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SUMMARY

The research explores the political socialisation of young females. Politics is defined broadly as the perception of patterns of human relationships, incorporating socio-economic concepts. Two elements of socialisation are identified which inform both theory and research design. First, political socialisation content is explored, operationalised in terms of political attitudes. Second, political socialisation process is explored, operationalised in terms of history of political exploration and the making of political commitments (derived from concepts of adolescent identity development described by Erikson and Marcia). The role of socialising agents is discussed, the study focussing on the role of school experience in political socialisation.

An empirical study is reported which explored the role of school experience in political socialisation, operationalised in a comparison of girls attending private and state sector schools. Questionnaires were completed by 181 girls aged 15-18 in the two types of school. Individual interviews were conducted with 127 of this group (67 private, 60 state) from comparable social backgrounds. The aim was to compare girls matched for family background but experiencing different types of educational structure. The interviews explored attitudes to a range of political and socio-economic phenomena (the content of political socialisation), and history of political exploration and commitment (the process of political socialisation). The process dimension was based on the identity categories of achievement, foreclosure, moratorium and diffusion described by Marcia. Significant differences between the two school samples are reported for both the content and process of political socialisation. Factors in the school experience which might lead to these differences are described. The implications of the results are discussed in relation to theories of political socialisation, and education theory and policy.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Governability and the Nature of Human Organisation

In exploring the organisation of human life into 'society', theorists in a range of disciplines have focused on the issue of governability. It has been suggested that governability cannot easily be explained (Prewitt, 1978), for there is no innate biological law that forces people to live together in communities governed by rules. Thus researchers from a wide range of disciplines, including political science, anthropology, sociology, and psychology, have aimed to explore the way in which individuals develop concepts about society and their role within it.

The exploration of governability and the nature of social life has taken place at a variety of levels, largely dependent on the discipline of the researcher. For example researchers have explored governability as it applies to whole societies, investigating how and why different political systems persist (for example Kavanagh, 1972; Moran, 1985). This macro-level approach has generally been undertaken by political scientists, and contrasts with work exploring the development of governability at an individual level. A micro-level approach can be seen in particular in the work of psychologists, for example in research exploring the relationship of individual cognitive development and its implications for political orientation (Torney-Purta, 1989), and in studies exploring biological bases for individual political development (Petersen, 1983). Some researchers have, however, attempted to incorporate both the macro- and micro-level approaches, exploring societal and individual aspects of political development (for example Gallatin, 1980; Merelman, 1986).
What all these approaches have in common, however, is that they aim to explore how people acquire certain beliefs and behaviours that enable them to live within a society governed by rules and laws. Thus

"... the various ways in which governability is insured have in common the assumption that people have to acquire certain social habits and political beliefs that make them capable of being governed" (Prewitt, 1978, p 119).

Explaining governability consequently involves an understanding of how children and young people acquire attitudes, values and orientations towards the political, social, and economic world. It is this which is the focus of the current research.

Central to exploring the acquisition of "social habits and political beliefs" is the notion of socialisation, and this concept is the key organising feature of the research. Socialisation is viewed as the emergence of children and young people into the adult world, and specifically as the development of attitudes, roles and behaviours appropriate to effective functioning within society. Socialisation is thus a process of adaptation, and one aspect of the overall process of human development. A wide-ranging concept, socialisation is usually explored in terms of its constituent parts, for example gender, political or work socialisation. (A full discussion of these issues is contained in Chapter 2).

In exploring issues of governability and the development of young people's attitudes and values, the current study focusses on the political socialisation of youth. The need for more work to be undertaken on this area has been stressed by researchers from a number of academic disciplines (for example Merelman, 1986; Palonsky, 1987). Although the concept of political socialisation has been used in much previous work and has generated a mass of literature, it has often resulted in the study of a narrow range of political
variables, in particular voting, political knowledge, and attitudes to current issues. It is a primary proposal of the author that this conceptualisation of political socialisation is too narrow and restrictive.

The literature chapters to follow will demonstrate not only the narrow focus of much political socialisation research, but also the undue emphasis given in most research to political content. Thus much research has focussed on the nature of attitudes, values, and beliefs to the detriment of the socialisation process, on how young people come to develop political orientations. The investigation of both the content and process of the political socialisation of youth is therefore central to the research. It will be suggested that knowing what young people's political attitudes are must be matched by knowledge of how those attitudes developed, and what it is that affects exploration of political alternatives and the formation of political commitments.

Central to all theories of youth socialisation is the concept of socialising agents. The notion of agents proposes that different individuals, groups or factors are involved in the socialisation of youth, each influencing different areas of socialisation and in different ways. The majority of socialisation research has aimed to isolate the different agents, and provide rules about the relative influence of each on young people's development. In political socialisation research in particular, there is much disagreement evident about the importance of various socialising agents. Some influence has been claimed for the peer group and the mass media, with most research concluding that the influence of the home and family is of the greatest importance.

In giving primary attention to the role of the family in the political socialisation of young people, however, the role the school experience in
political socialisation has been largely neglected. Most early research suggested that schooling and educational experience was of only minor importance in youth socialisation generally, and in political socialisation in particular (Hyman, 1959; McQuail, O'Sullivan and Quine, 1968). Other researchers have suggested that the school experience may, in fact, be a major influence on political socialisation (for example Hess and Torney, 1967). Indeed, evidence from a longitudinal study showed the "...dominant influence..." of the school in socialisation (Himmelweit and Swift, 1969, p157).

However, a major problem inherent in much of the research in this area has been the problem of separating out the effects of school experience with the effects of home and family background, leading Gallatin (1980) to comment on the "...formidable methodological problems..." (p 359) involved in isolating educational effects. This study aims to address this problem directly.

The influence of educational experience on young people's development has not generally been well researched. In concluding their study Himmelweit and Swift (1969) claimed that

"Few measures have been developed for understanding how, why and with what effect the school seeks to influence behaviour and outlook." (Himmelweit and Swift, 1969, p 155).

Twenty years after this comment, the extent to which school and educational experience affects the development of attitudes, values and aspirations remains unclear. The current research addresses this issue by aiming to isolate the effect of school type on political socialisation after controlling for the effects of family background.

One additional aspect of the current state of knowledge in this area is important; namely that the majority of work has focussed on boys and young men. Relatively little work has explored the political development of women: thus the single focus of the research described here is the political
socialisation of young women. The aim is therefore to contribute to knowledge concerning the political socialisation of young women, investigating the nature, development, and articulation of political and socio-economic understanding. The focus will be on the role of the school and educational experience in this development. Central to the study is the investigation of the psychological nature of political development, supplementing and extending the sociological emphasis evident in much research to date. Four social-psychological theories are identified as likely to contribute to a greater understanding of this area: social representations, social identity, attribution theory, and individual identity development. These theories each offer a useful perspective for understanding the role of the school in the political socialisation of youth.

In exploring the role of the school experience in the political socialisation of youth, it is important to establish and explore the issues involved within a social context. The notion of governability (proposed earlier as a central feature of human organisation) is a key aspect of everyday political, social and personal relationships, and must be explored and understood in terms of current political structures. Understanding politics and the nature of the political culture are therefore as essential as utilising psychological frameworks and concepts. Similarly, education must be viewed as one part of the wider social structure, providing a bridge between the individual and the social worlds.

The literature reviews that follow therefore include analyses of the cultural and contextual frameworks of the research, and the experiences of young people as seen against a backdrop of recent educational, political, and labour market changes. The 1980s saw considerable changes in the relationship of young people to the state: these political, economic and social aspects are
important contexts for the research. The research therefore aims to provide new information about young people and politics in the 1980s, and about how educational structures affect the process of this development.

1.2 Aims of the Research
The previous section has briefly outlined the main issues to be addressed in the research. A subsequent chapter (Chapter 6) specifies the null hypothesis and objectives of the research. These aims are also given here in order to guide the reader through the first half of the thesis. A full account of the theoretical frameworks, relevant literature, research rationale, and empirical study is given in the following chapters.

The null hypothesis of the study is that there are no differences in the political socialisation of young females matched for socio-economic background, but who are educated in two different types of school. (Private and state sector schools are used to operationalise school type). The research aims are therefore as follows:
1. To explore whether there are differences in the content of political and socio-economic attitudes of young people educated in private and state schools.
2. To explore whether there are differences in the process of developing a political identity in private and state educated young people.
3. If differences are found, an additional aim is to isolate factors in the school experience which may lead to different socialisation outcomes or processes.

1.3 Plan of the Thesis
This Chapter has briefly introduced some of the issues involved in investigating the role of the school in the political socialisation of youth, and has also
detailed the research rationale and objectives. The structure of the rest of the thesis is detailed below.

There are three literature chapters. The first (Chapter 2) reviews the literature relating to the social-psychological frameworks of the study. It includes a discussion of the nature of adolescence, explores further the concept of socialisation and socialising agents, and outlines the psychological frameworks of the study. These frameworks including social representations, social identity, attribution theory and identity development in adolescence. Identity development (based on work by Erikson (1959, 1968) and Marcia (1966)) is identified as the main framework to be used to explore the process of political socialisation in the empirical study.

The second literature chapter (Chapter 3) therefore reviews the literature on identity development in adolescence and details its utility in investigating political identity development. This literature forms the theoretical and empirical basis for the exploration of the process of political socialisation. The third literature chapter (Chapter 4) reviews the literature on politics and the political socialisation of youth, and explores the role of the school experience in political socialisation. This literature forms the theoretical and empirical basis for the exploration of the content of political socialisation. At the end of each of the three literature chapters there is a brief summary of the main points of that chapter.

Chapter 5 details the research context of the study. It discusses issues of politics, education and the youth labour market in the 1980s, outlines the ESRC 16-19 Initiative from which the research originated, and gives details of the private education system in Britain. Chapter 6 briefly summarises the
literature and theoretical frameworks, and specifies the research rationale and objectives.

Chapter 7 explains the research methodology and details the empirical study. This is followed by two results chapters: The first (Chapter 8) describes the results for the content of political socialisation, the second (Chapter 9) presents the results for the process of political socialisation. Finally, there is a detailed discussion of the results (Chapter 10), followed by conclusions (Chapter 11).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (1) YOUTH SOCIALIZED: SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL FRAMEWORKS

This Chapter outlines the literature relating to the theoretical and psychological frameworks of the study. It explores the nature of adolescence, and the emergence of this age group as a field of study within social psychology; it further examines adolescence as a part of the life cycle. The Chapter continues by discussing the concepts of socialisation and political socialisation, and explores the relationship of political with socio-economic concepts. The notion of socialising agents is discussed, focussing on the role of the school and educational experience in this process. Finally, four main psychological frameworks are presented within which the study of youth socialisation can be undertaken and interpreted. The issue of gender in political socialisation research is also discussed. (Note: this Chapter focuses on psychological frameworks. Literature relating specifically to politics, political socialisation and schools is presented in Chapter 4).

2.1 Adolescence and the Life Cycle

The nature of the adolescent period is very much a culturally bound phenomenon, varying both over time and across cultures and societies. Different cultures will see the adolescent period as characterised by various physical, psychological, and lifestyle changes and developments; these individual level changes will be matched by changes in the rights and status of individuals within that society. Rogers (1972) claims that the study of adolescence as a distinct part of the life cycle began with the work of G Stanley Hall at the turn of the century. Hall's work identified the existence of certain key changes in individual development that mark the change from 'child' to 'adult' (Hall, 1904).
Since that time, adolescence has been seen as a distinct phase in an increasingly differentiated life cycle (Klein, 1990). Coleman (1980) suggests that the early academic study of adolescence viewed it as a single stage in the life cycle, a period in life experienced by all young people of a certain age who experienced similar problems. Coleman proposed instead that there are a wide range of behaviours throughout the adolescent period. He therefore described adolescence as a transitional phase experienced variously by different people at different ages, with a wide range of behaviours shown (see also Springhall, 1983; Lapsley, Enright and Serlin, 1985).

Some researchers propose that adolescence is essentially a social creation and not a natural or biological phenomena (Sieg, 1971; Bates et al, 1984; Griffin, 1987). Thus the nature and study of adolescence will vary over time and across cultures: the age range and the foci of investigation will vary as, for example, school leaving and voting age limits are altered. The status of young people will therefore change over time not only in terms of academic study but within society itself. An example of this movement within the concept of adolescence is in terms of the age boundaries given for the period. Argyle (1972) describes the period as those young people aged 12/13 to 18/19; Erikson (1959) extends the age range well into the early twenties, perhaps reflecting a different social era. Springhall (1983) points out that British law defines a young person as aged 14-20.

Young people can now achieve adult status very early on in their lives, for example by marrying, working, or voting. Crow and Crow (1965) offer a useful description of the changes that have occured in adolescent status over time. The most important historical changes for adolescents are described in terms of rights and freedom of choice. Among the changes they describe, the following are important in the current context:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earlier cultures</th>
<th>Modern society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short periods between childhood and adulthood</td>
<td>Longer periods of preparation for adulthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised training for leadership for the chosen few</td>
<td>Many sided education to allow for choice of life occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education available only for the few</td>
<td>Education available for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education the responsibility of parents and religious groups</td>
<td>Education the responsibility of the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much disregard of individual interests, abilities and needs</td>
<td>Increasing interest in maturation and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on submission of young people to authority and elders</td>
<td>Encouragement of individual freedom within a democratic framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Crow and Crow, 1965, p 28)

It is important to remember therefore, that in the current research the young people occupy as unique a position as any group of young people studied before (or after) them. Their transition into adulthood takes place at a particular time in the historical, social, political, and technological life of British society. In the sense that any society is continually changing and developing, research on the experiences and behaviours of those currently undergoing this transition is unique.

Linked to the view of adolescence as a historical phenomenon, is the notion that the adolescent phase is just one period in the human life cycle (Klein, 1990). The behaviours of adolescence must therefore be viewed as both dependent on what has gone before, and as having major influence on future development. The importance attached to the adolescent period for influencing later behaviour, however, will vary depending on the overall approach taken to human development. Psychoanalytic theorists see the early
years of infancy and childhood as of most importance for later development (for example Freud 1927, 1937), thus reducing the importance of the adolescent period for developments later in life. Other theorists such as Erikson (1959) and humanistic psychologists like Maslow (1954) and Rogers (1961), see the adolescent period as crucial for healthy psychological development in adulthood. Erikson described adolescence as one of the critical learning periods, emphasizing the importance of the stage for the development of psychological maturity in adulthood. The concept of critical periods and broader developmental issues will be returned to later.

2.2: Socialisation as a Social-Psychological Concept

Chapter 1 introduced the concept of socialisation, a term widely used in the social and behavioural sciences, and frequently applied to the study of the adolescent period. It is often used by youth researchers, however, with variable definitions and sometimes with no attempt at definition at all. Essentially, socialisation concerns the emergence of children and young people into the adult world. In this sense, socialisation can be defined as the development of attitudes, behaviours and roles appropriate to effective functioning within society. Socialisation is therefore primarily a process of adaptation, specifically adaptation to new roles and new experiences during the childhood and adolescent years. It is thus an integral part of the overall process of development.

