



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Gothenburg University Publications

La percezione dello status occupazionale:il caso svedese

This is an author produced version of a paper published in:

Sociologica Del Lavoro (ISSN: 0392-5048)

Citation for the published paper:

Svensson, L. ; Ulfsdotter Eriksson, Y. (2008) "La percezione dello status occupazionale:il caso svedese". Sociologica Del Lavoro, vol. 112(4), pp. 139-153.

Downloaded from: <http://gup.ub.gu.se/publication/95003>

Notice: This paper has been peer reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or pagination. When citing this work, please refer to the original publication.

Article to Sociologia del Lavoro

Lennart G Svensson & Ylva Ulfsdotter Eriksson

Perceptions of Occupational Status – the Swedish case

Abstract

The sociology of occupations since its classical period has been related more or less closely to studies of class and status. This paper depicts some of these issues from a case study of Sweden. Data are based on a national survey distributed in 2002 among the Swedish population age 16-74 (sample 3000), where 100 occupations were included for independent assessments of their status in general in society on a nine-point scale.

The constructed rank order of occupations demonstrates a well known range of ascribed status from dishwasher to physician – legitimizing the distribution of resources and privileges, and with only minor differences of means between groups of respondents. However, some interesting class, gender and age differences remain – sometimes hidden by mean of means. Income is the main explanation behind status with a subjective as well as an objective indicator. Other significant subjective explanations are career, skill, autonomy, responsibility, honesty and moral, and influence.

An alternative rank order is constructed on the status the occupations ought to have according to individual perceptions separated from collective perceptions. Occupations in education, health and care were especially upgraded, and in particular by women. There is great potential for social equality, impeded by strong reproduction of common perceptions of occupations and their status ranking. The paper is finished by comparing the data from year 2002 with data from a Swedish survey in 1958 and an American in 1989.

Key words: perceptions, occupations, status, class, gender, age

Brief biographies:

Lennart G. Svensson, currently, senior researcher and professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. Connected to the Centre for Studies of Professions at the University College in Malmo. His main research is devoted to the sociology of education, occupations and professions, and particularly the organization of professional work.

Ylva Ulfsdotter Eriksson, currently, university lecturer at the Department of Sociology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. She is teaching in organisation and human resource management. Her research is devoted to sociology of occupation, stratification, organisation and gender, mixing qualitative and quantitative methods.

Introduction

Perceptions of occupations constitute a considerable part of our socially constructed world. They contribute to produce and reproduce the social structures such as classes, organisational hierarchies, and segregation on gender and ethnicity. Occupations compose the most essential aspect in the definitions of class affiliation, and they are connected to certain positions in many different organisations. Perceptions of occupations and professions determine to a great extent our choices of education and life careers, and they can partly explain the reproduction of the segregation in the labour market. They also indicate expected and acceptable actions and allocation of sanctions and privileges, comparative to models, stereotypes and perception in other fields. They can determine the possibilities for successful daily or more infrequent cooperation between different occupations. In spite of extensive views of changes and flexibility in a post-modern world, perceptions of occupation seem to represent reproduction and stability of major importance for individuals as well as for societies.

Much research on perceptions of occupations is related to research on prestige or status¹, which in its turn depends on the status aspect in almost all perceptions of occupations. Many status measures are generated from the evaluations by the general public of occupational standing, and they are supposed to reflect a classical sociological hypothesis that occupational status constitutes one of the most important aspects in social interaction (Ganzeboom & Treiman 1996:203). Status is defined as a social evaluation of individuals or collectives, and occupational status is here related to positions, separated from individuals, which by strong institutionalisation can be labelled status.

