



Reproletarianization in the Teaching Labor Process: From Theoretical Discussions to the Empirical Results*

Orkun Saip DURMAZ**

(Received April 30, 2016 – Approved May 28, 2017)

ABSTRACT. The class positions in a capitalist society, which are determined by the relations of production, never refer to a fixed stratification model in which the same places are occupied by the same individuals over the same period of time. On the contrary, class positions emerge as a result of class relations, therefore they can be changed. At this point the proletarianization process has an important impact on reshaping the class positions of individuals because it leads those who were previously either an employer or self-employed to become an employee. Furthermore, proletarianization does not only have effects on employers and the self-employed. The employees, such as educational workers/teachers, have also been influenced by the destructive results of the proletarianization process and thus, they becomes reproletarianized. Teachers have been losing their reputation in the eyes of the people day by day and teaching comes to resemble ordinary work with each passing day. In this study, the process of reproletarianization from its foundations to its outcomes is taken into consideration in the context of the teaching labor process.

Keywords: teacher, labor process, reproletarianization, surplus value, employment

* This article is mainly derived from Orkun Saip Durmaz's PhD dissertation. And, the interviews which were used in this paper were generated from the field study which had been pursued for my published PhD work named *Türkiye'de Öğretmen Olmak: Emek Süreci ve Yeniden Proleterleşme* (Being a Teacher in Turkey: Labor Process and Reproletarianization), 2014.

** Dr., Research Assistant, Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

The question of *who are the teachers* can be answered in the way that teachers, who are mostly employed as civil servants, are among the well-educated and cultured employees that are considered to be middle class professionals. In this context, since the responses to the question can be meaningfully combined in one sentence, it is clear that the responses do not contradict each other. Each answer focuses on different aspect of the teaching profession, and *describes* it. Nevertheless, in order to examine the teachers in the context of capitalist relations of production, it is crucial to transcend the limits of a descriptive class analysis. Thus, a more *explanatory* parameter to analyze the complex relations in a capitalist society is needed. The parameter used above is *social class*. If a study aims to determine the class position of the individuals and to examine the effects of the economic and social process on the existing social classes, the theoretical discussion has to pass beyond the empirical data and to respond the following question: Why do the social relations of production, referred to as class relations, give a society its central character?

The concept of the relations of production basically corresponds to the sum total of *social relationships* experienced by individuals to survive. By the term of social relationships, Marx (2009, p.49) referred to both economic and ideological-political relations: “[...] the same men who establish their social relations in conformity with the material productivity, produce also principles, ideas, and categories, in conformity with their social relations [...]”. Moreover, participation in this kind of social relationships is compulsory. And, since they are employees who have to work in order to survive, teachers cannot be analyzed without drawing a theoretical framework depending on the relations of production. From a different perspective, the concept of class not only provides descriptive information about teachers, but also enables us to evaluate them in compliance with their class positions which have been changed as a result of proletarianization. Thus, class position gives a theoretical key to understand the fundamental conflict in a society, which leads to the main social and political differentiations across the country in which the teachers live. In order to examine the teachers in a class-based social structure, it is essential to be able to go beyond the details of the occupation of teaching. To clarify, a study that considers teachers only as an occupational group neither concentrates on the similarities between them and other employees working under similar conditions in different sectors, nor draws attention to the class-based differences among teachers in themselves. For instance, in terms of the class relations in that society, a teacher working at a private teaching

institution is completely different from another teacher who is the owner of that institution. Therefore, it is impossible to consider them as parts of the same social cohesion although both are within the same occupational group.