This generalised definition of socialisation, however, is too broad to be managed effectively within a research context. The concept is therefore most usefully broken down into separate components, such as influences on the socialisation process and outcomes of socialisation. Bynner (1987a) describes socialisation research as composing the investigation of four primary aspects, specifically
1) structural influences: eg the labour market, social class, age, sex.
2) socialising agencies: eg education, work, family, media.
3) social-psychological influences: eg identity, self-concept, social representations and attributions.
4) outcomes of socialisation: status, behaviours, attitudes.

Socialisation is rarely explored in this broad context, however, but in terms of its constituent parts (see also Harpaz, 1985). Thus researchers have explored political, socio-economic, work and sex-role socialisation, and also socialisation to a domestic and family role. It is important to stress, however, that these areas of socialisation are not independent of each other, and development in one area will necessarily affect outcomes in other areas (see Grotevant, 1987, for a further discussion). It is also important to see socialisation as a two-way process, with young people active in their own development.

The focus of research on youth socialisation has varied across different disciplines. Differences in the approaches of sociologists, psychologists and economists have been particularly noticeable in terms of theory, method, and foci. Sociologists have focussed on the economic and political development of the young as seen against societal structures - primarily class, race, and gender (Roberts, 1987a, 1987b). Economists have looked at issues of consumption and production, and the role of individuals and groups within the economic process (Elias and Blanchflower, 1987; Baxter, 1988). Other disciplines, such as political science (Merelman, 1986) and education (Bates et al, 1984; Dunn, 1984), have all used quite different concepts, but have to varying degrees still included social-psychological concepts. Psychologists have focussed more on the processes of individual identity formation during adolescence in the political, socio-economic and occupational spheres. They have explored, for example, the importance of social networks and social groups (Gaskell and
Smith, 1986), identity development (Waterman, 1985), concepts of efficacy and control (Breakwell, 1988), and attributions (Lewis, 1981; Feather, 1983).

Integrating these approaches and utilising concepts from across a range of disciplines is a primary aim of the current research. This is considered essential in research concerned with the relationship between educational structures, political understanding, psychological processes, and wider political and socio-economic issues. As Bynner (1987a) suggests, both structural and psychological approaches must be utilised to fully understand the development of the young and the influence of

"... social and occupational structures as mediated through the agencies of the school, the family, the workplace, the mass media, and the peer group". (p 26).

One method of integrating sociological and psychological approaches to socialisation is to see socialisation as both a content and a process variable. Much past socialisation research has adopted what is primarily a sociological approach, exploring the content of socialisation. This includes the study of such aspects as occupational outcomes and the adoption of a domestic role, as well as the development of political and economic attitudes. Specifically, researchers in this tradition are interested in how membership of a particular social class, sex or racial group determines outcomes on these factors.

Some researchers have commented on the over-emphasis of work on socialisation content (for example Kavanagh, 1972; Tajfel, 1978; Petersen, 1983), commenting that the processes involved in socialisation have been given insufficient emphasis. Those investigating the processes of socialisation (generally psychologists) have looked at such areas as how children and young people acquire societal norms, values and attitudes, and what psychological processes are involved in their development. Waterman (1985) for example explored the notion of individual identity development as part of an
understanding of broader aspects of psycho-social development, and Adams (1985) examined how individuals develop in terms of political identity exploration and commitment. The importance of addressing both content and process is a main feature of the current research.

To summarise, the current study views socialisation in a number of key ways. First, socialisation is a process of adaptation to new experiences encountered in the childhood and adolescent periods. Second, socialisation comprises constituent parts, in terms of development in, for example, political, work, and sex-role domains. Third, socialisation can be explored in terms of structural and social-psychological influences, agencies of socialisation, and affective and behavioural outcomes; the integration of these aspects is necessary to fully understand youth socialisation. Fourth, socialisation can be identified as comprising both outcomes and processes; the examination of both theses aspects is considered important in providing a greater understanding of youth socialisation. The aim is therefore to describe the political attitudes of young people (ie socialisation content) whilst also investigating how young people explore political issues and make commitments (ie socialisation process). Finally, socialisation is seen as an active, never-ending process continuing into adulthood, with young people pro-active in their own development.

It is important at this point to expand on the fourth of the characteristics of socialisation described above. This concerns how the content and the process of political socialisation are operationalised in the current research. First, the content of youth socialisation. This is most often explored in terms of the attitudes, values, and behaviours of youth in such areas as occupation, politics, or interpersonal relationships. In the current study, content is operationalised in terms of attitudes. Attitudes in this context are conceptualised following Lalljee, Brown and Ginsburg (1984), who define them as:
"...communicative acts which imply evaluations of a class of objects, persons or events. The clearest case of attitude would be a self-referent speech act of the form 'I approve/disapprove entities of type X'. (p 233).

Defined in this way, attitudes are clearly separate, but related to, broader value structures (see Feather (1980), for a discussion of values in adolescence; also Jaspars and Fraser, 1984). The content of political socialisation is therefore operationalised in terms of attitudes to politics and political issues (the political remit is defined later in this Chapter).

Second, the process of political socialisation is conceptualised in terms of history of exploration of political alternatives and the making of political commitments. The focus is therefore on mode of political development and thinking rather than on outcomes, which is generally the domain of a content focus. Theoretically and methodologically, process is operationalised using Eriksonian concepts of identity development in adolescence, and developments of his work by later researchers. These theorists focus on young people's exploration of political alternatives and on whether secure and coherent political commitments are achieved. Identity theorists generally use individual interviews to categorise young people according to four different identity "statuses" - identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure and identity diffusion. Individuals in these four identity statuses are distinctive in terms of exploration and commitment in the political domain. Theoretical and methodological aspects of identity theory are presented in Chapter 3, which explains further the nature of the four identity statuses and how they are utilised here to explore the process of political socialisation.

2.3 Political and Economic Socialisation

It was suggested earlier that relatively little work has been undertaken on the political socialisation of young people. Further, where such work has been
undertaken, it has often been conducted in limited terms and with varying definitions of politics. Yet understanding how young people are socialised to politics may contribute to a greater understanding of wider processes of socialisation, and the relation of political development to other areas of development. Youth researchers often comment only briefly on the political socialisation of young people, with political questions simply 'tacked on' to other studies; rarely is an investigation of political development the primary focus. Kavanagh (1972) comments that most research on young people and politics isolates one area (typically voting behaviour) without investigating broader aspects of politics or ideology. Further, Merelman (1986) suggests that political socialisation research has "stagnated" because of the lack of any real theoretical bases to the research. Similarly, Palonsky (1987) and Prewitt (1978) criticise the current state of political socialisation research.

Definitions of politics, and thus the remit for political study, have been many and varied. A key proposal of the current work is the adoption of a broad definition of political behaviour. Essentially, political socialisation can be seen as the development of rules and norms that govern human relationships. The political remit therefore ranges from relationships between individuals (for example in terms of establishing possession rights), to the functioning of a whole society (for example the making of laws and establishing of authority). Prewitt (1978) describes politics as "...the organisation of power in society..." (p 125), and political socialisation as "...the socially organised and institutionalised production of consent to the entire structure of social relations" (p 125). These definitions link political theory to political culture and in turn to human behaviour. Kavanagh (1972) defines the political culture as "...the emotional and attitudinal environment within which the political system operates" (p 10).
The study of politics can therefore be described as the perception of patterns of human relationships, and political socialisation as how children and young people come to develop such perceptions. It is of note that many researchers emphasise that these relationships are power relationships (Prewitt, 1978; Merelman, 1986). With this emphasis the study of "politics" extends naturally into any sphere of human life where power relationships exist. In the current study the exploration of politics therefore includes the study of attitudes to, and understanding of, the following: party politics and the democratic process, interest in politics, use of political media and involvement in political activity, voting, perceptions of the rule of law and civil disobedience, view of political systems and different types of human organisation, notions of class and the redistribution of wealth, equality and stratification, and view of human nature.

Viewing politics as the perception of patterns of human relationships necessitates the incorporation of other areas of socialisation into the study. Specifically, it requires the integration of economic and social concepts into the definition. Socio-economic socialisation includes the development of attitudes relating to work (purpose, aims, value), training, the local and national labour market, and attributions for unemployment, success, wealth, and poverty. Thus political socialisation is seen to incorporate economic and social concepts under its umbrella.

Research that has been conducted into socio-economic concepts highlights the need to incorporate these areas in any exploration of political socialisation. Stroebe and Frey (1982) for example, consider the "...selfish man..." (p 122) model (adapted from economics), which suggests that early on children construct views of personal interest and collective action. The link of beliefs about taxation, equity, and intergroup relations with attributions for the causes of wealth and poverty have also been established (Lewis, 1980; 1982). Similarly
Stacey (1982) and Cummings and Taebel (1978) have attempted to locate the origin of the rules of capitalism in the early socialisation experiences of children and young people; the latter authors propose a theory of indoctrination to explain the widespread acceptance of capitalism as the predominant form of social organisation.

The remit of politics, and the link between political socialisation and the development of social and economic concepts, is detailed further in Chapter 4. It is sufficient to note here that the relationship between these concepts is a central tenet of the current study. This view is in agreement with Furnham (1987a), who proposed that adolescent views on economic structures, social inequality, and preferences for government expenditure were closely related to political standpoint. Furnham suggested that social, economic, and political development in adolescence cannot be studied in isolation. He concluded that:

"... economic and political beliefs are inextricably intertwined... a study of the structure and determinants of the one, will inevitably involve the other." (Furnham, 1987a, p 370).

The relationship between these areas is discussed further in Chapter 4.

2.4 Socialising Agents: The Role of the School

The notion of socialising agents is a theme common to most socialisation literature. It suggests that different individuals, groups, or factors are involved in the socialisation of youth, each influencing to a different extent and in different ways. In the field of political socialisation, researchers have highlighted various factors as important with little agreement as to their relative influence. (This section briefly outlines these factors and the issues involved, which are detailed later in Chapter 4).
Work by Hyman (1959) and Dawson and Prewitt (1969) suggested that the family is of most importance in the development of political attitudes and values. Dawson et al (1977) later detailed the ways in which the family influences the political socialisation of children, for example by providing role models and via interpersonal relationships. The role of the family in political socialisation has therefore been seen as very significant by the majority of researchers in the area. Other researchers have described the influence of the mass media (Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Garramone and Atkin, 1986; Rosier and Little, 1986), and peer and social groups (Dawson et al, 1977; Conover, 1988; Gaskell and Smith, 1986).

The role of the school in political socialisation has been widely debated in the socialisation literature. Whereas some early researchers concluded that the school has little or no effect on political socialisation (Hyman, 1959; McQuail et al, 1968; Easton and Dennis, 1969), others have proposed that the school is a major influence on political socialisation. Hess and Torney (1967) claim that schools may be more influential than families in socialisation, and Dawson et al (1977) suggest that schools influence both in formal ways (via the curriculum, teacher style, and value orientation) and non formal ways (social composition, school ethos, etc). Palonsky (1987) believes that schools are a major arena for the development of citizenship skills and political knowledge, concluding that the school is a key factor in determining the "...magnitude and valence..." (p 493) of early political learning. It has already been mentioned that in a longitudinal study of the relative influence of home and school, Himmelweit and Swift (1969) revealed evidence pointing to "... the dominant influence of the school" (p 157).

Given these indicators of the possible role of the school in political socialisation, it is surprising that more research has not been undertaken to
establish its importance. It is still unclear to what extent the school and educational experience affects the political development of young people. In particular, very little is known about the socialisation of girls and young women in the political arena and the role of the school experience in this. Thus the current research aims to combine the exploration of these three neglected areas: political socialisation, the role of the school as a socialising agent, and the political socialisation of girls.

2.5 Gender Issues in Socialisation Research

Research on youth socialisation has highlighted, to varying degrees, the existence of gender differences in development. Researchers have, however, only recently begun to explore gender differences in youth socialisation in any meaningful way. Much work has dealt exclusively with the experiences of boys, and so more is generally known about their development. Studies exploring boys and young men only include, for example, Himmelweit and Swift's (1969) study of the impact of educational experiences on socialisation, Fox's (1984) study of parental motivation of public school boys, Furnham's (1982b) study of perceptions of poverty, and McQuail et al's (1968) exploration of the relationship between politics and education.

Several researchers have also, of course, focussed their attention on the experiences of girls and young women. For example Frazer (1988) has explored girls' perceptions of class, whilst Griffin (1985) detailed the post-school experiences of working-class girls. In many early studies based on one particular group of girls, however, the results were often generalised to all females. For example Osipow (1968) suggested that choosing a career is pseudo-exploration for women, filling in time before marriage; although this may have been true for some women it was certainly not true for all of them. Further research on gender differences appears justified, therefore, particularly
in light of the findings of recent work which has reported differences between genders in youth socialisation (Waterman and Nevid, 1977; Grotevant and Thorbecke, 1982).

Overall, however, studies focussing exclusively on girls and young women have not been as extensive as those concerning boys and young men, and many researchers have commented on the need for a more focussed attention on the experiences of females (Konopka, 1983; Borcelle, 1985). Similarly, Murray, Maguire and Ashton (1988) conclude that within youth research "The tendency has been for greater attention to be paid to the experience of young males" (p 42).

The issue of gender in political socialisation is a central theme of the current research. In order to redress the balance of earlier research which has focussed primarily on boys, the present study explores the political socialisation of girls. In focussing the research on females only it is anticipated that some new information can be offered of the socialisation of this group in the 1980s. (Issues of gender in political socialisation specifically are discussed in Chapter 4).

2.6 Psychological Frameworks in the Study of Political Socialisation

Various frameworks exist within social psychology that may assist in the exploration of the political socialisation of youth, and in the role of the school in this process. This section details the four frameworks considered most useful. The first three - social representations, attribution theory, and social identity - are related in that they each attempt to explain the existence and nature of the social rules governing human behaviour. Each of these is used in the research primarily for interpreting and understanding the results of the research. The fourth - Erikson's theory of identity development - aims to explore developments in adolescence as part of a theory of human development
across the life span. This latter framework is used as a basis for one part of the empirical study, the process of political socialisation.

The first of the theoretical approaches which may assist in a greater understanding of political socialisation is social representations. Primarily the work of Moscovici (1984; 1988), the concept is used to understand and explain how members of different social groups create and represent social reality. Griffin (1987) suggests that social representations emerge as a result of both social interaction and group membership, and provide the "...psychological glue..." (p 7) that holds a social group together. Moscovici (1988) suggests that the main aim of social representations is to focus on everyday communication and thinking, providing a link between the most basic elements of human psychology, and social and cultural trends. As such, the study of social representations concerns the

"... contents of everyday thinking and the stock of ideas that gives coherence to our religious beliefs, political ideas and the connections we create as spontaneously as we breathe. They make it possible for us to classify persons and objects, to compare and explain behaviours and to objectify them as part of our social setting" (Moscovici, 1988, p 214).

Similarly, Duveen and Lloyd (1990) describe social representations as

"...particular kinds of structures which function to provide collectives with intersubjectively shared means for understanding and communicating" (Duveen and Lloyd, 1990, p 2).