Social status is a collective social judgement of relative superiority or inferiority, respectability or disdain, desirability or rejection. Status represents the subjective evaluation of members of society by other members of that society using contemporary values and beliefs. (Rothman 1999:103)

Social evaluations are based on personal performance and individual properties. It is also based on structural positions such as occupation, class, and family or on social attributes such as gender, age and ethnicity. Occupation may be the most manifest source of social status and the most powerful consideration in urban and industrial societies. Occupational prestige is often called status and refers firstly to ascribed status hierarchies as parts of cultural traditions and transmitted during socialisation from early years, and secondly to achieved status more

¹ Status here covers both status and prestige.

related to evaluations and comparisons of jobs and their various attributes and standards as income and other desirable working condition dimensions (Turner 1988; Rothman 2001). These desirable criteria can be categorised as prerequisites, rewards and characteristics of the work. The most significant *prerequisites* in industrial societies are educational requirements: intelligence, formal education, duration and complexity of training. Scarcity on the labour market can give temporary fluctuating effects. *Rewards* such as income and privileges and fringe benefits of various kinds have symbolic values and can also be translated into desirable lifestyles. *Characteristics* of the work are composed by e.g. work tasks, social organisation of work, physical, mental and social working conditions, and the degree of routine, responsibility, autonomy and discretion.

Occupational prestige and status is a multidimensional concept (Haller & Bills 1979) and is regarded as a result of several variables, such as educational level, income and authority and power (Marsh 1971). These criteria can vary between specific occupations and to some extent complement each other. An occupation with a high degree of power is less dependent of a high educational level for perceptions of prestige (Marsh 1971; Ulfsdotter Eriksson 2006).

Perceptions on occupations are in this research project defined as: attributions and properties concerning demands for education and competence, physical, mental and social conditions and rewards, ascribed to groups with established and well known occupational labels. One important objective for the research project is to construct and put forward those latent attributions and properties as indicators of occupational status.

A primary issue in the research on occupational status has been whether perceptions are depending on the personal properties of the responding individual such as e.g. education, occupation, gender, age, income, religion and region or if occupational status is to be seen as an objective social fact, since several studies in the research tradition shows stability, and similarity of the occupational status hierarchy (Reiss 1961; Treiman 1977; Wegener 1992). Many research findings are indicating very low dependence, and another objective of this study is to test such hypotheses once again.

Systematic studies of occupational status originated in the 1920s, and today we have a rich and comprehensive literature in the field, which confirms relatively stable hierarchies of status (Treiman 1977; Nakao & Treas 1990; 1994; Ganzeboom, Graaf & Treiman 1992;

Wegener 1992; Ganzeboom & Treiman 1996; Hansen 2001; Ulfsdotter Eriksson 2006). There is a high level of consensus on the placement of most occupations within nations. People tend, though, to inflate the social standing of their own occupation and others similar or close to it. Economic rewards also tend to be more salient criterion for people at the lower end of the stratification system, while educational attainment is given more weight by those at the upper end of the ladder.

Repeated international studies in industrial societies have demonstrated very high degree of stability. In one excellent example of the dominating perspective in the international status research 55 countries were compared (Treiman 1977). The conclusion states the perceptions on occupational status to be roughly the same in all complex societies and over time. This is explained by the necessary consequences of the logic in division of labour. Status was there assumed to be, “an indicator of those resources that are converted into privilege and exclusion in human interaction and distributive processes” (Ganzeboom, Graaf & Treiman 1992:8). Or may be even, quoting Davis and Moore (1945), “the approval and respect members of society give to incumbents of occupations as rewards for their valuable services to society”. According to the reasoning from this structural functional perspective a common hierarchy of occupational status is assumed independent of time, place, and individual preferences. From these findings a scale of status adaptable to all industrial countries was constructed (Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale).