The process of proletarianization results in an increasing number of people becoming dependent on waged labor, in that they have to work for an employer since there is no other way for them to earn a livelihood. This is the main aspect of the proletarianization process and is called social proletarianization. Any study aiming to analyze transformation of the teachers must not underestimate the proletarianization process that divides occupational groups on the basis of the interests of two main classes: the working class and bourgeoisie. To clarify, for Marxism the main contradiction as a result of the relations of production emerges between the two fundamental classes, but not amongst sub-groups of the working class; therefore, it is necessary for a class-based analysis to emphasize the similarities of the employees rather than the differences.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY

Certain epistemological terms such as *determinism* and *dialectic of structure and agency* have strong links with the concept of the relations of production in Marxist theory. The debate over the primacy of structure or agency reveals the well-known question of to what extent do social structures determine human agency's attitudes and behaviors. In the current study, this question is reformulated as: Do relations of production have deterministic influences on teachers' social life and their everyday working experiences? This means that the social relations of production are accepted as the main structure, and teachers refer to human agency in this study. Before moving on to the class structure of teachers in Turkey it is necessary to define the terms mentioned above from a Marxist perspective.

From a Marxist approach, the production process has three dimensions. The first one is the forces of production which is composed of the means of production and the labor power. This dimension can also be considered as a starting point in building a social theory. The second dimension is relations of production that not only refers to production but also the reproduction of the social life through surplus transfer from the exploited classes. Lastly, the third dimension is the *contradiction* between the forces and relations of production. Those three dimensions characterize historical materialism, that is, they are regarded as fundamental *structures* that restrict the movement of *agency* in Marxist theory. As Marx and Engels (2000) stated, the production process where capital accumulation and social forms of the class relations

are realized, and which is experienced by humankind, is the “real basis” of the “essence [of] man”. In order to apply this understanding to the problematique of the re proletarianization of teachers, it is essential to analyze teachers’ class position in relation to the dimensions given above. Then, the questions to be answered are the followings? Who produces? What is produced? And how is that production realized in the teaching labor process? I will try to give conclusive answers to those questions, but first the issue of “structure-agency” in Marxism needs to be clarified. There is no doubt that historical materialism, in contrast to other macro-scaled sociological approaches such as Weberian sociology, mainly concentrates on the production process. This is very clearly mentioned in the commonly held structuralist text’ *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* in which Marx (1999) stated:

“[...] No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society [...].”

Although the next quoted above appears to be a very structuralist. Marxism cannot be regarded as a reductionist theory which just presents a mechanical *base-superstructure model* ignoring the role of human agency in making history. Marxism is a social theory that has very strong structural framework; nevertheless, it cannot be defined as a structuralist model. The difference between *the structural* and *the structuralist* can be understood in another work by Marx (2010) although he never used those two terms together in his work, “[...] men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past”.

Marxism gives an important role to human beings in making history. In order to clarify the structure-agency model in Marxist theory, there is a need for a convincing framework, which highlights the agency’s activities without rejecting structural determination. In this context, E.P. Thompson’s study of *The Making of English Working Class in 18th Century* should be considered. He stated that the notion of class is a relationship rather than a thing, a social category, or a conceptual abstraction; it must be thought as real human relationships in a real world (Thompson 1963, p.9). He continues:

“[...] we cannot have love without lovers, nor deference without squires and laborers. And class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the

identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs [...]"

This quote shows Thompson's subject-oriented approach. Nevertheless, he does not underestimate the importance of the structural framework of the class relations, and he claims "[...] the class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born—or enter involuntarily [...]" That is to say the notion of determination is not to be cursed by Thompson. His approach is very different from the structuralist conceptualization of the notion of determination. He states that: "[...] Class-consciousness is the way in which these experiences are handled in cultural terms: embodied in traditions, value-systems, ideas, and institutional forms. If the experience appears as determined, class-consciousness does not..." (Thompson 1963, p.9). To conclude, in this paper I attempt to adapt Thompson's approach to the issue of reproletarianization of teachers, since I consider that it is the most useful conceptualization of the relation between structure and agency when studying on labor process theory. Furthermore, Thompson (1981, p.5-6) claimed that a well-developed Marxist theoretical framework needs to have an analytical category, called *experience* and has to engage in a *dialogue with empirical data* inferred from the real world and real human relationships without falling into an empiricist fallacy. In other words, Thompson's famous concepts, which are experience and dialogue with empirical data, are very important for this study, too.