Duveen and Lloyd also emphasise two aspects of social representations theory important in the current context: the theory focusses on the importance of groups and their role in constructing shared knowledge, and on the need to give equivalent emphasis to the content of what is constructed and the process of that construction.

The concept of the creation of social reality has been used increasingly in the 1980s to help explain various social and behavioural phenomena, and in the
interpretation of results in a number of studies. For example, Emler and Dickinson (1985) utilise social representations theory to explain their finding that middle-class and working-class children offered quite different explanations of economic inequalities. They conclude that "...children in different social classes are immersed in quite dissimilar social worlds" (p 192); other researchers have utilised social representations to explain their findings (for example Hewstone, Jaspars and Lalljee, 1982). The focus on group views of the social and political world suggests that social representations may be of use in the interpretation of results in the current study.

The second theoretical approach of importance in the research is attribution theory. Originating from the work of Heider in the 1940s and 1950s, attributions concern the attempt by individuals to give causal meaning and structure to personal behaviour and to the behaviour of others (see Hewstone, 1983). Essentially, people are found to offer individualistic/ internal (personalised), structural (societal), or luck/chance factors in explaining human behaviour. More recent work on attribution theory has tended to emphasise the social dimension of attribution. Jaspars, Fincham and Hewstone (1983) for example, propose that the social context underlying attributions is important, and in particular they stress the importance of membership of social groups in understanding differences in attributions. Conceptualised in this way attributions are linked to both social representations (above) and social identity (below). Essentially, attributions are

"... a process of organising the universe of the subject (both internal and external) and the environment (both physical and social). Thus attribution is a process of putting representations into operation." (Hewstone, 1983, p 238)

Attributional style has been used to explain the findings of several research studies. Feather (1983) found that pupils at an independent school made more
internal attributions in explaining the causes of unemployment. Furnham (1982b) observed that internal attributions for poverty were more likely to be given by public school boys. Similarly Moscovici (1984) reports that those supporting right-wing philosophies favour person-based, individualistic explanations of unemployment, whilst those with a left-wing bias prefer situation-based, societal explanations. (Other studies utilising attribution theory include Gurney, 1981; Furnham, 1983c; Gaskell and Smith, 1985; Breakwell, 1986).

The third social-psychological theory which may assist in understanding youth socialisation is social identity. Social psychologists have long described how minority (or distinctive) groups in society may develop in-group pride and identification (see Tajfel, 1978; Turner, Sachdev and Hogg, 1983), based on negative and positive comparisons between groups. So far this concept has been applied to groups such as the unemployed and members of ethnic minorities. The relevance of social identity to studies of women has more recently been proposed. Skevington and Baker (1989) for example focus on women as a distinct social group, with different groups of women revealing different social identities. Elements of social identity theory can also be seen in work on youth subcultures as described by sociological theorists (Corrigan, 1979; Jenkins, 1983). It is possible that the development of in-group pride and identification is associated with those attending different educational establishments. The utility of social identity theory as applied to an educational setting remains largely unexplored, however. The current research aims to shed light on this issue.

The fourth theoretical approach utilised in the research is Erikson's theory of psycho-social development. In exploring adolescent development as one phase in the life cycle, this approach is clearly very different to the three
above, which aim to explain aspects of social behaviour rather than the process of human development itself. Erikson (1959, 1965, 1968) described adolescence as one of the eight critical periods in human life, the successful negotiation of which is essential for normal healthy development. Erikson's work was substantially refined by later researchers such as Marcia (1966, 1980), and Waterman (1985). Tanner (1971) comments that Erikson's psycho-social theory is particularly useful for an understanding of development in adolescence.

Identity researchers using Eriksonian concepts explore development based on poles of commitment and exploration. Erikson described the development of a political ideology in particular as a key achievement of adolescence, and later researchers have refined the relationship between political development and identity (for example Adams, 1985; Grotevant, 1987; Kroger, 1988). The concepts of commitment and exploration as used by these researchers are particularly valuable tools for exploring the process of political socialisation, and are a central feature of the research. (The following chapter discusses these issues in detail).

2.7 Summary
This Chapter has discussed further the issues presented in Chapter 1, focussing on theoretical and psychological aspects of youth socialisation. Socialisation was described as a social-psychological concept centering on the notion of adaptation to new roles and experiences, and comprising developments in different parts of a person's life. Political socialisation was identified as a neglected area of such research, and identifying the role of the school experience in political socialisation was highlighted as the aim of the study. A focus on the political socialisation of young women was proposed as a response to the low level of knowledge of this group.
A content/process distinction was made in relation to youth socialisation, the latter area having received much less attention from researchers. Content was described in terms of outcomes, and operationalised as attitudes to politics and areas within the political remit. Process was described in terms of concepts of exploration and commitment derived from Eriksonian notions of identity development. A wide remit for politics was proposed, broadly conceived of as perceptions of patterns of human relationships. The interrelationship of political with the social and economic domains was also proposed.

The second literature chapter (Chapter 3) focusses on Erikson's theory of identity development in adolescence, and its utility in exploring the process of political socialisation in the empirical study.
CHAPTER 3: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (3): IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENCE

It was proposed in Chapter 2 that Erikson’s theory of identity development offers a useful contribution to both theoretical and empirical elements of the investigation of the process of political socialisation. Its relevance to studying socialisation process arises from its focus on how young people explore political alternatives (and on how they have explored them in the past), as well as on whether they have made political commitments. The aim of this part of the research is to utilise identity theory and methodology to extend the information acquired on the content of political socialisation.

This Chapter examines the literature relating to identity, and explores its relationship to the concept of socialisation. It continues with an examination of the theoretical and empirical work of Erikson, Marcia, and others in the field, describing an approach that operationalises history of identity development using four different statuses. Research exploring the statuses and their psychological correlates is described, followed by an examination of gender differences and methodological considerations in identity research. Finally, research focussing on political identity development is highlighted.

3.1 Identity Development in Adolescence: an Introduction

The concept of identity development emerged primarily from the work of Erik Erikson (1965, 1968), and was central to his theory of development across the life span. Erikson’s proposal was that adolescence, as the fifth stage of development in his theory, is the time when young people develop an inner sense of identity. Waterman (1985) builds on Erikson’s work, proposing that during adolescence there is a progressive strengthening in an individual’s sense of personal identity.
Though widely used in academic as well as non-academic circles, identity is not easily defined. Archer (1985b) defines identity as:

"...one's personally expressive self-definition pertaining to values, beliefs, and goals in life." (p 291).

Similarly, Marcia (1980) refers to identity as:

"... an existential position,... an inner organisation of needs, abilities, and self-perceptions as well as a socio-political stance." (p 159).

The majority of definitions of identity rest on the dual notions of self-perceptions and self-definitions. Josselson (1987) summarises these two ideas when she describes identity as

"...the stable, consistent, and reliable sense of who one is and what one stands for in the world." (p 10).

This definition of identity is adopted for use in the current research, as it is specific, clear, and can be usefully operationalised in a research setting. It is the development of a political identity which is the focus of the research.

In concentrating on identity development in this way, this aspect of the research focuses on the level of the individual rather than on groups or whole societies. It was suggested earlier that research on identity has traditionally been the focus of psychologists, whereas the study of groups and societal structures has generally been undertaken by other disciplines, in particular sociology. The distinction between the individual and the group/societal level of investigation, however, is in many ways a false one. Identity development does not take place in a vacuum, and many writers on identity have stressed the social aspect of individual identity development. Grotevant (1987) for example, proposes that future research into identity development should explore the joint contribution of personality and situational variables, and the role of cultural and societal events and norms, in individual identity development. Similarly, Kroger (1985) stresses the interplay of identity
development with wider aspects of social organisation. The task of adolescence, she proposes, is to obtain

"... a 'goodness of fit' between internal structural demands and occupational and ideological roles offered by one's society..." (p 134).

The notion of psycho-social development as used by many in the area indicates the close relationship of individual and structural factors. Exploring this relationship is fundamental to the research.

Research focusing on identity development is generally more descriptive and in-depth than most socialisation research, commonly using small sample sizes and in-depth interviews. This essentially qualitative approach means results are often presented in descriptive form, frequently using case studies (e.g. Josselson, 1987). This methodology is justified by the claim that it provides rich data, with smaller numbers of young people illustrative of wider populations. Josselson, Greenberger and McConochie (1977a) for example, argue that descriptive research presents typical cases from which to generalise. Others (Marcia, 1976) also propose that detailed descriptions of those in the different statuses is most revealing about adolescent development. (Methodological issues in identity research are discussed further in section 3.6).

Research into identity development is different to most socialisation research. This is because the main emphasis of identity research is on the process of forming an identity rather than on overt content. Researchers focusing on identity development in adolescence therefore explore issues of movement through different statuses, with certain statuses associated with better psychological health and growth (see for example Archer, 1985a; 1989b). For identity researchers, therefore, a change in the content of a person's views
would not in itself indicate evidence of positive or negative psychological growth. As Waterman, Geary and Waterman (1974) suggest:

"... the distinction between change and growth can be made in terms of the processes by which identity elements are altered with growth entailing the use of more mature modes of functioning." (p 387).

These authors therefore recommend that research explores not only changes in the elements of identity (ie content) but the processes of change themselves. For example Josselson (1987) in exploring identity development in women, proposes that research should not concentrate on who has chosen a career and who a family, but who has obtained a secure identity and who a more precarious one. This is a process rather than a content emphasis, because it concentrates on an individual’s exploration of alternatives and on whether they have arrived at a commitment. Waterman (1985) links these two approaches by suggesting that the identity construct is composed of two elements: (a) a content variable: the areas of a person’s life where identity commitments exist, and (b) a process variable: the techniques an individual employs to identify and evaluate goals and values.

A final distinguishing feature of much identity research is that it explores identity not as a unitary concept, but as a jigsaw of interlocking parts. Researchers have criticised work that treats identity as a unitary concept (such as that by Andrews, 1973), with adolescents having or not having a sense of personal identity (see Waterman, 1985; Kroger, 1988, for a further discussion). These authors have instead explored the progress of identity development in certain key areas: occupation, politics, religion, and sex roles (see also Kroger, 1986; 1988). According to Waterman (1985), this approach accepts that adolescents differ in the areas of their lives in which they have established goals and beliefs; at different times during adolescence they will
have different self-defining commitments. In research terms, this suggests that rather than solely exploring differences in occupational choice or political attitudes, work is directed at establishing which young people have (and have not) addressed these issues, and whether (or not) an occupational or political commitment has emerged.

3.2 Identity Formation and Socialisation

The previous section highlighted the differences between identity development (used to operationalise socialisation process) and socialisation content. However, it has also already been proposed that to the extent that identity development is brought about through social interaction, it is inextricably related to wider processes of socialisation. Identity and socialisation are therefore distinct but related. One theoretical model particularly revealing in this light is the process model of identity formation described by Grotevant (1987), which was proposed in response to the socialisation/identity debate. The model is represented by the following diagram:

Figure 3.1: Grotevant's Process Model of Identity Formation

(from Grotevant, 1987, p 205)
The framework for Grotevant's model hinges on three main features. First, the model as developmental, focussing on the process of forming an identity. Second, it is contextual, stressing the interdependence of family, peers, society and school in identity formation. Thirdly, it is life-span oriented, with identity formation seen as an ongoing and life-long task. The model emphasises the close relationship between the process of identity formation and the contexts for its development, and as such it clearly focusses on both individual identity development and wider processes of socialisation.

Those parts of the diagram of particular relevance to the current study are 'identity process in domain A' and 'contexts of development', roughly corresponding to the individual/societal distinction. Each of these will be examined in turn. First, Grotevant's model proposes an identity formation process based on Eriksonian concepts, with the key to identity formation based on exploration and commitment. The aspect of identity referred to as 'domain A' in the diagram refers to the progress made within one specific domain, such as politics or occupation. Second, the model proposes that certain contexts of development will influence the nature of exploration in the various identity domains. The contexts are described as culture/society, family, peers, and school/work. Grotevant suggests that these areas are particularly important and yet have been largely neglected by identity researchers, primarily because of the homogeneous populations used in such research. These four contexts are summarised briefly below:

(a) Culture/society: Grotevant suggests that the notion of identity formation is itself culturally bound, in that it is based on notions of individual choice of careers and political allegiances. In practice however, different groups will have different expectations about the choices open to them, and society itself
will regulate access to alternatives. These beliefs about choice and options will be mediated via schools, families, and peer groups. Consequently, the culture and society context is a vital consideration in exploring identity:

"... access to alternatives is strongly influenced by one's position in society. In particular, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and gender, have all contributed to the context in which identity is shaped by controlling the opportunity structure of society, by shaping norms that govern appropriate behaviour, and by serving as stimulus variables that act as elicitors of how one is treated by others." (p 215).

(b) The family: Grotevant proposes that communication processes and structures within the family will provide experiences in which adolescents learn how to develop their individual point of view. The family context also provides models and messages about what is appropriate in occupational and ideological terms.

(c) Peers: Grotevant sees peers as important because they allow the young to look at their reflected images, and then decide whether to retain or reject aspects of this identity. Thus peers may facilitate change in relation to careers and values, or they may encourage continuity.

(d) School and work: Grotevant views the contexts of school and work as locations for shaping beliefs about values and relationships; they also provide information about careers and pass on predominant views and values.

Returning to the diagramatic presentation of Grotevant's model, the discussion above has highlighted the relationship of individual identity development with wider social processes and contexts. The interrelationship between identity domains themselves is also clearly important ('domain B' on the diagram). Thus although a single domain (for example occupation) may be explored, its development cannot be seen in total isolation to other areas of a person's life (such as politics).
This section has focussed on the relationship between individual identity development and youth socialisation, concepts which are often explored separately. It is proposed that socialisation (in terms of socialisation content) and identity are better seen as two different (but closely related) approaches to exploring key phenomena, such as occupational development or political ideology. This notion is reflected in the view of Josselson (1987), who refers to identity development as a jigsaw puzzle which has

"... somewhat different pieces to fit together. Natural talents, social class, physical attractiveness, genetic aspects of temperament, physical limitations, early deprivation, and traumatic experience all render a unique hue to the identity formation task." (p 12)

In the current research therefore, both the process of political identity development and the content of political socialisation are explored. The origins of work on the process of political socialisation, and the mode of categorising stage of identity development, are detailed below.

3.3 Identity Theory and Practice: The Work of Erikson and Marcia

Erikson's work on development across the life-span has its roots in the tradition of psychoanalytic psychology. Although based on Freudian concepts of human development, Erikson's work differs in several ways from earlier work. This section briefly details the theoretical and empirical nature of Erikson's identity theory, and developments of his work by later theorists, in particular Marcia.

Several theorists have commented on the differences between Erikson's work and Freudian psychology. Kroger (1989) suggests that Erikson diverged from Freud in one particular (and important) respect:

"Moving beyond Freud's goal of raising human misery to mere unhappiness, Erikson painted not only a more optimistic picture of human capabilities but also shifted the emphasis of psychoanalysis from pathology to healthy functioning..." (p 11)
Kroger also comments that among psychoanalytic theorists it was Erikson who recognised that personality development did not come to an end in adolescence, but continued to change and evolve during the life course. Similarly, Hamachek (1988) stresses the utility of Erikson's work because it acknowledges changes in social, emotional and intellectual aspects during adolescence and their importance for later life.