However, there have been various critiques of the structural functional perspective. Coxon et. al. state e.g. that “[...] cross-national, cross-cultural agreement is artefactual, depending as it does upon the set of stereotyped occupation names that survive cross-cultural and translational comparison, and upon the crudest method of aggregating rating scale measures” (Coxon et.al. 1986:47). Wegener (1992) asserts that people with low status tend to even status differences between occupations, while people from higher status factions tend to separate stronger between occupations with high and low status respectively. Nakao and Treas (1994) compare their new status scale from 1989 to the dominating scale from 1964 and assert the trend during 25 years that “[...] lower-status occupations [to] gain prestige points vis-à-vis higher status ones. Although this has not greatly reordered the relative rankings of different lines of work, the changes are sufficient to distinguish scales reflecting public opinion in the 1960s from those reflecting Americans’ views in 1989” (Nakao and Treas 1994:36). Haller and Bills even suggest Treiman’s study to be “premature” (1979:725). They argue that his

evidences are biased due to an overload with sampling from industrial, Western and urban samples. They conclude that we cannot rely only on Treiman's scale, but to acknowledge that there might exist several occupational hierarchies in the world. However, they do state that the Treiman scale should be treated as a good tool for occupational prestige in the West. Apparently, there is not full consensus to the assumptions behind the status scale independent of time, place and individuals, which give good reasons to yet another time study the perceptions of occupational status in the contemporary Swedish society. Our findings may be compared to some results in international studies (e.g. Nakao and Treas 1994; Ganzebom et.al. 1992; Ganzebom and Treiman 1996).

The Swedish survey and rank order of occupations ²

One hundred occupations were selected to represent the classifications of occupations according to the international occupational classification ISCO88 (ILO 1990). Each occupation had to be estimated on a ninth point scale according to the item: "State for each occupation how it is evaluated in society according to status." The estimation was in our study made one occupation at a time and not as a rating and ranking of all compared to all as in the interview set up by Nakao and Treas (1994). Here are some results depicted, referring to appendix 1, and the number in the rank order within brackets.

The range of weighted means was from ambassador (1, M=8.32) at the top to dishwasher (100, M=1.66) in the bottom. Other occupations at the top were physician (2), judge (3), university professor (4), lawyer (5), aircraft pilot (6) and chief executive (7), and in the bottom street vendor (99), cleaner (98), garbage collector (97), ticket collector (96), forestry labourer (79) and supermarket cashier (88). The standard deviation varied from the lowest 1.11 (judge) to the highest 2.31 (fashion model), and was relatively high for Member of Parliament, rock musician, tax enforcement and artist, demonstrating a number of more controversial occupations. Some fairly new occupations as aircraft pilot (6), professional

² Technical specification of the study.

A survey was distributed by mail to a sample of the Swedish population age 16-74 in Febr. 2002. The response rate was 61 percent – especially low among citizens not born in Nordic countries, low income and low education. Data has been calibrated and weighed according to the non-response rates. The sample was stratified on age with a larger sample in age 16-24 years, and on selection of occupations in four strata to cover 100 occupations (20 equal for all respondents and 20 more specific for every fourth part of the sample).

athlete (11), web designer (24), computer operator (29), fire-fighter (36), fashion model (39), airhostess (40) and cook (45) were given higher status than might be expected according the required credentials, but may be explained by their popular, fashionable and conspicuous character. Results according to groups of occupations in the international classification are demonstrated in table 1.

Table 1: Mean status score for Sweden 2002 and status score for international Standard Classification of Occupations 1988.

ISCO-88 fields	Swedish mean	Status score
1. Legislators, senior officials, managers	8,06	77
2. Professionals	6,41	66
3. Technicians and associate professionals	6,0	60
4. Clerks	3,27	28
5. Service, shop, market sales workers	4,34	41
6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	3,73	34
7. Craft and related trades workers	4,17	42
8. Plant and machine operators	3,66	33
9. Elementary occupations	2,34	19

The ISCO codes above describe fields of occupations according to educational requirements and tasks at work. Legislators (1) require no specific formal education. Professionals (2) correspond to academic degree or longer post-secondary education; technicians (3) to shorter post-secondary education; and categories 4 to 8 correspond to upper secondary education; and category 9 to elementary education. Service work (5) and craft and trade (7) are estimated relatively high in status and deviate from the rank order of the fields. The status score is the mean for the scores labelling the first and highest level and computed within fields according to Nakao and Treas (1994:8). There are great variations within the fields on the fourth and most detailed level, and especially so for professionals from professor and physician (89) down to social work professional (40).