THE CLASS STRUCTURE OF TURKISH TEACHERS

In this study, in order to make the theoretical framework more operational, a class schema developed by Boratav (2004 and 2005) based on the relations of production and the class structure in Turkey, has been adapted to the research problematique. In this way, it is possible to determine a new class schema restricted to the teachers' class positions. This means that the adapted model which presents teachers' differentiated class positions does not reflect what the teachers experience in real life, but helps the researcher to analyze their class relations in a defined structural framework: *The employers* are teachers who have ownership of an educational institution and *materials* which refer to both the workplace and means of production; hire other teachers; and directs where the teaching labor process is realized. Employers refer to bourgeoisie since they live by extracting surplus value from their employees. They rarely execute their profession and if they do, the work has symbolic meaning. *The self-*

employed are the teachers who do not work for anybody and neither have anybody working for them. They are in control of their teaching labor process because they are not subordinated to any employer. In addition, since they have no employees, they do not extract surplus value from anyone other than themselves. *The employees*, who are also teachers, are the waged laborers in the public or private sector. Since they have to sell their labor power to survive and because they do not have ownership of the means of production they are considered to be working class.

In Turkey, the teachers in the category of waged laborers can be divided into two main categories; *permanent teachers* and those who are *precariously employed*. Most of the permanent teachers have reasonable conditions of work and are mostly employed as civil servants in public schools. There is no need to sub-categorizing permanent teachers since nearly all of them are civil servants and there are only a few exceptions; however, a more detailed categorization is required for the *precariously employed teachers*: The first group is *temporary instructors* employed in public schools, and subject to the Law on Civil Servants, code 657, 4/C clause. *Contracted teachers* who are dependent on the 4/B clause of the same code constitute another group (Ertürk 2013, p.235). In addition, there are three further groups involved in the precariously employed teachers: *private school teachers*, *teachers working for tutoring institutions* and the *unemployed* referring to the teachers without work but are ready to sell their labor power.

TEACHERS AS PROLETARIANS

Teachers, except for those who are employers, must be regarded as components of working class since most of them have to sell their labor power in order to survive. At this point, it is necessary to underline the fact that being a wage earner does not always mean being a worker, or being a member of the working class. For instance, a teacher who is a wage earner at a private teaching institution can have a share in the profit at the same time. This refers to contradictory class position. In these circumstances, it appears crucial to determine which is essential for that teacher, having a share in profit or earning a wage? Although it can be important to clarify these contradictory class positions, it is not discussed in this study. When considering the practice in Turkey, there are not many teachers employed at private teaching institutions possessing these contradictory class positions. In the case of Turkey, private teaching institutions refer to workplaces in which the very sharp class contradictions never allow these contradictory class

positions to emerge or develop. A final point concerns the problematic of unemployed teachers. And lastly we should mention, contrary to the studies concentrating on the profession, it is very important for a class-based study to state that the unemployed as a whole are definitely included in working class since they are ready to sell their labor power. This is the reason why unemployed teachers are considered as members of the employees category.

Before starting to discuss the concept of reproletarianization and its effects, one more issue needs to be explored, that is the meaning of the term *proletarian*. In a sociological analysis, this word can be substituted for the words; *worker or employee* and vice versa. Therefore, any distinction among the concepts of proletarian, worker and employee, which may be significant in developing a political strategy concerning the classes, is not adopted in this study. There are different meanings of the term of proletarianization: “[...] The *proletarianization of society* refers to the tendency for the working class to increase in size [...] and to experience relative poverty as a result of the development of capitalist mode of production [...]” (Edgell 1998, p.15). This is a generally accepted meaning of the concept. In addition, there are two more definitions of proletarianization. The second meaning of the term refers to more specialized division of labor and deskilling of the labor power because of increased usage of machinery in labor process. And, political proletarianization is the third conceptualization, which means the emergence of the proletariat, transformation of the working class into a collective and political agency. In this study, the concept of proletarianization is used only with the first and second meanings.