Erikson (1959; 1965; 1968) proposed a stage theory of development across the life span. The first four stages of life, if successfully negotiated, would lead to the acquisition of trust, autonomy, initiative and industry. These characteristics then become what Hamachek (1988) describes as the groundwork for achieving a sense of personal identity in the fifth stage of adolescence. Each stage is a crisis or a turning point where potential for both development and vulnerability are increased; the stage can therefore be either positively or negatively experienced.

Erikson's work on identity development focussed on movement between two poles, one of crisis and one of commitment. Individuals were described as being either in a state of identity achievement or identity diffusion in two areas - vocation and ideology. Marcia (1966) defined these two poles of crisis and commitment:

"Crisis refers to the adolescent's period of engagement in choosing among meaningful alternatives; commitment refers to the degree of personal investment the individual exhibits." (p 551).

For both Erikson and Marcia, identity was seen as a progression of crisis experiences and the making of commitments in different spheres of a young person's life. Marcia (1980) describes the impact of this spiral of crisis and commitment on adolescent development: the better developed identity is, the more aware young people are of their own strengths and weaknesses. The
less developed it is, the more young people are confused about their own distinctiveness. In a useful extension of this concept, Hamachek (1988) offers a behavioural description of young people demonstrating identity and identity confusion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
<th>IDENTITY CONFUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are able to combine short-term goals with long-range plans</td>
<td>Tend to set short-term goals and have trouble setting long-term ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are less susceptible to peer pressure</td>
<td>Are more susceptible to peer pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to be optimistic for themselves and life generally</td>
<td>Tend to be cynical about themselves and life generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe they are responsible for what happens to them</td>
<td>Believe what happens to them is out of their hands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Hamachek, 1988, p 39)

It was Marcia (1966, 1980) who expanded Erikson's work to its full potential, and his developments are now used as the basis of much theoretical and empirical work. Marcia suggested that Erikson's two categories of identity achievement and diffusion each be divided into two further categories, more accurately describing the different processes involved in identity development. Marcia (1966) thus proposed a four-fold classification of identity, described as identity "category" or "status". The categories, which in the current study are applied to politics, are as follows:

(a) **Identity achievement**: individuals in this category have seriously explored options and alternatives and come to a decision to which they are committed.

(b) **Identity diffusion**: individuals in this category have no commitments, and show no evidence of trying to make any; they may or may not have experienced a period of crisis in the past.
(c) **Moratorium:** individuals in this category are "in crisis", currently exploring amongst alternatives in an attempt to form commitments.

(d) **Foreclosure:** individuals in this category have commitments, but show no evidence of ever having experienced a period of exploration of alternatives. It is these four categories that are used to explore the process of political socialisation in the current study. (The four stages, and their psychological and behavioural correlates, are described more fully in the following section, 3.4).

Marcia (1966) proposed that the four status approach be used not for the assessment of global identity, but in relation to three different domains - occupation, politics, and religion. This approach has since been adopted by most researchers in identity research, with the addition of the sex role domain in the early 1970s (see Kroger and Haslett, 1988, for a discussion). Marcia (1980) concludes that this category approach improves on the original work of Erikson. This is because it (a) allows for a greater variety of styles in the ways young people deal with identity development; (b) allows for healthy and pathological aspects to each style; and (c) provides a system that can be determined with a fair degree of interobserver reliability (ie it can achieve high levels of agreement between raters on assessment of which of the four statuses individuals are in). The four statuses are described further below.

3.4 **The Four Identity Statuses: Descriptions, Research Findings, and Psychological Correlates**

The four identity statuses which Marcia (1966) described can be applied to each of the four domains. This section describes how those in each status are dealing with identity, and explores issues of change and movement between the statuses. Finally, psychological correlates are briefly described, characteristics and behaviours associated with those in the four statuses.
(Note that for ease of description, the four statuses are often referred to in this and the following Chapters as achievers, moratoriums, foreclosures, and diffusions). Those in the four categories are as follows:

1. **Identity achievement**

Marcia (1966, 1980) describes identity achievers as those who have gone through a period of exploration and emerged with firm identity commitments. Their lives are structured so as to translate these commitments into action. Individuals in this stage find their goals and values personally expressive, giving their lives meaning and direction. In the area of occupation, these young people have considered occupational possibilities and made a decision; in politics they have re-evaluated past beliefs and come to a resolution. Donovan (1975) describes achievers as having coherent and settled plans for their future, and political and religious views that are stable and integrated.

2. **Moratorium**

Marcia (1966) describes those in the moratorium status as currently in an identity "crisis", meaning that they are actively seeking amongst alternatives in an attempt to arrive at a resolution. In the area of occupation they are likely to be looking at different types of jobs/careers, aiming to settle on one of them. In relation to politics, they are likely to be using political media to gather information about different parties and policies, and discussing issues with parents and peers. These individuals are primarily characterised by a struggle to make decisions.

3. **Foreclosure**

Marcia (1966) proposes that although those in the foreclosure status reveal definite commitments, they show no evidence of ever having experienced an identity crisis and explored different alternatives. Marcia proposes that they
have often established their goals early on in life, adopting the beliefs or aspirations of their parents. The original source of the foreclosed identity, though usually a parent, can also be peers, teachers, or siblings. Waterman (1985) adds that the foreclosed individual is often brought up in a homogeneous environment with little exposure to competing viewpoints, and where early commitments seem acceptable in providing direction and meaning to life. Marcia (1966) concludes of the foreclosure that "It is difficult to tell where his parents' goals for him leave off and where his begin". (p 552)

The foreclosure is therefore characterised by commitment without evidence of exploration.

4. Identity diffusion

Marcia (1966) describes individuals who display identity diffusion as those who do not have any firm commitments, and who are also not trying to form any. Those in this status may or may not have experienced a crisis period, but if they did they were unable to resolve it and are now characterised by both a lack of commitment or exploration. In relation to occupation for example, they probably have no occupational aims, and do not appear bothered by this situation; they may mention an occupation, but know little about it, and would easily give it up if something more interesting came along. In ideological matters they are either totally uninterested or sample randomly from different party policies.

In developmental terms, Marcia proposes that children are initially in the diffusion status, and that they move in and out of this (and other) statuses during adolescence. Waterman (1985) offers a diagramatic presentation of the different routes possible:
This diagram represents the different routes possible from one status to another. In theory only certain routes are possible. For example movement from achievement to foreclosure is not possible as if a person with commitments has experienced a period of exploration (achievement), they cannot move to a stage characterised by lack of exploration (foreclosure).

Waterman suggests that a common path for adolescents is from moratorium to identity achievement, particularly in the occupational domain. This transition is most likely when:

"... one or more of the alternatives under consideration represents an integration of personal potentials with social opportunities and supports." (Waterman, 1985, p 15)

Researchers have highlighted the most common identity status transitions made by young people. Kroger (1988) studied 76 New Zealand adolescents and found that over a two year period there was a significant movement into the achievement status in the occupational domain. For politics, the most significant shift was from diffusion to achievement. Meilman (1979) in a study of 12-24 year olds found a general movement into the achievement status during adolescence, with decreasing numbers in the diffusion and foreclosure
statuses. He believed this confirmed the notion that adolescence is a period of re-evaluation and decision-making. Similarly, Waterman and Goldman (1976) in a study of American college students found an increase in those in the achievement status for the vocational domain and a decrease in moratorium and diffusion.

Certain patterns have therefore been highlighted in identity research, showing common movements between domains during the adolescent period. Kroger and Haslett (1988) suggest that overall the identity literature reveals a decrease in foreclosure and diffusion statuses during adolescence, and an increase in the moratorium and achievement statuses. Similar claims are made by Waterman, Geary and Waterman (1974), Stark and Traxler (1974), Adams and Fitch (1982), and Cote and Levine (1989). There is a debate, however, about which of the statuses are more psychologically healthy and therefore desirable, ie those characterised by commitment or by history of exploration (see for example Archer, 1989b; 1989c). This issue is returned to later in this review.

In considering movement between statuses in any one domain, it is important to consider when and why a particular domain becomes central and subject to exploration of alternatives. In a longitudinal study of adolescents Kroger (1988) found that most young people were rated as being in different categories for different domains at any one period in time. Thus a young person may be in the achievement status for occupation, foreclosure for religion, and moratorium for politics. Further, she found that only 7% of women and 23% of men had all four of the identity domains with the same rating. She concluded from this that the identity domains may be addressed sequentially rather than concurrently during adolescence.
Work by Grotevant and Thorbecke (1982) confirmed this hypothesis, by demonstrating that youth will explore (and possibly make commitments) in one area and then shift their attention to another area. Identity formation can thus be viewed as a continually evolving structure, a "... spiral of cycles of exploration and commitment" (p 403). Similarly, Waterman et al (1974) proposed that certain catalysts can promote movement within a domain. In a longitudinal study of new college students they found that foreclosures were stable for occupation but unstable for ideology, concluding that experiences at college help support and implement vocational choices. Ideology, however, may be unstable in this environment because of the sudden exposure to a diversity of political and religious views.

A number of other factors (including those already mentioned such as attendance at college), may promote movement between statuses. Waterman (1982) suggests the following influences are important:

a) the degree of identification with parents: where there is strong identification, for example, foreclosure is most likely.

b) differences in parental styles: for example rejecting, authoritarian, democratic.

c) range of identity alternatives the young person is exposed to: a wider range means the person is more likely to undergo an identity crisis.

d) availability of role models: these will serve as examples of how to cope, and will suggest possible alternatives.

e) nature of social expectations: for example family, schools, and peer group will influence whether questioning of alternatives is promoted.

f) whether previous history provides a foundation for coping with identity issues: ie trust, autonomy, industry.

Further, some researchers have recently suggested that certain contexts (in particular the school and college environment) may be of use in interventions
during adolescent identity development, helping young people move towards more mature and psychologically healthy forms of functioning (see Archer, 1989b; Raskin, 1989; Waterman, 1989). Archer (1989b) for example suggests that

"... the purpose of identity intervention is to provide our youth with the tools to enhance their ability to adjust to changing conditions, to include refining as well as the development of new definitions of various components of one's self as needed." (p 354).

The issue of intervention in identity will be returned to.

In proposing the utility of identity research to explore socialisation process, it is necessary to note that a few researchers have claimed to have found cases which do not easily fit into the four fold typology described by Marcia. For example Kroger (1985) suggests two variations were evident from her research. First, she suggested that diffusions were actually two groups. One group were real diffusions with no occupational or ideological commitments. The other group did show strong overriding philosophies of life, but their personal ideologies were not able to be classed as commitments according to Marcia's framework. These included personal ideologies such as "having a happy life", and "taking each moment as it comes". Second, Kroger identified a group subsumed within the foreclosure status. They showed strong commitment without exploration (as usual), but also did not seem to have adopted the values of a significant other. One subject given as an example said she just sat down one day and thought "I want to teach", having not really thought about it before but pursuing it as an occupational aim. (See also Donovan, 1975; Meilman, 1979 for problems of classification). Reports of difficulty of classification are rare in the literature however, and the use of the four fold typology will be maintained for use in the current study.
Much of the research on adolescent identity development has focussed on movement in and out of different statuses in the four identity domains, as described above. Work has also been conducted on the psychological correlates associated with those in the different statuses, exploring differences of personality, interpersonal style, and attitudes and values in young people in the different statuses. Some of this research is briefly summarised here.

One area explored has been the concept of separation, regarded by many (eg Blos, 1967; Kroger, 1985) as central to identity development. Separation involves disengagement from parents and the development of attachment to peers and significant others. Kroger (1985) proposes that the ability to explore occupational and ideological alternatives necessitates a loosening of ties with parents: this has implications for the different statuses. According to Kroger, identity achievers have established their separateness from their parents and so are able to explore among alternatives and choose personal goals and values; moratoriums are also undergoing this process. Foreclosures "... appear happily embedded in the internal and external family nests..." (Kroger, 1985, p 136), and diffusions reveal a quite different pattern. Their parents were never really "there" for them in the first place, and so there was nothing to break away from. Achievers and moratoriums also show less anxious attachment styles than foreclosures and diffusions. A subsequent study (Kroger, 1988) found achievers were most likely to show secure forms of attachment, with foreclosures most likely to be non-secure, and moratoriums and diffusions evenly distributed.

Work by Marcia (1976, 1980) highlighted differences on various psychological dimensions between the statuses. Foreclosures were found to have the most authoritarian values, and achievers and foreclosures had a more future oriented time perspective; foreclosures and diffusions were also more likely to
reveal external locus of control. Josselson (1987) in an analysis of the literature shows that achievers and moratoriums showed higher levels of self-esteem. Foreclosures were frequently afraid of uncertainty and lack of control, and often religion played a major part in their lives.

Research has found differences between the four categories in interest in art (Waterman and Goldman, 1976), in moral reasoning (Adams and Shea, 1979), and in autobiographical recall (Neimeyer and Rareshide, 1991). Other research has focussed on identity status and interpersonal style. Donovan (1975) found distinctive characteristics for each of the statuses in relation to attitude to authority, conversational style, degree of optimism/pessimism, and relationship with parents. Foreclosures were particularly distinctive, generally middle-class and with evidence of having internalised their parents plans for them:

"It seems that these people had not rejected, or reworked, much of what their parents had offered. In this overt sense, the identification of the children was conscious and ... unambivalent..." (p 45).

Overall, Donovan concludes that foreclosures are...

"...the ones to maintain a group or a community, but not to turn either in new directions" (p 46).

Donovan also found that moratoriums were rebellious to authority and actively seeking resolutions to personal conflicts. Achievers were settled and coherent, with political and religious views that reflected stability and integration. Of all the groups, the achievers showed the greatest psychological health.

3.5 Gender Differences in Identity Development

Some researchers have raised the issue of whether the process of identity formation in adolescence is different for males and females. It was Erikson (1968) who originally proposed that men and women had quite different
processes of identity formation. His research was concerned primarily with identity in males, and much subsequent research continued this trend (e.g., Marcia, 1966, 1967; Waterman and Waterman, 1971; Meilman, 1979). It was claimed that females differed in both the salience of the different domains and the processes involved in establishing an identity in the domains. Males were seen to focus on careers and ideology, with females focusing on personal relationships. Marcia (1980) suggested that:

"The predominant concerns of most adolescent girls are not with occupation and ideology... they are concerned with the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationships." (p 179).

Much of this early research claimed clear gender differences in all areas of identity formation. Waterman and Nevid (1977) for example showed that females were more likely to have experienced a sexual identity crisis than males, with the latter more likely to be foreclosed in this area. They suggested this was because the sexual identity issue may be more salient for women, as they are more aware of sexual stereotypes and spending more time discussing the current egalitarian issues of sex roles. Archer (1985a), however, suggests that the anticipation of gender differences often determined the identity domains explored by researchers. Often only females were asked about their plans concerning marriage and the family, while research on males focussed on occupations and career plans.