Explaining the rank order

The first interpretation of these results is that they represent a strong status hierarchy and a kind of collective consciousness in Sweden reproduced over time and common to different groups like gender, age, education and class. The gender correlation was almost complete (Pearson=0.99). However, occupations as veterinarians, psychologist, military officer, priest, midwife, dancer, and forestry labourer were estimated higher by females. Others were estimated higher by males as dentist, electrician, construct worker, car fitter and farmer. Females tend to estimate high status occupations higher than males, while men tend to estimate low status occupations higher than women. According to age the correlation is also very high (Pearson=0.97). But there are some interesting exceptions. Young people tend to ascribe lower status to middle and low status occupations, and to ascribe higher status to new occupations as stock broker, film producer, computer consultant, fashion model, web designer and art director. According to education there is a bias of estimating high status occupations higher among people with higher education and low status occupations lower. The opposite is the case among people with lower education, i.e. estimating high status occupations lower and low status occupations higher. Here we find one of the reproducing mechanisms of the rank ordering, that higher education supports lower status as well as higher status, while lower education does not support lower status. This can be demonstrated by the width of the mean scores, which are 7 for higher educated and 6.44 for lower educated. A similar pattern can be demonstrated according to subjective class as well as class origin. Seven particular occupations were tested by logistic regression analyses and some differences were demonstrated for education and class (Ulfsdotter Eriksson 2006). On the whole, however, the strong consensus for the rank order and the perception of occupational status is again the main result.

As above, using the property of the respondents is one way of trying to explain any differences in perceiving occupations. Another method is to ask for subjective estimation of properties characterizing occupations. Marsh (1971) argues that explanation to similarities in occupational status hierarchies are due to similarities in requirements for a given occupation (educational demands, power and authority and rewards) rather than a common structural division of labour in complex societies. The “cross-societal similarities in prestige” (Marsh 1971:222) are to be found in properties of occupational roles. Since occupational prestige is based on perceptions, they are based on what people know about a given occupation, but also how they value occupational properties. These properties should be understood as criteria for prestige (Marsh 1971; Ulfsdotter Eriksson 2006).

A number of items constituting status, that also can be understood as occupational properties, were exposed to the respondents as depicted in table 2 below.

Table 2: Importance for the status of occupations (1-5), mean and standard deviation.

Indicator	Mean	Std deviation
1. High salary	4,22	0,83
2. Good career potential	4,09	0,88
3. High skill	4,09	0,90
4. Responsible	4,07	0,88
5. Autonomous	4,05	0,92
6. Honesty and moral	4,03	1,13
7. Great influence	3,90	1,00
8. Value for society	3,68	1,14
9. Help to others	3,53	1,22
10. Long education	3,39	1,10
11. Great efforts at work	3,29	1,05
12. Long experience	3,28	1,11
13. Popular	3,02	1,27
14. Male dominated	2,32	1,36

High salary is the outstanding explanation for status with career, skill, responsibility, autonomy, and honesty and moral in second place and male domination as very low, and last of these given alternative aspects. Some of these variables demonstrate fairly high correlations, which have been used to search for more complex components by a factor analysis. The first component is constituted by honesty and moral, value for society, help to other persons, long experience, great effort, responsible and high skill, which may be labelled **professionalism in work**, a calling to the benefit of others and based upon requirements not as much connected to formal education as on experience from the work itself. In the second component high salary goes together with great influence, long education, popular, and male dominated. We may label this component **career** or work to the instrumental, rewarding benefit of the individual. (These two components are covering almost half of the variance 47 %.) Among those indicators in the first component honesty and moral seems to be the most controversial according to the standard deviations.

Young people (16-24) put significantly more importance than the rest of the sample (25-74) in autonomy, skill, salary and education. Women put more importance than men to: male domination, responsibility, honesty and moral, value for society, great effort and help to others, which is close to the component of professionalism.