REPROLETARIANIZATION OF TEACHERS

I argue that reproletarianization refers to the transformation process that has effects on the internal structure of working class. Teachers are influenced by that process, and their class positions in the working class are redetermined. I mean that the privileged class positions in the working class are being eroded by the destructive effects of the neo-liberal transformation. It refers to a process experienced by real people in a real world through class struggles. When class struggles continue on the behalf of bourgeoisie, and working class people begin to lose their gained rights. Through the wholesale privatization of common property over natural resources such as water, forests, pasturage and other non-commodified spheres of life, workers have been separated from not only from means of production but also from the means of subsistence (Duffield 2013, p.12). This is the general framework of the reproletarianization process, which is compatible with, and

also one of the most important components of, the generalization of free market rule across Turkey. Thus, in their daily life workers become more and more dependent on cash (Dant 2000, as cited in Özügurlu 2008, p.65).

Therefore, by stating that Turkish teachers are being re proletarianized, I want to emphasize the effects of the free market rule on teachers' everyday practices. Teachers, since they had regular work and a high level of social prestige, had privileged positions amongst other working class people. However, as a result of the new working conditions; such as flexible employment and a high degree of unemployment, many teachers have become unqualified workers who are precariously employed, and even excluded from the social security system. Deterioration of the prior privileged class positions is not restricted only to the re proletarianization of the teachers; on the contrary, it is a general process that involves almost all of the previous privileged professions (Eagleton 2011 p.173-174).

Teachers are still employed as wage laborers; however, there are crucial changes in the relationships between waged labor and capital in the neo-liberal context of the teaching labor process. In Turkey, some changes are taking place with the emergence of a new labor regime in Turkey. These include; precarious employment, forced and unpaid work, long working hours, intensified work, an increasing proportion of the private teaching institutions in the educational system, ineffective and powerless trade unions, the emergence of a large number of unemployed teachers, and the legitimization of free market rule in public schools. The effects of those changes on the daily life practices can be seen in the example of a teacher who applies for a job at any private teaching institution. In such a condition, that teacher would need to accept all of the conditions stipulated by the institution. The applicant has no bargaining power to persuade the managers or owners of that institution to add anything to the contract that would be in favor of the employee. In order to be employed, the teachers need to forego many expected rights such as paid and unpaid leave (annual and other purposes), overtime pay, social insurance and even the right to salary, which is an obligation on which the employment relationship is founded. These are significant indicators for the re proletarianization of teachers in Turkey. Furthermore, neo-liberal employment policy aims to decrease the value of teachers' labor power unless it faces serious resistance.

Re proletarianization is the process in which the teachers' labor power has been more and more commodified as a result of neo-liberal transformation. In addition to this, exploitation as a fundamental characteristic of the capitalist relations of production must be taken into consideration. Thus, it seems that the re proletarianization process, which is

particularly visible in the private teaching institutions, has important effects in *deepening* and *extending* the exploitative relations. Deepening means acceleration of the process of production with the help of new techniques and innovation. However, in order to extract absolute surplus, it is also necessary to *extend* exploitation in despotic and even illegal ways. For example, the use of interactive white boards in the classroom represents the direct interference into the production process itself and to the producers since it aims to make the teaching process faster. According to the Marxist theory of surplus value, it is well-known that more rapid production is desired by the capitalist classes to make the labor power more productive. This type of process deepens exploitation by extracting a relative surplus. Another type of process is absolute surplus transfer, which is more apparent during the neo-liberal teaching process. There are many examples that verify the existence of the absolute surplus transfer. As mentioned above, new forms of flexible employment, long working hours, intensified works, forced and unpaid work are only some examples of the instruments for transferring absolute surplus. At this point, the obligation to undertake unpaid additional work which has not been defined in the employment contract can be important. For instance, repairing computer hardware, installing software programs, various administrative and financial responsibilities as well as other unpaid works refer to extraction of absolute surplus value. All those practices remind us of a modern version of *the form of primitive accumulation*.