The majority of subsequent research has in fact suggested that processes of identity development for males and females are comparable. Waterman (1985) in an extensive review of the literature, found very few studies that revealed significant gender differences, concluding that:

"... males and females are fully comparable in their capacities to use the various pathways to identity formation, and there is only weak and inconclusive evidence that the genders differ in the pathways they employ in various content domains." (p 22)
Similarly Kroger (1988) concludes that:

"... identity content and process features may be more similar than different for the two sexes." (p 60).

Other researchers report similar findings (Waterman and Nevid, 1977; Matteson, 1972; Adams and Fitch, 1982; Archer, 1989a). Research indicating gender differences in identity formation is therefore in the minority. The view of Waterman (1985) that males and females are "...fully comparable..." (p 22) is accepted, as is the view of Josselson (1987) that identity formation in women remains under-researched. The exploration of political identity formation amongst young women is therefore the focus of the current research.

3.6 Methodological Issues in Identity Research

It was suggested earlier in this Chapter that identity development, operationalised in terms of the four identity statuses, is a valuable tool in exploring the process of political socialisation. The Chapter has also highlighted a number of areas where contentious or disputed issues have arisen. These relate to methodological issues (sampling and analysis for example) many of which are relevant to using the four status approach in the current study. These issues are therefore discussed here.

The majority of research on identity emphasises qualitative methods, with individual interviews most commonly used for deriving the identity statuses. Josselson et al (1977a) criticise much of the identity work for relying on translating interviews into statistical data, losing the richness of detail; they recommend instead the use of quantitative data as well as interviews and case studies (see also Waterman, 1985). However, other aspects of the identity literature are more problematic. Six main areas are discussed below.
First, much of the identity literature samples only those young people at university and college. Examples of this include work by Marcia (1967), Waterman and Waterman (1971), Waterman et al (1974), Adams and Shea (1979), Kroger (1985, 1986), Josselson (1987), Caldwell, Bogat and Cruise (1989) and Cote and Levine (1989). Clearly, these populations are chosen mainly because of their availability to researchers and not primarily because of their pertinence to identity research. Indeed, Grotevant (1987) suggests that several of the important contexts for identity development, such as families, peer groups and schools, have been neglected because of the easy availability of college populations. Their relative homogeneity may have led to a distortion of the picture of general identity development in adolescence.

A second characteristic of identity research is that it is largely American. The majority of the studies quoted above were conducted in American universities, with a few undertaken in Canada. A limited number of research studies have also been reported from New Zealand (eg Kroger, 1985) and Scandinavia (Matteson, 1972). Very little is known about the development through the statuses of young people in Britain. Accepting Grotevant's (1987) comments on the importance of the social-political context within which identity develops, it is important that the identity development of British youth be explored further.

A third characteristic of identity research concerns sample selection, specifically relating to gender and sample sizes. It was demonstrated in the previous section, that the majority of work in the areas was on males (further, these are often of male students at American universities). Studies exploring males only include Marcia (1966, 1967), Waterman and Waterman (1971), Waterman et al (1974), and Meilman (1979). Fewer studies have compared the identity development of males and females, or focussed specifically on
women (for example Schenkel, 1975; Josselson, 1987). It is also worthy of note that sample sizes are generally small, ranging from 25 (Meilman, 1979) upwards. Definitions of longitudinal are also often varied, with most longitudinal studies of identity development referring to change over one year only (Waterman and Waterman, 1971; Fitch and Adams, 1983).

The above issues, relating to sample size, sample selection, and length of study are important considerations not often fully addressed by authors in presenting their work. A fourth area of confusion and inconsistency can be identified in the age of those adopted for study. Most researchers describe their study as being of youth or adolescents. However, a wide variety of ages are often selected, with little reference to the legal, developmental, maturational, or societal changes related to age. A selection of papers illustrate this point. Kroger (1986) uses a sample aged 17-22; Meilman (1979) in a paper looking at adolescence has a sample aged 12-24. Cauble (1976) used those aged 18-23; Hamachek (1988) describes this period as the ages of 12-20; Josselson's (1987) longitudinal study started when her subjects were aged 20-22. Archer's (1989a) sample were aged 11-17; Donovan (1975) has a sample of 22 students with a mean age of 21, and with two subjects aged over 30. Indeed, Raphael (1977) suggests that many of the reported differences between males and females are due to the age of the samples selected, with most studies of males selecting a sample 2-3 years younger than those for females.

A fifth methodological issue in identity research is the degree of inter-rater reliability in the allocation of subjects to the four statuses. Most researchers have recognised the high degree of subjectivity in deciding on a subject's identity category, in particular when derived from an interview transcript. Most studies therefore use one or two additional coders, and figures for inter-rater
reliability are variable but generally high. Kroger (1988) who used two judges, claimed an 83% agreement rate for the occupational domain and 71% for the political domain. In an earlier study by the same author (Kroger, 1986), agreement between three coders was 78.8%; using two raters it rose to 96%. Other studies claim levels of agreement from 75% (Marcia, 1966) to 94% (Mattesson, 1972).

The sixth and final methodological aspect of identity research is largely neglected in most discussions of the literature. This concerns the grouping of the four identity statuses into two groups, used in most of the research for analyses and comparison. Different methods of grouping the statuses have been used, often with little justification or discussion when presenting research findings. Researchers have combined the four statuses into two groups using one of the following criteria:
(1) combining those with commitments (ie the achievement and foreclosure groups) and those without commitments (moratorium and diffusion groups). This approach uses the criteria of outcome, ie. looking at those who have or have not achieved an identity.
(2) combining those who have undergone or who are undergoing a period of exploration (ie achievement and moratorium) and those who are not (ie foreclosure and diffusion). This approach uses a process criteria, ie. looking at those who have or have not experienced a period of exploration of alternatives.

Those using the first method include, for example, La Voie (1976) and Adams and Shea (1979), who describe the committed and uncommitted groups. The second method is more common, however. Cauble (1976) used this method, distinguishing between those in the questioners categories (achievement and moratorium) and non-questioners categories (foreclosure and diffusion). It is
also used by Kroger (1986, 1988) on the basis that the statuses can be divided into "high" and "low" groups, in terms of the degree of psychological health and mode of functioning. It is also the method used by Marcia (1976) and Fitch and Adams (1983). The latter authors prefer this mode of categorisation because they believe a more complex identity requires a period of self-exploration. The achievement and moratorium statuses are therefore described as more "desirable". This issue will be returned to later in the methodological and results Chapters of the thesis.

3.7 Political Identity Development in Adolescence

Politics was one of the domains highlighted by Erikson as a key area for development during adolescence. Similarly, Waterman (1985) suggests that working out a political ideology is a primary developmental task. Identity status research is a useful tool for focussing on the process of political socialisation rather than focussing on overt content (the latter being the focus of much research reported in the area). Adams (1985) comments on the lack of work relating to political identity development, and the relation of political identity development to political socialisation. The literature reveals, however, that very few researchers have in fact used Eriksonian identity concepts to explore political development in adolescence.

In his survey of research over ten years, Waterman (1985) found some consistent results with regard to politics. As for the other domains, there was a general increase in the numbers reaching the identity achieved status with age. He also noticed some increase in the foreclosure status during adolescence, concluding from this that some adolescents "... appear to be becoming committed to the first political ideas they entertain." (p 19). There is also evidence that political issues are addressed after occupational ones. One explanation for this might be that adolescents are encouraged by both
parents and the education system to establish an occupational plan early on in their lives. Waterman, Geary and Waterman (1974) for example, found that their sample of college students first showed evidence of settling on an occupational identity; they were then shown to move on to, and work out, their ideological beliefs.

It is of note here that Erikson (1968) referred generally to the establishment of an ideology in adolescence. He included in his view of ideology religious attitudes and moral values, and overall he viewed ideology as a way of life, a way of perceiving and ordering the world. Similarly, Marcia (1966) combined scores for politics and religion to give one overall score for ideology. It is important to note that in the current research political ideology is the focus, and not ideology in general. Often researchers refer to ideology in general when in fact political ideology is the focus. (A definition of the remit of 'political' is given in Chapter 4).

Several writers stress the relationship between political identity development and the structures of society within which they are formed. Adams (1985) for example, proposes that this area is where research on identity and socialisation merge. He concludes that:

"... the ultimate focus of research on political socialisation and identity formation may be the study of how society assists an individual in constructing an identity that is ideally designed to fit with the existing institutions of a democratic society." (pp 74-75).

Many of the authors discussed here therefore stress the interdependence of identity and socialisation, as proposed earlier.

Identity status research is therefore considered a useful way of exploring the processes of adolescent political development. This work is considered particularly valuable when supplemented by research on political content.
Grotevant (1987) comments on the lack of understanding of this relationship, and proposes further investigation of such contexts as the school, home and media in political identity development. The final part of this literature review (Chapter 4) therefore explores the issue of politics itself: how it can be defined and what earlier researchers have discovered about political socialisation in adolescence. It also reviews the literature on the role of the school experience in political development.

3.8 Summary

Identity development is the theoretical and methodological basis utilised to examine the process of political socialisation. The aim is to supplement and extend information gathered on political content in the study. The Chapter demonstrated that process (in terms of identity development) was distinctive from content, in that the focus of the former is on how individuals explore political options and make commitments. The school experience was identified as a context involved in identity development, but one that has received minimal attention from researchers.

Four identity statuses (achievement, moratorium, foreclosure and diffusion) were described, these enabling discrimination between individuals on the two elements of history of political exploration and commitment. Individuals in the four statuses were shown to be distinctive on a variety of dimensions (for example separation and self-esteem). Developmental trends were also revealed, with a move away from less committed statuses during adolescence. Political identity development was shown to have received little attention, with work that has been conducted generally showing a move into identity achievement during adolescence. Political identity development was shown to be closely related to both political context and the wider society, demonstrating the interrelationship of political identity development and
political socialisation content. A number of methodological issues and deficiencies were identified in much of the identity literature. Investigation of gender issues in identity development was shown to reveal more similarities than differences between males and females, but knowledge of female development was also shown as inferior to knowledge of males.
CHAPTER 4: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (3): POLITICS, POLITICAL SOCIALISATION AND SCHOOLS

The aim of the research is to isolate the role of the school as a socialising agent in political socialisation. The literature relating to these areas is considered further in this Chapter. The first part of the Chapter (4.1) focusses on theoretical and empirical aspects of politics and political socialisation. The second part (4.2) focusses on the role of the school. Additionally, there is a summary of the Chapter (4.3).

4.1 Politics and Political Socialisation Research

The first part of this Chapter develops further the main issues already presented. Issues of political socialisation and political development are detailed, the role of agents is discussed, and the relationship between the political and socio-economic domain is demonstrated. Research results on elements of the political remit as traditionally conceptualised are presented (attitudes and voting), as well as the results of research undertaken on broader political areas. Finally, there is a discussion of gender and political socialisation.

4.1.1 Political Socialisation Research: an Introduction

This section discusses some of the theoretical issues underpinning the psychological study of politics. It includes a discussion of definitions of politics and the political remit, the role of psychology in exploring this, and the relationship of political and moral development.

The concept of governability was proposed in Chapter 1 as integral to explaining the organisation of human beings into society. It was also proposed that certain strategies exist that promote governability. Each of these
stategies, according to Prewitt (1978), have one feature in common. This is that

"... people have to acquire certain social habits and political beliefs that make them capable of being governed." (p 119).

It is these habits and beliefs that are promoted through political socialisation. This notion is reflected in the view of Dennis (1973) who suggests that political socialisation is the means of building diffuse support for a political system, which in turns results in systems persistance and the continuation of a political system over time.

Notions of persistance may, however, imply too rigid a conceptualisation of society. Several researchers have proposed that fundamental changes in values and attitudes have occurred in recent decades. These authors prefer to view society as more fluid and subject to constant change. The most prominent of these authors, Richard Inglehart, suggested in 'The Silent Revolution' (1977) that Western societies have moved

"... from an overwhelming emphasis on material well-being and physical security to a greater emphasis on the quality of life". (p 3).

Inglehart suggests this is a result of various factors, including increasing levels of education, growth of the mass media, and increased economic prosperity. Moran (1985) however, believes that the post-affluence model proposed by Inglehart may in reality only apply to the young, well-educated middle-classes. There are, however, clear aspects of the British political system which have persisted for centuries. Research into political socialisation thus contributes to an understanding of both continuities and changes in the political system.

Political definitions and remit
Research into political socialisation and disagreements over both its definition and content go back many years. Dawson et al (1977) trace the origin of
political socialisation research (in its current form) back to the late 1940s. Research then focussed on two main areas. First, researchers explored the origins of individual political outlooks, (for example Hyman, 1959). Hyman stressed a learning model of political development, seeing individuals as socialised into their appropriate place in society. Second, researchers explored the characteristics of political systems, aiming to explain why some systems remain stable when others do not (for example Easton, 1965). Cook (1989) comments that many of these early studies stressed the importance of appropriate political learning for providing support for the political system and to "...avoid chaos and protect social well-being..." (p 27).

Most researchers working in the area have offered their own definition of both politics and political socialisation. This has resulted in both a wide variety of definitions and variations in the political remit. As a result Allen (1989) suggests that current political socialisation research is a "...conceptual quagmire" (p 2). Most of the definitions of political socialisation centre on the notion of political culture and the development of attitudes towards a political system. Kavanagh (1972) describes political culture as

"... the emotional and attitudinal environment within which the political system operates" (p 10).

Merelman (1986) describes political socialisation more specifically as the process by which people acquire "...relatively enduring orientations towards politics" (p 279). Jennings and Niemi (1974) propose that political socialisation is the acquisition of prevailing norms and modes of political behaviour, whilst Himmelweit (1983) sees political socialisation as the way different socialising experiences, group memberships, and the political-economic climate affect the cognitive maps people draw of their society.
Some researchers give more emphasis to the structure of power relationships and control in society in exploring political development. Thus Prewitt (1978) suggests a definition of politics based on the organisation of power in a society, with political socialisation

"...the socially organised and institutionalised production of consent to the entire structure of social relations" (p 125).

Researchers who propose a greater emphasis on power structures in political socialisation criticise the traditional approach that focusses on such areas as voting behaviour and overt political attitudes. Rather they propose a hegemonic approach, exploring the dominance of one group over the rest of society. Political socialisation research thus becomes the study of how the dominant ideology is transferred from a dominant group to the dominated, combined with an exploration of the mechanisms of compliance.

What all these definitions have in common is a view of individual political development against a backdrop of the wider political and socio-economic structures of society. The notion of the political self is often referred to here (eg Jennings and Niemi, 1974). Dawson et al (1977) describe the political self as

"...the individuals entire complex of orientations regarding the world of politics, including his views toward his own political role." (p 39).

These political outlooks are encompassed within more general outlooks, such as an individual’s economic, cultural and religious views.

