teachers are to be found typically in the category of semi-autonomous employees. In some cases, however, where teachers hold managerial or supervisory positions, they are to be classified as such. Here, however, we are mostly dealing with «ordinary» teachers. They share some characteristics with workers (such as the fact that they are employed) and some with the petty bourgeoisie (e.g., self-direction in their work).

In such a contradictory position teachers might move in one direction or another, depending on the circumstances, and they might split and seek alliances, depending on conjunctures. Their situation might also change depending on external factors such as the relative strength and frequency among other categories in the model. Internal factors such as the ways their work is organised and governed and teachers= control over their work and so on is another aspect of teachers= position and conditions for work. In this study we will deal with external as well as internal aspects.

Some important structural factors that constitute the context for understanding teachers are, to be brief, their semi-autonomous position within the class-structure;

their localisation in the public sphere; their function as mediators of factual knowledge and normative orientations in a society where dominating discourses strongly emphasizes factual knowledge as the most important aspect productive factor. Due to the changes in opinion we have registered over time these structural factors can not be seen as static causal factors.

We underlined the need to make cross-professional studies in order to capture aspects of teachers' work and lives. The current study is based on a analysis of data collected in Sweden in 1980 and 1995 and in Norway in 1982 and 1995. The first data collections were carried out when the welfare state model was still in its peak in Norway and Sweden. In 1995 this model had been replaced by a more deregulated state with new ways to govern education for some five years, after a period of restructuring. Thus, the actual period seems to fit rather well with changes in society and education. The two cases of Sweden and Norway is of interest, since they are quite similar as welfare states but with somewhat different ways to deal with issues of centralisation and with education matters.

Data were collected by means of surveys in combination with telephone interviews directed to independent random samples of all individuals at the age of 16-65 years old. Around 68 percent of individuals in the samples answered the surveys. The surveys took one-two hours to respond to. The total numbers of individuals responding to this study were as follows:

Sweden	1980:	Total 1074	Teachers 65
	1995:	Total 1175	Teachers 88
Norway	1982:	Total 1681b	Teachers 108
	1995:	Total 1296	Teachers 124

It should be emphasised that our material is based on people participating in the work force which means that our picture of the social structure in general is somewhat restricted. We are merely mapping the occupational structure. This is not however a major drawback since the unemployment in Sweden and Norway has been relatively low under the major part of the studied period. 1990 it was 1,8% in Sweden and then rose to 9,2% 1995, which is quite an exceptional level by Swedish standards. In Norway the unemployment was highest 1990 (5,3%) and then decreased somewhat in 1995. A conclusion that can be made in this context is that high unemployment not yet seems to be firmly institutionalised as a structural feature in Sweden and Norway. Considering the very high unemployment figures for the younger generation not yet established on the labour market this conclusion can however be problematic in future.

In order to capture teachers' locations and to compare them with different social layers we use the design for social class analysis developed by Eric Olin Wright (1978, 1997). This is based on individuals concrete work situation and experiences of such matters as authority and control in various ways. We are here dealing with *autonomy* in relation to planning and performance of work and *authority* in relation to tasks, policy and organisation. We also deal with levels of *expertise* in relation to different social categories. In more detail, see short presentations of instrument in appendix 1a.

Considering teachers relative strength as a professional corps, we consider issues of *union organisation* and *political organisation* as well as incomes relative to other

layers. These are rather abstract notions of strength, but they have the value of being comparable over layers and time.

In order to measure teachers' orientations in society we look at their responses to statements of economic and political nature which they can agree or disagree to in higher or lower extent. This we compare to patterns obtained for other social groups and layers in order to find out similarities and differences.

To end: the reader must remember the small numbers in the category of teachers. This restricts the possibility to do more elaborated analyses and to obtain Aharð's findings.

The relative frequencies of different social categories in Sweden and Norway over years. Percent. Middle class positions grey-shaded.

Social Category	Sweden		Norway	
	1980	1995	1982	1995
Bourgeoisie	1	1	1	1
Small employers	5	2	3	4
Petty bourgeoisie	5	6	10	6
Managers	2	4	4	4
Advisor-managers	9	13	9	18
Supervisors	10	9	13	11
Semi-autonomous employees	17	26	16	27
Working class	51	39	44	29
Total percent	100	100	100	100
Total number	1 074	1 175	1 681	1 296

The middle class positions (managers, advisor managers, supervisors and semi-autonomous employees) have in sum significantly increased their relative share - from 38 to 51 percent in Sweden and from 43 to 61 percent in Norway. However, there are striking differences even between these positions. In table 2 we can see that more precisely within these layers, the semi-autonomous workers are those who have increased most - from 17 to 26 percent in Sweden and from 16 to 27 percent in Norway. As a general trend this can be interpreted as higher demands on qualifications of the workforce, also suggesting a more accentuated importance of the educational system.