In relation to the realization of the primitive accumulation, in *The Theories of Surplus Value*, Marx claimed that the general tendency of capital, as soon as it emerged, was to reproduce its own conditions of presence until it arrived at the moment when a *historical deviation* occurred. After a certain point, social welfare, national developmentalist and socialist states, with their different effects and different scales, all turned into serious obstacles to realize capital accumulation. Therefore, the capitalist classes tried to find a better way, that is, to develop a new strategy for the realization of capital accumulation, which was called neo-liberalism. Furthermore, political force is also employed to provide surplus value, and this is not an extraordinary process in neo-liberalism since commodification of the reproduction of labor power is only realized through political force (Özügürü 2003, p.186-187).

THEORY AND THE FACTS ABOUT TEACHING LABOR PROCESS

In order to pursue a discussion on the teaching labor process, it is necessary to enrich the analytical framework of the study with both theoretical content and empirical facts. It is claimed that a study has to provide *four conditions* each of which refers to a different aspect of the labor process. *Firstly*, it must focus on the class-based contradictions. *Secondly*, the control mechanisms and the process of deskilling must be considered. *Thirdly*, it is essential to include political and ideological dimensions of the teaching labor process as well as economic base. *Lastly*, it is crucial to regard the individuals as human agency or subjects of history. Those four conditions mentioned above can only be provided if the contributions of two labor process theoreticians, Braverman and Burawoy, are evaluated together. Braverman (1974) took a theoretical approach containing highly detailed analyses about control mechanisms and the deskilling of labor power as a result of mechanization. Burawoy (1979, 1985) concentrated on the production element, and regarded the labor process as an economic process in which the surplus had been extracted and human beings' experiences with its political and ideological dimensions depending on the dialectic of consent and coercion.

Emphasizing the problematique of deskilling under the capitalist labor process, which is Braverman's main argument, is usually a starting point for most of the studies about the teaching labor process. Ozga and Lawn (1981), placed emphasis on Taylorization since deskilling, decreasing autonomy and strict control mechanisms became characteristics for the teaching labor process. Smyth (1991) also agreed with Braverman's main approach because he mainly focused on the problem of control mechanisms applied to teachers. In their studies on market oriented education reforms and their impacts, Sinclair et al (1996) argued that reduced autonomy, deskilling and work intensification are the main characteristics of the transformation of teacher labor. And, Apple and Junck's study (1990) clearly claimed that teachers became less and less skilled because they were prevented from having control over their work in areas such as planning lessons, designing and implementing instructional strategies, and setting relevant curricular goals. All of the studies mentioned above have similar theoretical framework to that of Braverman's labor process theory. However, Burawoy's approach has rarely been applied to the teaching labor process this is probably because his work was mainly related to the daily life of blue-collar workers; thus, his approach might be considered as not connected to the teaching labor process. Since they combine debates on the teacher labor process with those on

surplus value, the work of Reid (2003) and Harvie (2006) may be regarded as relatively compatible studies concerning the Burawoian labor process theory. Thoma (2005) evaluated the issue of restructuring the labor process in Greece and contained a more coherent content with Burawoian conceptualization. Although concentrating on the problem of the restriction of teachers' autonomy, she considered ideological and political dimensions of the teaching labor process by using the notion of *relation in production* which was a concept devised by Burawoy. I think that Burawoy's concepts could be beneficial in achieving a more comprehensive analysis. I have tried to apply his concepts; *production regime*, *hegemonic production regime* and *hegemonic despotism* to the teaching labor process in my previous study named "From the Hegemonic Production Regime to the Hegemonic Despotism: Reading the Transformation of the Teaching Profession in Turkey through Burawoy's Set of Concepts" (Durmaz, 2013). In my previous study I have mentioned that the transformation of the teachers in Turkey could be explained with a transition from one production regime to another. In this study, without emphasizing on production regimes, I am trying to examine three of the four conditions that have been already mentioned at the beginning of this section. Since the issues of the control mechanisms and the process of deskilling are Braverman-oriented contributions to the teaching labor process theory, they are not going to be evaluated in the following section in order to make the Burawoian conceptualization clearer.