These different views of political socialisation have resulted in very different remits for the study of political socialisation, and often in a very narrow focus of such research. Cochrane and Billig (1983) comment on this narrow focus, proposing instead a greater emphasis on how these political views are integrated into the broader perceptions young people have of their own
position in society (see also Kavanagh, 1972). This research adopts the broad
definition of politics given in Chapter 2, that politics is the perception of
patterns of human relationships. The remit for political study is therefore
broad and incorporates socio-economics. This is returned to later in this
section.

**Political socialisation: the role of social psychology**

During the 1970s and 1980s, some researchers criticised some of the most
basic assumptions made by psychologists in exploring political socialisation.
Social psychology in particular was criticised for being narrow and restrictive
in its exploration of political development. Several of the most important
comments (and those viewed as particularly relevant to the current study) are
summarised here.

The first area of criticism lies in the distinction made in much political
socialisation research between the individual and society, with researchers
giving weight to one or other factor without sufficiently exploring their
relationship. Duveen and Lloyd (1986) for example, reject the whole notion
that separate concepts of individual and society can be used. Rather, they
propose that individuals are so closely woven into a fabric of social relations
that the individual cannot be seen independently. The concept of social
identity, they suggest, marks the individual-society interface:

"Individuals are related to society through their participation in
social groups defined by gender, age, social class, etc, and within
the social representations of these systems particular
'individual-society interfaces' are defined". (p 221).

Other researchers have criticised social psychology for neglecting to give
sufficient attention to the relationship between the individual and society (see
for example Allen, 1970; 1989). It is acknowledged in the research that
although the individual and social are distinct, they are very closely interrelated.

The second area of controversy relates to the models of human beings (often referred to as "models of man") used by social psychologists. Both psychology and political science utilise models of human behaviour. Some of these models, however, (for example social learning, behavioural) imply passivity on behalf of the individual. Renshon (1977) suggests that the model most commonly used in political socialisation research is a "...passive, reactive..." one (p 247), with the individual seen as a tabula rasa on which society imprints its political values. These researchers recommend the use of models that reflect activity on the part of individuals. It should be noted that in the discussion of socialisation in Chapter 2, socialisation was described as a two way process with young people pro-active in their own development.

The third area of controversy concerns the degree to which social psychology really explores and challenges the most basic human concepts involved in political socialisation. These include for example, the psychological investigation of capitalism as a form of social and economic organisation, and notions of human rights (see Rogers and Kitzinger, 1985). These concepts are presented within the literature as if there was agreement on their meaning and nature. A good example of this concerns the capitalist/ materialist form of socio-economic relations. Berti and Bombi (1988) suggest that the capitalist framework, and how children develop ideas about it, has been largely unexplored. In investigating notions of money, exchange, or self-interest therefore, social psychology has neglected the wider social implications of these concepts. Berti and Bombi comment on the importance of work on this area by Cummings and Taeble (1978), saying that:
These authors assert that in American society there is a widespread conviction that economic activity is a consequence of the action of laws analogous to laws of nature, having an autonomous existence independent of individual beliefs or comprehension." (Berti and Bombi, 1988, p 2).

The current research therefore aims to explore the fundamental issues of political socialisation, including such areas as human nature and capitalism.

A fourth area of controversy emerges from the very nature of social research itself, and the way in which it focusses primarily on individuals. Psychological study is characterised by the breaking down of complex behaviour into its constituent parts. Billig (1984) suggests that this is a legacy of psychology's obsession with laboratory experiments, and that this results in the fragmented study of ideology. Further, and more importantly, Billig suggests that this leads to an emphasis on individual level factors and explanations:

"... if attention is directed only upon individual factors, then the temptation is to explain social problems in terms of individual motivations... and not in terms of the deficiencies of the wider social system" (p 448).

According to Billig therefore, social-psychological theories emphasise individual factors which can lead to implicit support for the current structure of social relations. The aim of this thesis is to explore individual political orientations, but as part of the political, socio-economic and educational context. It is therefore likely to be able to comment on issues of societal structure and functioning.

Finally (and related to the above), researchers have proposed that social psychology and politics must be brought closer together if political socialisation is to be effectively researched. Merelman (1986) in an extensive review of the literature, shows how the four main models of politics used by political scientists have implicit psychological and socialisation theories built into them. In a detailed investigation of research evidence, however, he concludes that none of the four is fully satisfactory. In proposing a new
"lateral" theory of political socialisation, Merelman effectively integrates both political and psychological concepts. This model is considered particularly useful and is summarised here.

Merelman's proposal is that each of the four models traditionally used in political science (systems, hegemonic, pluralist and conflict theory), sees political socialisation as reflecting the current form of political relations in a particular way - as a relationship between leaders and led. Merelman's new paradigm proposes instead a lateral process, where under certain conditions any one of the four images (or models) of society could be socialised. He therefore proposes that research look at how the socialisation process creates "rules" for choosing among these images of society. Merelman's new paradigm reflects the views of both Billig (1984) and Berti and Bombi (1988) described above:

"...the most important component of any socialisation process is not its manifest content (partisanship, issues and the like) but the implicit images of power and society that the socialisation process itself models" (p 308).

Merelman's paradigm is essentially a model of political socialisation which uses the differing models of society as the socialisation content, with young people accepting or adopting any of the four models. The following characteristics of the model are considered particularly important in light of the previous discussion:

a) it accepts that there is no single, objective view of society to be socialised.

b) it explores basic concepts such as the acceptance and rejection of capitalism.

c) it ensures a link of societal and individual factors.

d) it adopts a model of human beings as active in choosing between different models of politics.
e) it proposes a broad definition of politics which focuses on ideology and power relations.

Merelman's lateral theory of political socialisation can be seen in terms of its relation to social representations. This is because both theories propose the social generation of knowledge, and stress the importance of social groups and group membership in the development of that knowledge. In exploring groups characterised by educational type, it is likely that the research can contribute to this debate.

In the previous discussion, issues of child and human development were highlighted as important in understanding political socialisation. The issue is particularly relevant to establishing the importance of political development in adolescence for the political orientations of adulthood, and is discussed further below.

Political socialisation: developmental issues

All approaches to studying the development of political orientations are embedded in a particular view of human development. Sometimes these assumptions are made explicit, but often they remain as implicit. These assumptions include the view of the individual as passive/active in his/her own development, and the approach taken to overall human development (social learning, cognitive-developmental, etc). Different views of child development have implications for both conceptual and practical aspects of political socialisation research. Gallatin (1980) identifies four main approaches, each stemming from different views of human development:

(1) The Behavioural School: this approach proposes that there is a stable political order into which children are socialised, with children completely apolitical and moulded by agencies such as parents and schools (for example Easton, 1965).
(2) **The Generational School**: this school mainly consists of sociologists who are interested in ideological shifts from one generation to another (for example Inglehart, 1977).

(3) **The Psychodynamic School**: followers of this school suggest that people are attracted to certain ideologies (democratic, authoritarian, apathetic) because there is a fit between a political philosophy and their own personal characteristics. The emphasis is overtly psychological and focuses on early personality development (for example Greenstein and Lerner, 1971).

(4) **The Cognitive-Developmental School**: researchers in this school apply a Piagetian framework to the study of political development. The process of human development is viewed as less passive, with more active involvement and negotiation between the individual and his/her environment (see for example Connell 1971b).

Gallatin (1980) concludes that the first three schools are linked, and with much overlap between them. Each portrays the individual as passive and subject to forces (for example agents, historical factors and psychological needs) that are beyond their conscious control. She describes the fourth school (cognitive-developmental) as presenting a more balanced approach.

The cognitive-developmental approach has provided a new impetus within the area of political socialisation research. Allen (1989) suggests that an important area of work is now based on seeing political development as the "...restructuring of cognitive representations..." (p 3). Whilst accepting the utility of the cognitive-developmental approach, however, many researchers have proposed that insufficient weight is given to social influence. Integrating the individual and the social worlds in this way is proposed by Torney-Purta (1989), who accepts the Piagetian approach to political learning and focuses on how new experiences in the social world lead to a restructuring of
representations of political knowledge (see also Moore, Lare and Wagner, 1985).

There is a clear utility in a cognitive-developmental approach that both acknowledges the role of social influence (in particular group membership and influence), and that questions whether there is an objective social reality for children and young people to "acquire". Dickinson (1986a) rejects the view that the construction of social knowledge is primarily an individual achievement. She proposes instead that children can develop many different representations of social reality, depending on their exposure to different social influences. To the extent that political socialisation is the development of social knowledge, therefore, a particularly useful framework is one that focusses on individual development whilst exploring the influence of groups and social forces in this development (this debate is discussed in detail in Emler, Ohana and Dickinson, 1990). It is of note that in accepting that there are different representations of social reality, this links to the work of Merelman (1986) that there is no single objective reality for young people to be socialised "to", and also to social representations theory (see also Duveen and Lloyd, 1990). The link between these areas is central to the research.

In accepting the importance of a cognitive-developmental framework which incorporates social influence, the role of moral development in this process must be briefly mentioned. This is because of the uncertain relationship between moral development and political development. An outline of the issues involved are detailed below, although the section is necessarily brief.

Emler, Renwick and Malone (1983) suggest that most work on the relationship of moral reasoning and political orientation has been interpreted primarily in cognitive-developmental terms, with level of moral development affecting or
determining political attitudes. Emler et al (1983) investigated the possibility that, rather, individual variations in moral reasoning reflect differences in the content of individual political ideology. Their findings supported this view, and they concluded that adult moral reasoning indicates political orientation rather than stage of development. Later work confirmed this proposal (Renwick and Emler, 1984; Markoulis, 1989), with moral reasoning and political orientations viewed as different dimensions of the same phenomena.

Later work by Reicher and Emler (1984) proposed that variations in moral judgement are in fact self-presentations, which allow individuals to associate with a particular social identity. Different moral attitudes thus convey to others different kinds of social identity. This notion of self-presentation and identification with a group was further explored by Dickinson (1986a), who proposed that people have a need to present views that are reasonably coherent and consistent. Dickinson suggested that

"... the need ... to account for, or express, one's views in social interaction with others is the major cause of development of ideas and the eradication of inconsistencies in understanding. The force for the development of knowledge of the social world is therefore social rather than cognitive" (p 9).

Thus Dickinson, like Emler, proposes that the development of political views and moral stance takes place within a social environment. Political and moral orientations therefore reflect the content of political, social and moral attitudes and values, and not different stages of development. As Simpson (1987) proposes "Political argument is largely moral, for it aims at determining right action" (p 270). Gibbs and Schnell (1985) further stress that socialisation and moral development cannot be completely distinct: moral development is not exclusively individual or cognitive, and socialisation is not exclusively societal. They suggest that current versions of both approaches are actually social interactionist. In discussing moral development and political socialisation, therefore, differences may exist only in emphasis.
4.1.2 The Role of Agents in Political Socialisation

Much political socialisation research has aimed to identify the agents of political socialisation, the different individuals, groups, and factors that influence young people's political development. A review of research on the major socialising agents - the family, the mass media, peer and social groups, and education/schools - is presented briefly below. (The literature on the socialising role of education and schools is reviewed in detail in section 4.2).

(a) The family as agent: a substantial amount of the research into political socialisation has explored the influence of the family. Early researchers proposed the family as the most important agent of political socialisation (Hyman, 1959), greatly influencing both general attitudes towards the political process as well as specific aspects such as partisanship. Later work reflected this view. In Australia, Connell (1971b) found that a sample of children and young people largely supported the same party as their parents; similarly Stacey (1978) found that parents with no party allegiance were most likely to have children the same. Furnham and Gunter (1987) reviewed a number of studies on youth and politics, and concluded that all the studies suggest "...powerful socialisation factors in the family with regard to socio-political beliefs..." (p 93). Jennings and Niemi (1974, 1981), however, suggest that families may not be as influential as many thought; parents may pass on party identification, but very little on more general views or attitudes.

Whilst acknowledging the importance of the family in political socialisation, Dawson et al (1977) suggest that this influence may have been overstated. In a review of the literature relating to parental influence on political outlooks, they comment that research findings have been variable. One important finding, they suggest, is that the most basic political outlooks (ethnic, religious, and social class attachments) are probably acquired from the family:
"One of the most significant roles performed by the family is passing on a set of social identities and feelings through which the maturing individual forms relationships with the political and social world". (p 121).

Dawson et al (1977) conclude that families will affect political orientations in different ways. They identify three main factors as important: (a) parental articulation of attitudes, (b) parental agreement on political issues, and (c) the relationship between parents and children. In any exploration of the family as a socialising agent therefore, it is important to investigate both parental views and the relationship between parents' and children's values.

(b) Peers and social groups as agents: peers and social groups have been shown to have some influence on political development (for example Cochran and Brassard, 1979). Peer group effects are also closely related to the influence of social groups and notions of social identity (as previously described). Gaskell and Smith (1986) propose that categories such as sex, nationality, and political affiliation are embedded in peer groups and provide the bases of social identity. Thus

"... individuals use their group to define their place in society and provide an identity in specifically social terms" (p 68).

Of particular importance in the context of group membership as a socialising agent, Gaskell and Smith (1986) add that group members will often show attitudinal and behavioural uniformity:

"Individuals define themselves as members of particular social category, they form, or learn, the stereotypic norms of that category and as category membership becomes salient so do they assign these norms to themselves" (p 69).

Conover (1988) further proposes that people have stored information and emotional reactions to social groups, suggesting that people become interested in what different groups have obtained and whether this is deserved (see also Tajfel, 1978; Turner, Sachdev and Hogg, 1983).
(c) **Mass media as agent**: very little research has specifically explored the role of the mass media (newspapers, TV, radio) as socialising agents, though work that has been undertaken suggests that the media is not a major socialising force. Dawson et al (1977) conclude that the media tends to crystallize existing orientations rather than create new ones (see Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Rosier and Little, 1986). Work by Garramone and Atkin (1986) has shown that different types of media differentially affect political knowledge, interest and discussion.

(d) **The school as agent**: the socialising role of the school on political development is the focus of the current study. Evidence for its socialising role is, however, contradictory. Some authors have claimed that the school has no real influence (Hyman, 1959; Easton and Dennis, 1969). Others have claimed it as a major influence (Hess and Torney, 1967; Palonsky, 1987). In addition, however, Gallatin (1980) comments on the "...formidable methodological problems..." (p 359) involved in isolating the school's role in socialisation. (The following section (4.2) explores the evidence for the relationship of the school and political socialisation).

In exploring the role of the various socialising agents described above, it is important to consider Merelman's (1986) view as previously described. Merelman rejects the notion that any basic rules can be established that describe the influence of each agent for all young people. Rather, he proposes that different socialising agents will influence different groups of young people to accept different models of society. In the present study therefore, the aim is to explore whether school experience may lead to young people to adopt different models and perceptions of the political world. The importance of agents in socialisation, however, can only be fully understood if it is known to what extent early political development affects later political
orientations. If, for example, developments after adolescence are most important, school experience as a socialising experience will be less important. Thus the following section explores political development in a life-span context.