Yet, another method to subjectively measure the status constitution was used, where the respondents had to estimate five properties and their connection to 20 given occupations. Estimated salary, thus, correlated strongly with the status estimations (0.96) as did influence in society (0.95). Considerably lower was the correlation between usefulness in society and status (0.42) and psychic efforts (0.61) and physical efforts (-0.61). People in general, thus, tend to connect or to explain occupational status in the first place by salary and influence.

In the study some objective data was collected for the main part of the sample of occupations. Actual salaries (average income for each occupation) correlated fairly high with estimated status (0.72). Long education as a subjective estimation of importance for status ended up only as number ten out of the fourteen properties above. Number of actual years of formal education for a smaller sample of occupations (39) had also a fairly low correlation with estimated status (0.49). When the four levels of educational requirements according to ISCO was used for the full sample of occupations instead, the correlation was only a bit lower than for salary (0.65). One third measure is composition of gender. Subjectively, this ended up in the last position above, but with lower consensus according to the standard deviation. Actual proportions of females correlated negatively with estimated status (-0.19). Gender equal occupations had a mean of estimated status on 5.64, male dominated 5.28, and female dominated 4.31. This was also found in another Swedish study, which demonstrated in particular that differences in occupational status did not seem to explain the impact of sex composition on salaries (Magnusson 2008:9).

An alternative rank order

The sample of respondents was also exposed to the item: “State the status that the occupation ought to have according to your own opinion.” The differences between this estimation and the earlier one may be regarded as the difference between individual preferences and perceived societal norms. Firstly, the width of the preferred rank order was narrower: 4.61 compared to 6.66 in the earlier one. This is caused mainly by upgrading a number of middle and low ranked occupations primarily in public services and health care and education as policeman, fire-fighter, nurse, midwife, primary school teacher, pre-school teacher, child minder, care worker and cleaner. This restructuring of the rank order of occupations shows a great potential for equality, though the correlation between the two rank orders remained at

0.77. There were some interesting gender differences, where women were estimating female dominated public service occupation higher than men, and where men were estimating typical male occupations in the private sector higher than women. But still, the correlation between the female and the male individually preferred estimations was as high as 0.96, which again demonstrates the fundamental societal consensus in these matters.

A comparison with Sweden from the 1950s

A study was performed in 1958 comprising a smaller sample of male occupations only, which made 18 occupations comparable between the two studies (Carlsson 1958). In the 2002 study a number of occupations received lower status estimation as: teacher, pharmacist, bank clerk, hair cutter, carpenter, taxi driver, shop keeper, construct worker waiter and postman. They are service occupations as well as qualified worker occupations. Only a few occupations received higher estimations as: university professor, chief executive, military officer, accountant, and (theatre) actor.

An international comparison

In appendix 1 the status scores for Sweden in 2002 and for US in 1989 are compared for 72 occupations, which have more obviously corresponding labels in these countries. Still, there are many differing conditions in systems and organisations explaining the differences in scores more than actual status evaluations, which should be born in mind.

The correlation (Pearson) between the Swedish and the US scores was 0,864, which could be compared to one reported title correlation from the same culture between 1964 and 1989 as high as 0,97 (Nakao & Treas 1994:15).³ The Swedish sample uses a wider range of scores from 8 (dishwasher) to 89 (university professor and physician) than the US data indicate, which run from 17 (dishwasher) to 86 (physician). The Swedish mean of scores is 49,86 and the US mean 49,89. Thus, the two countries at different times and from different data still tend to be very close to each other in this sense. Of the 72 comparable occupations 41 scored higher in Sweden 2002 than in US 1989, which means a slight upgrading in that sense. But on the whole this comparison confirms the stability thesis and that there is strong reproduction of the perceptions of the status of occupations – a robust hierarchy (Ibid 2).

³ The correlations between different prestige classifications of occupations are discussed in Hansen 2002.