In this context, firstly, the contribution to labor process theory, which is related with the term of exploitation, should be taken into consideration. Exploitation is the imperative result of the capitalist mode of production, which realizes surplus transfer. According to Burawoy (1985, p.32-34), exploitation is both *obscured and secured* under the capitalist mode of production; and both the exploitation and its obscured and secured characteristic can be illustrated by empirical facts. The following extracts are taken from interviews with teachers from a study conducted in Turkey.¹

¹ The information about **the interviewees** are:

Interviewee 1: She is about 25 years old teacher who has been working for a private teaching institution for 3 years. Before working as a teacher, she had been precariously employed at other sectors for approximately 1-2 years. **Interviewee 2:** She is about 25 years old teacher who has been working for a private teaching institution for 5 years. She does not have any other work experience. **Interviewee 3:** He is about 30 years old teacher who has been working for a private school for 8 years. He had been employed at a different sector for 1 year before being a teacher. **Interviewee 4:** She is about 45 years old teacher who has been employed at public schools for 16 years. She had worked at other sectors for approximately 4 years before appointed as a teacher. **Interviewee 5:** She is about 45 years old teacher who has been employed at public schools for 19 years. She does not have any other work experience. **Interviewee 6:** She is about 45 years old teacher who has been employed at public schools for 17 years. She does not have any other work experience.

"[...] I work at a private teaching institution... Tutoring institutions are taking a lot of money from the children; 9,000 Turkish liras (TL) from a YGS [the higher education entry examination] student. However, my monthly salary is only 1,000 TL for working 6 days a week. Many of the teachers are also taking a similar amount of salary. I mean the advertisements are wonderful (!), the appearance of the institution is wonderful (!); but the teachers employed at these institutions do not live under wonderful conditions [...]" (Interviewee 1)

It is concluded that exploitation is very countable in a private teaching institution when the difference between teacher's salary and the institution's income is considered. For instance, there were about 100,000 students and only 5,000 teachers by the year of 2013 in Ankara, and the cost of one teacher, (earning 1,000 TL per month) to an institution in an academic year is just 9,000 TL equal to only one student's payment for tutoring in the same institution. Thus, the secured characteristic of capitalist exploitation can be clearly seen in this example. As a result, since the teacher's wage cannot be differentiated from the production of surplus value, not only does the teacher become dependent on the institution and its owner, but also the production of surplus value becomes an uninterrupted and secured process (Durmaz 2013, p.92). Many types of absolute surplus transfer emerge in the re proletarianization process such as application of new flexible forms of employment, long working hours, intensified works, forced and unpaid work:

"[...] The obligation of preparing four hundred [exam preparation] questions means that we start to work in debt at the private teaching institution. We start work on the condition that we will prepare four hundred questions. If we cannot do this we have to pay the school 3.5 TL for per question [...] The institution can cut your salary and may even fire you if you could not prepare a sufficient number of questions [...]" (Interviewee 2).

The same interviewee continue: "With reference to your contract you might have to give lesson 12 hours in a day. I give 24 hours of lessons at the weekends." As a result, it is highly possible to state that extracting absolute surplus is one of the main characteristics of teaching labor process in Turkey.