4.1.3 Political Development in Childhood and Adolescence

Political development does not have a fixed end-point; rather it is an ongoing process of change and development across the life-span. The political socialisation literature, however, reveals some disagreement about which period in life is of most importance in political development: Do childhood political orientations persist into adulthood, or are there major developments later in life?

A useful model of the political life cycle has been proposed by Dawson et al (1977). They explore the three main models of political development, concluding that no single one is correct. Rather, each of the models can be used to explain development in different political areas. The three models of political development, and their application to the process of development, are as follows:

(1) The Primacy Model: this model proposes that early and middle childhood are the most significant periods for political learning. Dawson et al suggest that this model is most useful for understanding basic political loyalties and identities, with these orientations serving as "...filters or eyeglasses through which later political stimuli are perceived and classified" (p 79).

(2) The Intermediate Model: this model proposes that political developments in later childhood and adolescence are most important for later political orientations. Dawson et al suggest this model is most useful for explaining the acquisition of information and the understanding of political roles and processes. By this point the young person has
"... the basic intellectual capacities to understand the abstractions and relationships that make up the political world" (p 79).

(3) The Recency Model: this model suggests that adults change their political behaviour throughout life, with little reference to the political ideas of childhood. Dawson et al suggest that this model is most useful for explaining the day to day choices that adults make about political issues.

Dawson et al conclude that a model or developmental pattern can be formed by integrating the two elements of age period and type of political orientation. The model (based on work by Weissberg (1974)) is represented in the following diagram:

**Figure 4.1: Scope of Political Learning**
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(from Dawson et al, 1977, p 80)

This model views childhood and adolescence as the periods when relatively enduring orientations are developed towards basic political concepts; later developments are likely to concern specific attitudes and policies. According
to this model adolescence is a particularly important period in the
development of political orientations:

"By late adolescence the acquisition of the broad general
attachments and the formation of general modes of political
thinking are accomplished... For the most part early acquired
outlooks are important for later life" (Dawson et al, 1977, p 80).

Stacey (1978) also proposes that major developments in political thinking take
place in adolescence. (See also Connell, 1971b, and Stevens, 1982 for a
further discussion of developmental issues in political socialisation).

Certain trends can therefore be identified in political development. Stacey
(1978) suggests that a fairly solid world picture will have emerged by the age
of 12 in such countries as Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the United
States. By this age children will have acquired a sense of the following:
nationality and race, the class structure, the prestige of occupations, a basic
ideology regarding power and strength, and ideas of voting, elections and
political parties. Similarly, Dennis (1973) suggests that the typical adult in a
given society has "... completed the major portion of this significant political
learning by middle adolescence" (p 13). Research has also identified clear
developmental trends in the acquisition of particular political notions, such as
the development of ideas about political organisation (Berti, 1988), possessive
behaviour (Furby, 1980), and ideas about law, authority and equity (Adelson,
Green and O'Neil, 1969; Emler and Reicher, 1987). A clear developmental
progression has also been found for economic understanding (Leiser, 1983).

So far, this Chapter has explored some of the fundamental (but rarely
addressed) aspects of political socialisation research. The following section
discusses some of the literature relating to those areas of political socialisation
most frequently researched and discussed, relating to political socialisation
content. These areas concern voting behaviour, attributions, political attitudes and gender issues.

4.1.4 Political Attitudes and Voting Behaviour

Voting behaviour

A large proportion of the political socialisation literature is concerned with attempts to describe, explain, and model how people vote. Three main models of voting behaviour have been developed. The first, the Michigan Model (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, 1960), is based on identification with a political party explaining voting behaviour. In this model people are seen as identifying with a certain social class, and people vote for what they see as the best interest of that class. Critics have suggested that this model fails to explain deviations from class voting.

The second model of voting behaviour is the Ideological Model (Heath, Jowell and Curtice, 1985). Similar to the Michigan Model, this model proposes that people look for a reasonable fit between their views and a political party. Finally the Consumer Model (Himmelweit, Humphreys and Jaegar, 1985) suggests that people have certain key preferences and choose the party closest to those preferences. These latter two models have been criticised because voters are shown to lack knowledge about party policies, and also doubts have been expressed about the empirical basis of the Consumer Model (Dunleavy, 1982). None of these models has been shown to accurately predict voting behaviour, and all have been subject to criticism.

A further observation of the three voting models described is that they may not be completely applicable to the voting behaviours of the young. Voting behaviour in adulthood can be traced back across elections; for young people approaching voting age this is not possible. If the major parts of political
identification are mainly completed by late adolescence (as previously proposed), however, then the measurement of voting intent will be possible. In this light Elcock (1983) dismisses the stereotype of young people's early voting behaviour as naturally left-wing. Rather he suggests that young people reveal a wide range of views and commitments, most of which are developed very early on:

"... most partisan self-images ... are established by the time the young person first enters a polling booth" (p 30).

Rather than attempting to produce rules explaining voting behaviour, many researchers have instead investigated the values associated with particular partisan attachments. Joe, Jones and Miller (1981) found that Conservative voters put a greater value on religious fundamentalism, insistence of strict rules, and the control of emotions and wishes. They were also found to de-emphasise intellectual curiosity, a hedonistic outlook, and tolerance of minority groups. These findings confirmed those of earlier authors (eg Wilson, 1973) that Conservatives stressed religious fundamentalism, and showed pro-establishment attitudes. Similar findings are reported for Australia by Feather (1984), who added that the sort of upbringing that emphasises hard work and achievement is likely to foster Conservative attitudes such as discipline and authority. (See also Cochrane, Billig, and Hogg, 1979).

Certain key factors have been identified in influencing voting behaviour. The British Social Attitudes Survey (Jowell and Witherspoon, 1985) showed that a variety of factors, including income, class, sex and region, are linked to voting behaviour. These are characteristics that:

"... locate the respondent within the social order and which may be expected to shape his or her attitudes to the world." (p 5).
Jowell and Witherspoon found a relationship between high social class, high earnings, and voting Conservative. The opposite was found with voting for the Labour Party. Similarly, Roberts and Parsell (1988) reporting on the findings of a longitudinal study of young people (the ESRC 16-19 Initiative; see Chapter 5 for details), found few age differences but significant area and social class differences in voting intent. Those living in prosperous areas were more right-wing and critical of trade unions; those in northern, less prosperous areas were more left-wing, and more likely to blame the political system for poverty. Overall, social class was found to be the greatest predictor of political orientations:

"...social class proved to be the most powerful predictor of the samples' political orientations, and the class differences uncovered...mirror those recorded in studies of young people during the 1960s and 1970s" (p 7).

Researchers have also explored the voting behaviour of young people, specifically in relation to the changing political, economic and labour market circumstances of the 1980s. Much of the research has suggested that the voting behaviour of many groups of young people is characterised either by apathy or extremism (Billig and Cochrane, 1982; Cochrane and Billig, 1982, 1983). It was predicted that the rise of unemployment in the 1970s and 1980s would lead to an increase in political activity by the young (Forester, 1981). However, most studies have shown that this did not happen (Breakwell, 1986; Banks and Ullah, 1987). Jackson (1985) suggests that unemployment may in fact make young people feel the political system is unable to deal with their problems, and results in passive alienation.

Two aspects of the literature on voting behaviour are particularly important in relation to the current study. The first is the finding that social class is one of the primary predictors of voting intent. Therefore, in aiming to separate
home and school factors in political socialisation, matching subjects for social class is likely to be effective in isolating the school effect. The second important aspect of this area of the literature concerns the use by many researchers of voting intent as the sole indicator of political stance. A more accurate method of establishing overall political orientation was developed for use in the empirical study.

Political attitudes and attributions
Recent research exploring political orientations has moved on from looking at voting behaviour, to looking at broader political attitudes and attributions. These attitudes and attributions relate to a wide range of political and socio-economic phenomena, including poverty, trade unions, public expenditure, wealth and unemployment. Some of this literature is presented here, focussing on the importance of groups and whether they reveal differences in political attitudes and attributions. Lewis (1981) comments that insufficient attention has been paid to the political attributions made by different groups in society, predicting that people with differing ideological viewpoints will have different attributions.

A small amount of research has been undertaken on attitudes towards social security recipients. Furnham (1985b) comments that attitudes to social security recipients were related to explanations for poverty and unemployment (Furnham, 1982a, 1982b, 1983b). He found that most people who focus on individualistic explanations for poverty are also more against social security, tend to be older, white, in high and middle income groups, and with either very low or very high levels of education. Other groups were more likely to offer societal and situational explanations for poverty, and were more pro-social security. (See also Furnham, 1983b, 1985a).
Attitudes to social security have been found to be related to attitudes to (and attributions for) unemployment. Researchers in Canada (Lowe, Krahn and Tanner, 1988) found that the main explanation for unemployment was that young people lacked the work experience that employers wanted; however, both system factors (business and government) and individual attributions were also widely used. Further Gurney (1981) explored the attributions for unemployment of those leaving school and possibly facing unemployment. They found that those unable to find work after school shifted their attributions to more external ones, such as depressed economy, union activity, or employers prejudice. The employed moved toward more internal attributions such as lack of skills, poor motivation, and insufficient effort. Similarly Breakwell (1986) found that the unemployed were more likely to attribute their own unemployment to the system.

Furnham (1984a) comments that little work has been undertaken on attitudes to trade unions, although research suggests that generally people are in favour of trade union activities such as pursuing higher wages and protecting rights. Furnham (1984a) found that there was a relationship between the Protestant Work Ethic, voting pattern, and attitudes to trade unions. Labour supporters were found to be more in favour of most union activities and their leaders. Attitudes to public expenditure have also been related to voting intent. Lewis (1980) found that public expenditure preferences could be predicted from party preference. Overall, there was

"... a remarkable reproduction... of party policy as it pertains to public expenditure." (p 290).

Much of the research investigating attributions and political attitudes relates to explanations for poverty and wealth. In focussing on poverty, Feagin (1972) states that in the USA there is a view that virtue will be rewarded and success
depends on effort; the poor are therefore to blame for their situation. Furnham (1982a) in relating views of poverty to voting behaviour found Conservatives gave mainly individualistic explanations for poverty, whilst Labour voters preferred societal explanations. Lewis (1981) found that Conservative voters were less likely to believe that the wealthy had been lucky or had received help from others. Similarly Stacey and Singer (1985) found that young people emphasised the importance of the family and gave less importance to luck in poverty and wealth. Further, Furnham and Gunter (1984) show that "just world" (p 265) beliefs are related to negative attitudes towards the poor, which are in turn related to voting Conservative (see also Furnham, 1986; Forgas, Morris and Furnham, 1982; Furnham, 1983c). Evidence from non-industrialised nations shows that this attributional pattern applies across cultures. Similar attributional styles were shown, for example, for poverty and wealth in India (Sinha, Jain and Pandey, 1980; Pandey, Sinha, Prakash and Tripathi, 1982).

In the current study, attributions and attitudes to these political and socio-economic phenomena are explored.

**Gender and political socialisation**

The issue of gender and political socialisation is a focus of the current study. Research has not provided conclusive evidence for claiming either great differences or similarities between males and females in political socialisation, with evidence generally contradictory. Those reporting gender differences, for example, have proposed that males are more interested in politics (Furnham and Gunter, 1983), and females more conservative (Furnham et al, 1985). Other research, however, has reported females as less conservative than males (Ekehammar and Sidanius, 1982). Findings of no gender differences have been reported on such areas as party preference (Sidanius and
Ekehammar, 1980; Marjoribanks, 1981) and interest in politics (Douse and Hughes, 1971). Sexist bias and methodological problems have, however, been identified in some political socialisation research (Morgan, 1974). Understanding further the political socialisation of females is a central aim of the study.

The political attitudes and attributions summarised in this section are those aspects most overtly "political", in that they are concerned with perceptions of patterns of human relationships. It was proposed earlier, however, that these overtly political attitudes and attributions are inextricably linked to social and economic orientations, and these are incorporated in the political remit of the current study. The following section therefore details research on the socio-economic domain, demonstrating the close relationship of political and socio-economic orientations.

4.1.5 Political Socialisation and the Socio-Economic Domain

The socio-economic domain includes the development of orientations to work, unemployment, and taxation, concepts of human nature, equality and inequality, the re-distribution of wealth, and the workings of the economic system. These socio-economic aspects are closely related to overtly political orientations, such as attributions for political phenomena; they are often only explored in research on economic socialisation, however. Many of these areas (such as views of taxation and the re-distribution of wealth) can be described as political or socio-economic, as they clearly relate to both economic and political debate. This section briefly explores the two main areas pertaining to economic socialisation. These concern (i) the structure of economic and work beliefs and a range of economic issues (taxation, social security, equity), and (ii) perceptions of economic inequality. Each of these areas are incorporated into the empirical study.
Work and economic beliefs

Furnham (1987b) explored the underlying structure of economic beliefs, in particular attitudes to work, savings and taxation. He found that two main factors emerged: individualist/collectivist and tough-minded/tender-minded. Furnham comments that these results concur with work by Eysenck, who found conservative and individualistic attitudes represented a capitalist belief, and radical and collectivist attitudes a socialist one. Furnham suggests that this finding raises the question of whether economic beliefs are a consequence of economic circumstances, or vice versa. The contrasting views he presents are Marxism, where capitalism as a belief system is seen as a consequence of economic conditions, and Weber's theory, where the belief system of Protestants was the cause of an economic system called capitalism. Much of the literature within economic socialisation is centered on the existence of the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) originally proposed by Weber (1947). According to Furnham (1984c) the PWE has "...filtered into popular consciousness..." (p 88). Furnham also mentions the work of McClelland (1961), who used the PWE as a social-psychological explanation of the link between Protestantism, capitalism, and achievement motivation (see also Feather, 1984; Kelvin and Jarrett, 1984).

General beliefs about work have also been explored within the context of economic socialisation. Research has examined the relationship between certain work beliefs and general human values (Furnham, 1987c) and the overall structure of work beliefs (Bucholz, 1978; see also Furnham and Rose, 1987). York and Barr (1987) propose that there has been a fundamental change in beliefs about work, with the rich and middle class valuing hard work, and work now "...the newest form of self-expression" (p 21). Importance attached to work is likely to be related to views on job entitlement. Paul (1979) in a study of the job attitudes of 16 year-olds, found most considered it
a right to have a job. Similarly, Derber (1979) found a high level of belief in job entitlement. The less well educated were more likely to feel that all groups were entitled to a job.

Many concepts more usually studied by economists have been used to help explore economic socialisation. The notion of self-interest versus collective action has been explored by Stroebe and Frey (1982), who propose that the concept of personal gain underlies most theories of motivation (this also relates to views of human nature, which are detailed later in this section). Stroebe and Frey identify "free-riders" (p 123), those who benefit from group membership, but who do not contribute to the group. These people may be viewed by the group as violating equity norms and so risk negative sanctions from group members. This notion may assist in explaining why some individuals or groups have more negative attitudes to the unemployed and those on social security. Similar work by Kourilsky (1981) found that children's attitudes to reward distribution favoured the productivity principle, ie that rewards should be made in proportion to contribution.