The mean is somewhat less for professional occupations (ISCO 2) in US (65,35) compared to Sweden (68,05), and reverse for non-professional occupations. Swedes tend to give higher assessment to legislators, managers and professionals, while Americans tend to give higher grades to non-professional commercial and personal services. Thus, there has been a general growth in status estimation for higher educated, which could be expected from the growth of the field of professionals and technicians in what is often labelled the post-industrial and the knowledge society (Hansen 2001). The higher importance for education stated by young people might also confirm this trend. But yet again, Swedes are less unanimous on professionals (std. dev. 14,98) than Americans (9,35), which is a contra indication to the post-industrial thesis.

Concerning differences between the two countries on particular occupations, they are greatest on cook and rock musician, which were given 20 units higher status in Sweden on the one side, and social work assistant professional⁴ and personal care/aid worker, given 20 and 18 units higher in US, respectively. There are a number of other occupations differently estimated in the two countries. Air flight pilot and technician (in Swedish engineer) are given significantly higher grades in Sweden. Engineers (short post-secondary education) score only 10 units less than civil engineers (academic degree), which depicts the traditional high status attributed engineering in Sweden. Computer operators have their status connected to the hot and prestigious information technology from the 1990s. Economists have had a salient position in media and the public discussion since the early 1980s. Judges, lawyers and the law system in general have high legitimacy in Sweden, which can explain the higher grades for judge and lawyer. Swedish midwives are more autonomous and have longer education than their equivalents in the US. On the contrary, teachers in preschool (15), in primary school (16) and in high school (11) are given higher status in the US than in Sweden, according to expectations from frequent criticism of schooling in general. The time difference of 13 years from 1989 may, of course, be part of the explanation to these deviations between the two countries.

⁴ Social work assistant professional is a middle management position, which has the misleading label of assistant.

Conclusion

The paper depicts some analyses on a survey of occupational status distributed to a sample (3.000) of the Swedish population. 100 occupations were included for independent assessments on a nine-point scale according to techniques elaborated by Nakao and Treas (1994).

Earlier studies on occupational status have reported strong stability and robust hierarchies. The Swedish data do not demonstrate full equivalence to the international standard classification of occupations on nine classes. Service work (5) and craft and trade (7) are estimated relatively high in status and deviate from the rank order of the fields. And inversely, clerks (4) and farmers (6) are assessed lower than the service and market workers (5) and craft and trade workers (7). However, the constructed rank order of occupations demonstrates a well known range of ascribed status from dishwasher to physician with only minor differences of means between groups of respondents as gender, age and class. E. g. females tend to estimate high status occupations higher than males, while men tend to estimate low status occupations higher than women. Young people tend to ascribe lower status to middle and low status occupations, and to ascribe higher status to new occupations. According to education there is a bias of estimating high status occupations higher among people with higher education and low status occupations lower. The opposite is the case among people with lower education. Income and salary is the main explanation to high status as a subjective indicator as well as an objective one.

An alternative rank order or restructured rank order asking for the preferred status of occupations showed a great potential for equality in Sweden. The correlation between Swedish (2002) and American (1989) status score data was 0.86, and the means were very close to each other. Swedes tend, however, to use a wider range of scores levelling “top” occupations and lowering “bottom” occupations. Swedes tend e.g. to give higher assessment to legislators, managers and professionals, while Americans tend to give higher grades to non-professional commercial and personal services. On the contrary, teachers in preschool, in primary school and in high school are given higher status in the US than in Sweden.