The political and ideological dimensions of the labor process are also important. The ideological and political functions of education which becomes the everyday subject of politics, and have effects on the teachers' daily lives. When school administrators develop prohibitive and punishing attitudes towards the teaching staff, then the teachers may become politicized. Furthermore, the political and ideological dimensions of the

teaching labor process cannot be restricted by macro-scaled developments and conflicts across the nation. As Burawoy (1979, p.220) claimed, the notion of *relations in production*, different from the notion of relation of production that refers to national or broader context, pertains to the politics of the point of production. The following extract from an interview demonstrates the impact of the politics and ideology of private schools on a teacher.

"[...] there is a commercial relation. The parent who sends his/her child to a private school is on the one side, and you are on the other side as a wage laborer of the institution. In such a commercial relation in which you also have to renew your contract to be employed, your contribution to the institution is in fact evaluated on a commercial basis. In other words, it makes you feel that you can continue to work there if you can contribute commercially. Even if not directly said, you can somehow feel that "I can be fired at any time". Therefore, to avoid this possibility, you try to work more after class hours, you try to make more labor. You are not directly told to work more [...] However, in practice, they somehow make you feel that you have to work harder and harder [...] You can be faced with comments like "the others do this and that, why don't you? [...]" (Interviewee 3)

According to Burawoy (1985, p.108), specific forms of struggle and resistance can occur in the work place. He conceptualizes three kinds of struggles; economic, political and class struggle. The first and second types explain the conflicts taking place, in his words, *on the shop floor* (Burawoy 1979, p.135-177). This conceptualization can be applied to the teacher's daily life practices. The application of handbook for instance, is one of those practices. Although the teachers working at a state secondary school are obliged to follow the handbook provided by the government, in reality they often do not fulfill this obligation, as shown in the extracts from the interviewed teachers.

"[...] the guide book is not a good thing for the creativity of the teacher, it can make teacher deskilled. Besides, it leads to the emergence of a perception which refers to 'everybody can teach by the help of guide book' among teachers, [...]" (Interviewee 4).

"[...] I don't use the guide book too much... I use different sources... we can suggest extra books to the children... I do not think that the guide book has any benefits. It is not only meaningless but also makes the teacher deskilled [...]" (Interviewee 5).

"[...] I have tried once or twice but then given up using guide book. Now I never use it. The teacher learns how to teach better by experience [...]" (Interviewee 6).

It is concluded that there is a noteworthy divergence between the expected effect of using guide book, and to what extent those effects are realized and whether teachers give consent to its execution. Therefore, the process that transforms teachers into ordinary instructors or technicians cannot be assumed as an inevitable and uninterrupted process that can never be stopped or prevented. In contrast to technological determinist approach which has a very strict structuralist theoretical framework, it is possible to assert that the transformation of teachers into technicians is, in fact, an intervened and non-continuous process which can be stopped by the activities of the human beings, namely by the teachers' daily practices in our case. Despite the factors which lead teachers to becoming less and less skilled, teaching work has still been performed by teachers but not by computers, intelligent boards or any instrumental materials used in teaching process.

CONCLUSION

This paper has discussed the reproletarianization process that has led Turkish teachers' class positions to be redetermined. In order not to digress from the main focus on the teaching labor process, other aspects of the reproletarianization process such as syndical organizations and political struggles have rarely been mentioned in the article. However, this lack of discussion cannot be assumed as a deficiency in this paper. To strengthen the theoretical framework, certain epistemological and methodological discussions referring to the interrelationships between structure and agency have been presented, and then a subject-oriented approach has been adopted without underestimating the structural framework that restricts the activities of agency. Teachers have been analyzed within two sub-groups, each has been determined with respect to whether they have a decent work or they are precariously employed. The first sub-group mainly consists of civil servants; nevertheless, the second one is very much differentiated in itself. The forms of the precariously employed teachers are *the temporary instructors, the contracted teachers, private school teachers, the teachers working for tutoring institutions and the unemployed*. After the evaluation of class structure, the notion of reproletarianization was discussed. And then we analyzed the empirical data gathered from the interviewees of teachers in Ankara, Turkey. During the reproletarianization of the teachers, there were changes in the teachers' class positions which had already become proletarian, and so they became reproletarianized. New flexible employment forms characterized with long working hours, intensified works, and forced