References

- Carlsson, Gosta (1958) *Social Mobility and Class Structure*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Coxon, A. P. M. et. al. (1986) *Images of Social Stratification. Occupational Structures and Class*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Davis, K. & Moore, W.E. (1945) "Some Principles of Stratification" *American Sociological Review* 10:242-249
- Ganzeboom, Harry B. G. & Treiman, Donald J. (1996) "Internationally Comparable Measures of Occupational
- Ganzeboom, Harry B.G.; De Graaf, Paul M. & Treiman, Donald J. (1992) "A Standard International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status" *Social Science Research* vol. 21 no 1:1-56.
- Haller, Archibald O & Bills, David B (1979) "Occupational prestige hierarchies: Theory and evidence" *Contemporary sociology*. Vol 8 No 5 pp.721-734
- Hansen, H. Lars. (2001) *The Division of Labour in Post-Industrial Societies*. Diss. Department of Sociology, Goteborg University.
- ILO (1990) *ISCO-88. International Standard Classification of Occupations*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Magnusson, Charlotte (2008) "Gender, occupational prestige, and wages: A test of devaluation theory. *European Sociological Review*, July 8, 1-15.
- Marsh, Robert M (1971) "The explanation of occupational prestige" *Social Forces* Vol. 50, No 2. pp 214-222
- Nakao, Keiko & Treas, Judith (1994) "Updating Occupational Prestige and Socioeconomic Measures: How the New Measures Measure Up", *Sociological Methodology* 24:1-72.
- Nakao, Keiko och Treas, Judith (1990) *Computing 1989 Prestige Scores*, GSS Methodological Reports No. 70. Chicago: National Opinion Research Centre.
- Reiss, Albert J (1961) *Occupations and social status*. New York. The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.
- Rothman, Robert. A. (1999) *Inequality and Stratification. Race, class, and gender*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Status for the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupations", *Social Science Research*, 25:201-239.
- Treiman, Donald J. (1977) *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*, New York: Academic Press.
- Turner, Bryan S (1988) *Status*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.
- Ulfsdotter-Eriksson, Ylva (2006) *Occupation, Status and Gender: A sociological study of occupations in a segregated labour market*. Department of Sociology, University of Gothenburg (In Swedish).
- Wegener, Bernd. (1992) "Concepts and Measurement of Prestige", *Annual Review of Sociology* 18:253-80.

Appendix 1. 100 occupations, mean and status scores (min. 0, max. 100) for Sweden 2002 and 72 for US 1989, and diff. Swedish and US scores

<i>Ra nk</i>	<i>ISCO 88(CO M)</i>	<i>Occupations</i>	<i>Swedish mean</i>	<i>Swedish status score</i>	<i>US status score</i>	<i>Note US label</i>	<i>Diff.</i>
1	1110	Ambassador	8,32	92			
2	2221	Medical doctor	8,15	89	86	Physician	3
3	2422	Judge	8,14	89	71		18
4	2310	Professor	8,13	89	74	College prof.	15
5	2421	Lawyer	7,96	87	75		12
6	3143	Aircraft pilot	7,81	85	73		13
7	1210	Chief executive	7,79	85	70		15
8	2xxx	Scientist	7,61	83			
9	214x	Civil engineer	7,47	81	69	Engineer	11
10	1110	Director of ministry	7,42	80	76	Dept head in state gov.	4
11	3475	Professional athlete	7,29	79	65		14
12	2419	Economist	7,11	76	63		13
13	2223	Veterinarian	7,03	75	62		13
14	2131	Computer consultant	6,98	75			
15	1229	Film producer	6,97	75			
16	2222	Dentist	6,94	74	72		2
17	3411	Stockbroker	6,88	74			
18	1110	Member of parliament	6,84	73			
19	31xx	Technician	6,84	73	54		17
20	2445	Psychologist	6,67	71	69		2
21	3472	TV anchorman	6,64	71	62		9
22	1231	Tax office manager	6,55	69			
23	2411	Accountant	6,36	67	65		2
24	3471	Web designer	6,32	66			
25	2451	Journalist	6,30	66	60		6
26	1232	Personnel manager	6,28	66	54		16
27	2451	Author	6,26	66	63		3
28	0100	Military officer	6,23	65			
29	3122	Computer operator	6,20	65	50		15
30	2452	Art director	6,11	64			
31	2455	Actor	6,11	64	58		6
32	2460	Priest	6,08	64	71		-7
33	2224	Pharmacist	6,08	64	68		-4
34	3450	Police officer	6,08	63	61		2
35	3419	Bank clerk	6,01	63			
36	5161	Fire-fighter	5,99	62	53		9
37	2442	Sociologist	5,97	62	61		1
38	2112	Meteorologist	5,79	60			
39	5210	Fashion model	5,76	59			
40	5111	Air-hostess	5,53	57	47	Air stew.	10
41	2230	Midwife	5,50	56	42		14
42	3222	Environmental officer	5,45	56			
43	7313	Goldsmith	5,42	55	45		10
44	2320	Upper secondary school teacher	5,42	55	66	High school teacher	-11
45	5122	Cook	5,36	54	34		20
46	3226	Physiotherapist	5,33	54	61		-7
47	3473	Rock musician	5,30	54	32	Rock band member	22
48	323x	Nurse	5,14	52	66	Registered nurse	-14
49	2429	Tax enforcement officer	5,13	52			
50	2452	Artist	5,10	51	52		-1