and unpaid works were only threats in pre-2000 period, but now they are experienced by a great number of Turkish teachers.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. and Jungck, S. (1990). "You Don't Have To Be A Teacher To Teach This Unit ", *American Educational Research Journal* (27), pp. 227-251.
- Boratav, K. (2004). *İstanbul ve Anadolu'dan Sınıf Profilleri [Class Profiles from Istanbul and Anatolia]*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Boratav, K. (2005). *1980'li Yıllarda Türkiye'de Sosyal Sınıflar ve Bölüşüm [Social Classes and Redistribution in 1980s in Turkey]*, 2nd edition. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent, Changes in the Labour Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*, London: Verso
- Duffield, M. (2007). "Introduction: Development and Surplus Life" In *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*, pp. 1-31. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Durmaz, O. S. (2013). "From the Hegemonic Production Regime to the Hegemonic Despotism: Reading the Transformation of the Teaching Profession in Turkey through Burawoy's Set of Concepts". *International Journal of Educational Policies*, 7(2), pp. 89-103.
- Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx was Right*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Edgell, S. (1998). *Sınıf [Class]*, translated into Turkish by D. Özyiğit, Ankara: Dost Yayınevi
- Ertürk, E. (2012). "Transformation of the Teaching Profession in Turkey" In *Neoliberal Transformation of Education in Turkey* edited by K.İnal and G. Akkaymak, pp. 233-244, New York: Palgrave and McMillan Press.
- Harvie, D. (2006). "Value Production and Struggle in the Classroom: Teachers Within, Against and Beyond Capital", *Capital and Class* (30) 1, pp. 1-32.
- Marx, K. (1999). *A Contribution of the Critique of Political Economy*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm> (accessed March 2015)
- Marx, K. (2006). *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/18th-Brumaire.pdf> (accessed February 2015)

- Marx, K. (2009). *The Poverty of Philosophy*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Poverty-Philosophy.pdf> (accessed March 2015).
- Marx, K and Engels, F. (2000). *A Critique of German Ideology*.
https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_The_German_Ideology.pdf (accessed February 2015).
- Reid, A. (2003). "Understanding the Teachers' Work: Is There Still a Place for Labour Process Theory", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, (24) 5, pp.559-573.
- Ozga, J and Lawn, M. (1981). "Schoolwork: Interpreting The Labour Process of teaching", *British Journal of Sociology of Education* (9) 3, pp.323-336.
- Özüğurlu, M. (2003). "Marksizm ve İlkel Sermaye Birikimi" [Marxism and Primitive Capital Accumulation] In *Marksizm Ve ... [Marxism and...]* edited by B. Ünlü, pp.161-192. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Özüğurlu, M. (2008). *Anadolu'da Küresel Fabrikanın Doğuşu, Yeni İşçilik Örüntülerinin Sosyolojisi* [The Emergence of the Global Factory in Anatolia, The Sociology of New Patterns of Work] 2nd edition. İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Smyth, J. (1991). "International Perspectives on Teacher Collegiality: A Labor Process Discussion Based on the Concept of Teachers' Work", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*(12) 3, pp.323-346.
- Sinclair, J. et. al. (1996). "Classroom Struggle? Market Oriented Education Reforms and Their Impact on Teacher Labour Process", *Work Employment and Society* (10) 4, pp.641-666.
- Thoma, D. (2005). "Restructuring the Teachers' Labor Process: The Case of Greece", *Mediterranean Journal of Education Studies* (10) 2, pp.1- 17.
- Thompson, E. P. (1963). "Preface", In *the Making of the English Working Class*, pp.9-14, New York: Vintage Books.
- Thompson, E. P. (1981). *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*, 4th edition, London: Merlin Press.