<i>Ra nki ng</i>	<i>ISCO 88(CO M)</i>	<i>Occupations</i>	<i>Swedish mean</i>	<i>Swedish status score</i>	<i>US status score</i>	<i>Note US label</i>	<i>Diff.</i>
51	2445	School welfare officer	4,94	49			
52	2331	Primary school teacher	4,83	48	64		-16
53	5113	Travel guide	4,77	47			
54	3229	Acupuncturist	4,71	46			
55	724x	Electrician	4,63	45	51		-6
56	3431	Trade-unionist	4,61	45	43		2
57	7129	Building worker	4,57	45			
58	5163	Prison guard	4,50	44	40		4
59	7124	Carpenter	4,49	43	43		0
60	5141	Barber	4,42	43	36		7
61	2446	Social work professional	4,39	42	52		-10
62	6112	Gardener	4,28	41	29		11
63	3473	Dancer	4,26	41	41		0
64	2432	Librarian	4,24	40	54		-14
65	3320	Preschool teacher	4,24	40	55		-15
66	8311	Locomotive engine driver	4,23	40			
67	5141	Cosmetician	4,08	39	36	Cosmetol.	3
68	8287	Car fitter	3,96	37			
69	7412	Baker	3,88	36	35		1
70	7231	Car repairer	3,87	36	40	Automech.	-4
71	612x	Farmer	3,86	36	53		-18
72	5131	Child minder	3,80	35	36		-1
73	7433	Tailor	3,80	35	42		-7
74	41xx	Office clerk	3,72	34	36		-2
75	812x	Metal-worker	3,62	33			
76	4142	Postman	3,59	32	47	Mailman	-15
77	5169	Watchman	3,59	32	42	Guard	-10
78	513x	Assistant nurse	3,54	32	42	Nurse aid	-10
79	6141	Woodman	3,46	31			
80	8323	Bus driver	3,45	31	32		-1
81	7129	Road-worker	3,44	30			
82	7129	Building worker/repairer	3,41	30			
83	8340	Seaman	3,35	29	34		-5
84	6153	Fisherman	3,35	29	34		-5
85	8332	Taxi driver	3,33	29	28		1
86	5133	Personal care worker	3,30	29	47	Personal aid	-18
87	5132	Care worker	3,18	27			
88	5220	Shop assistant	3,13	27	31	Salesman	-4
89	4212	Post office cashier	3,10	26	42		-16
90	5123	Waiter/waitress	2,94	24	27		-3
91	3460	Social work ass. prof.	2,93	24	47		-20
92	9141	Janitor	2,92	24	22		2
93	9330	Dock worker	2,85	23			
94	4211	Supermarket cashier	2,67	21	33		-12
95	9212	Forestry labourer	2,47	18			
96	9153	Ticket collector	2,29	16			
97	9161	Garbage collector	2,27	16	28		-12
98	9132	Cleaner	2,24	16	23	(Sw. female)	-7
99	9111	Street vendor	2,04	13	21	Pushcart	-8
100	9132	Dishwasher	1,66	8	17		-9