Notions of the re-distribution of wealth and equality are closely related to attitudes to taxation. However, fiscal psychology has been explored by relatively few researchers. Furnham (1983a) found that attitudes to taxation were related both to work beliefs and general human values. Those endorsing the PWE, for example, were generally more opposed to taxation. Lewis (1982) stresses that views on the principles of taxation are interwoven with notions of justice and social justice, and linked to wider attitude structures:

"... the redistributive function of taxation may be favoured according to attributions as the the cause of wealth and poverty..." (p 154).
Lewis suggests that attributional preferences and fiscal attitudes will be linked to a person's view about the extent to which governments can alleviate poverty and re-distribute wealth.

Fundamental to both political and economic socialisation are beliefs about human nature. Furnham, Johnson, and Rawles (1985) in exploring beliefs about the hereditary/environmental determinants of human nature, suggest that "Political writings express both explicit and implicit beliefs as to the origins of human nature..." (p 676). They further suggest that different theories of economic and political organisation make assumptions about human nature. For example communism assumes that the selfish and competitive aspects of human behaviour are not natural but a product of socio-economic and political conditions; liberalism assumes human beings have a primary desire for freedom and self-determination; conservatism assume human beings are naturally selfish, aggressive and anarchic.

Perceptions of economic inequality
Perceptions of social inequality represent a clear link between the political, social and economic domains. Stacey (1982) comments on the need for more work on perceptions of inequality in children and young people. Stacey points out that young people may be socialised or indoctrinated into the capitalist viewpoint (the Marxist interpretation), or a capitalist orientation may be a natural characteristic of human behaviour. He further shows how views of social differentiation and inequality are established early on in childhood, and become clear economic standpoints by the age of 14/15. (See also Webley, 1983).

In exploring inequality, Dickinson (1986b) found clear social class differences in perceptions of social inequality. This research utilised both social class and
school type to discriminate between groups. Similar findings are reported by Dickinson (1987) and Emler and Dickinson (1985); these findings are discussed further in section 4.2. Research has also found that children as young as six are able to recognise and classify people of the basis of social inequality (Baldus and Tribe, 1978). Their sample of 6-11 year-olds had also acquired predispositions that led them to expect the lower classes to be unsuccessful in life and/or engage in morally disapproved behaviour. Also Leahy (1981, 1983) reported differences between those in different social classes in their descriptions of rich and poor people.

The aspects of the socio-economic domain described in this section (in particular attitudes to taxation, social security, work, human nature, and perceptions of social inequality) are considered central aspects of a broad definition of politics, incorporating the socio-economic domain. These areas are explored in the empirical study.

This section has focussed on defining both politics and the political remit, and has identified some of the main findings within these areas to date. It has already been demonstrated, however, that very little of this research has explored the role of school experience in political development. The second part of this Chapter (4.2) addresses this issue.

4.2 The Role of the School in Political Socialisation

This section discusses general issues of the role of education in society, and presents a model which may help in understanding the role of school experience in youth socialisation. The section also presents research findings on the political and socio-economic orientations of private and state educated young people (the method of operationalising different school experiences in
the study), and offers a research rationale for exploring the role of the school in socialisation.

4.2.1 Schools, Socialisation and Society

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a rise in the numbers of researchers exploring education and its impact on both individuals and society. Mostly sociological in origin, research explored such things as the experiences of working-class children in grammar schools (Jackson and Marsden, 1962), the nature of delinquency and anti-school youth subcultures (Hargreaves, 1967), and the role of the school in American society (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Some of this early work, however, had a more psychological emphasis, exploring the way in which attitudes, values and personality may be shaped or influenced by aspects of the educational experience. Many researchers have proposed that not only is our understanding of school influences on development limited, but that the study of its influence is of both theoretical and practical importance (Tapper and Salter, 1978; Rutter et al, 1979; Palonsky, 1987; Emler, Ohana and Moscovici, 1987; Emler, 1988).

Much of the work exploring the school's role has stressed the need to see education and schools as part of the wider social, political and economic structures of society. Robins (1988) proposes that all education is inherently political:

"Education is a political process, and in the widest sense all teaching and associated school activities can be recognised as being political in nature". (p 19)

Similarly Anyon (1979) comments that Western society views schools as autonomous and neutral, though a school's practices and assumptions will reflect those found in wider society.
Other researchers have explored the link between education and wider social processes, and its relation to the perpetuation of political systems. Giroux and Penna (1979) comment on the need to explore the ideological messages that lie within the curriculum and in the social relations within schools. Once the relationship between schooling and social processes is established, they believe that:

"... questions about the nature and meaning of the schooling experience can be viewed from a theoretical perspective capable of illuminating the often ignored relationship between school knowledge and social control" (p 21).

In a similar manner, Tapper and Salter (1978) propose that education is a socialising force within society. Education is one part of a range of social forces, and its influence should be measured by the degree of success it has in preventing alternative patterns of behaviour/attitudes emerging. Meyer (1977) proposed that educational systems are "...theories of socialisation institutionalised as rules at the collective level" (p 65).

Much of the literature exploring the school's role as a socialising agent has concluded that the school is, above all, an agent maintaining the status quo. Education is viewed by many researchers as reproducing society (for example Levin, 1974; Tapper and Salter, 1978; Anyon, 1979; Palonsky, 1987; Robins, 1988). Summarising the view of many of these writers, Giroux and Penna (1979) believe that:

"Instead of preparing students to enter the society with skills that will allow them to reflect critically upon and intervene in the world in order to change it, schools act as conservative forces which, for the most part, socialize students to conform to the status quo" (p 32).

It is anticipated that, by exploring school effects in socialisation, the current research can comment on this issue.
4.2.2 The Relationship of School Experience and Political Socialisation: Research Findings and a Possible Theoretical Framework

Operationalising the role of the school in socialisation is problematic, and has been a central issue in much of the research. Strategies have included (for example) exploring the effects of differences in school organisation and culture, and comparing groups of children and young people who have experienced different types of education such as comprehensive and grammar schools, and private and state schools. Theoretical and methodological issues involved in operationalising the school effect are clearly important, and a brief review of this work is presented below.

Much of the early work on the school's role in development focussed on the way in which schools affect early political development, focussing mainly on school organisation and culture. Palonsky (1987) comments for example that schools are an important arena for the development of political roles and ideologies. Overall, Palonsky suggests the school experience can

"... reinforce or amend the patterns of political learning children acquire at home in dramatic and enduring form." (p 493)

Palonsky adds that American research shows the school experience is "... a strong environmental factor affecting the magnitude and valence of early learning" (p 496). Work by Stevens (1982) has also demonstrated the importance of the school experience in the development of political thinking. In a study of over 800 7-11 year olds, Stevens found that several key political concepts are influenced by the school environment. For example, notions of authority are developed via the power structures of the school, and notions of equality are based on the idea of a public good and distribution according to need.
Research has also focussed on the role of the formal and informal curriculum of schools and its possible influence on political development. Dawson et al (1977) describe the influence of the formal curriculum in terms of the presentation of facts, and the attitudes of the teacher to such things as democracy and punishment in the classroom. These behaviours will affect a child's attitudes to notions of fair play, rights and obedience, and these may then affect political outlooks (see also Ehman, 1980). Further, non-classroom, informal aspects of schooling will affect political development. Dawson et al suggest in particular that the social composition of the school will influence the child's perception of the world.

Investigations of the school's role have also explored its effects on attitudes to authority. Educational achievement (rather than educational structure) was found to be related to positive attitudes toward authority (Emler, 1988). Emler comments that he was unable to demonstrate whether those who do well at school develop attitudes that are pro-authority, or whether attitudes to authority can influence educational performance. Further, Emler, Ohana and Moscovici (1987) explored the perceptions of the teacher and his/her role in those educated in private and state schools, reporting differences between these groups on a variety of factors relating to authority.

The school's role in influencing the development of political orientations has been most often explored by comparing those educated in state and private schools, and grammar and comprehensive schools. This method focusses on the effects of different educational structure. McQuail et al (1968), for example, compared the political attitudes of boys from grammar and (fee-paying) public schools. They found some differences between the two groups, for example higher levels of political knowledge amongst the private school boys. They found no differences on several other political variables, however,
and suggested that the differences that were found might be a result of the different social backgrounds of the two samples.

One of the most detailed explorations of the role of the school in the development of attitudes and values was undertaken by Himmelweit and Swift (1969). Their research is of relevance to the current study, as it provides a useful theoretical framework for the investigation of the role of the school in political socialisation. Himmelweit and Swift explored the influence of the school on aspirations, behaviours and attitudes, investigating the effect of different school types (grammar and secondary) on children from comparable social backgrounds. They studied over 600 13/14 year-olds, re-interviewing them 11 years later on a wide range of variables including personality, school performance, and social and political attitudes. They concluded that the results of the study

"... pointed to the dominant influence of the school. Information about the type of school a child attends enables better prediction of his behaviour, outlook, values and attainments than does his IQ or his family's social background." (p 157).

Based on their findings Himmelweit and Swift proposed a model of the school's influence. Like Merelman (1986) nearly twenty years later, the model suggests that at any one time the child is subject to a variety of pressures (both conflicting and reinforcing) including the family, the peer group and the school. The extent of the school's influence will depend on various factors, as it will be competing with influences from both the home and the peer group. The socialisation outcome depends primarily on the relative strength of these competing agents. The extent of the school's influence depends on the following factors:

1. The extent to which the school's values are consistent and coherent.
2. The extent to which the school's values and ideology conflict with (or are reinforced by) other values he/she is exposed to.

3. The kinds of rewards (short-term and long-term) that the school can offer its pupils in return for acceptance of rules and norms.

4. The kinds of sanctions the school can use for non-compliance with its objectives.

5. The kinds of status the child has within the school.

Himmelweit and Swift (1969) proposed that schools are different types of "systems", ranging from strong to weak. By strong they refer to a school that has coercive and persuasive power over its pupils, deriving from the school's objectives and their salience for the individuals within the system. A strong system is more able to reduce the influence of characteristics that the pupil brings to the school. Thus

"... background factors are significant where school structure is weak... and less so where it is relatively strong." (p 175)

In explaining their results, Himmelweit and Swift suggest that the secondary school is a weak system and the grammar school a strong one. In particular they add that the strong system is able to select its pupils, and has explicit goals which are designed to shape its pupils futures.

The model is considered particularly useful for understanding the role of the school in socialisation. In aiming to compare the political socialisation of young people from different types of school (private and state in the current study), such methods of establishing the influence of the school are important.
4.2.3 Political and Socio-Economic Orientations in Private and State Educated Young People

The previous section detailed some of the ways in which schools have been shown to influence the development of political orientations. Much of the research explored aspects of an individual school's structure (such as teacher style or school rules) and its impact on children and young people. This section details research designed to investigate whether different educational experiences within state and private schools influence political and socio-economic orientations. It was specified in Chapter 1 that comparing young women from private and state schools was the method of operationalising school effect in the study. (Further details of the rationale and the education system in Britain are given in Chapters 5 and 6).

A limited number of research studies have explored private/state school differences in political and socio-economic attitudes. Some research results and explanations for findings reported are given here. Those educated in private and state schools in Australia have been shown to have different beliefs about employment and unemployment (Feather, 1983). Private school pupils were found to give more external attributions for unemployment, and were more likely to expect to find work on leaving school. Similarly, work has shown that boys at private and state schools have different views of poverty (Furnham, 1982b). The private school boys in this study were more likely to give individualistic explanations, the state sample more societal ones.

Further differences in attributional style and attitudes have been identified. In a study exploring the causal explanations given by private and comprehensive school boys for success and failure in exams, Hewstone et al (1982) found the former were more likely to talk about ability and effort, the latter about luck. Similarly Dickinson (1986b) found private and state school
differences in perceptions of occupational achievement. In a sample of 10-16 year-olds she found that private school pupils were more aware of the socio-economic status of jobs, whilst the state school pupils were more likely to view lower status jobs as acceptable possible careers. A later study (Dickinson, 1987) focussed on beliefs about socio-economic structure in private and state educated children and young people. Although the two groups showed many similar beliefs, some differences were evident. The state school group were more likely, for example, to give descriptive statements of why people earn different amounts; the private school group were more likely to refer to variations in qualifications or skills.

Similarly, Emler and Dickinson (1985) investigated perceptions of inequality in 7-12 year-olds in private and state schools (see also Emler et al, 1990). They explored perceptions of social class and judgements of different income distributions, using children from a state school in a working-class area, and a private school in a middle-class one. The private school pupils perceived incomes as generally higher, and also were more likely to view wide income inequalities as justified (see Burgard et al, 1989, for criticisms). In explaining the differences found, however, the authors focus on the different social class backgrounds of the pupils rather than on any specific effects of educational experience.

Some recent findings have highlighted differences in perceptions of class between the two groups. Frazer (1988) explored class concepts in private and state educated girls, finding that class was not particularly important for the state school girls, but was important for the private school girls. She concluded that for the private school group

"... class as such is the most salient organising category in their lives - it is a central factor in their self-identities, and the major site of conflict and source of anxiety." (p 344).
Frazer adds that the private school group had a very clear view of the class structure, and placed themselves very near the top.

A variety of factors have been identified as being involved in the school’s role as a socialising agent. Some explanations, such as the work of Himmelweit and Swift (1969) have already been detailed. Some of the additional factors described by researchers are detailed here. Anyon (1979) proposes that educational materials are important in youth socialisation, in that they legitimate current political and economic relations. Thus social studies textbooks in the western world focus on such things as social harmony, political concensus, and individual freedom, and aim to promote through education the current structure of social and economic relations.

An area which may help illuminate the relationship between education and socialisation is the exploration of whole school environments. Metzger and Barr (1978) suggest that research should investigate the educational atmosphere of schools, exploring the relationship of school aims and culture to pupil’s political attitudes. Harber (1986) suggests that a political message can be seen as embedded in such aspects as school organisation and atmosphere. Similarly Emler and Reicher (1987) propose the investigation of the school as a particular form of social system. The relationship between these proposals and Himmelweit and Swift’s (1969) model of schools as "systems" is clear. The use of concepts from occupational psychology such as organisational climate and culture are relevant in this light.

Some of the studies exploring the school’s role in socialisation (and political socialisation in particular) have explained its possible influence using social representations theory. It has already been suggested that social representations may assist in framing and interpreting the research. This is
because it focusses on social groups and their role in the construction of social knowledge. The groups in the current study are different educational (and thus social) groups. Feather (1983) suggests that a person’s location in the social structure will influence their view of social reality; thus different groups in society are likely to share representations of this reality. Similarly Emler and Dickinson (1985) suggest that social representations may explain the different beliefs of those from middle and working class backgrounds. They conclude that

"...children in different social classes are immersed in quite dissimilar social worlds." (p 192).

They add that knowledge about socio-economic inequality is unevenly distributed amongst different social classes; this leads to differences in their political and socio-economic attitudes and values. Similar suggestions are made by Hewstone et al (1982), Dickinson (1986a, 1987), Emler, Ohana and Moscovici (1987), and Emler et al (1990).

Hewstone et al (1982) suggest that their findings (detailed earlier) can best be explained using a combination of social representations and social identity theory. They add that little work has been undertaken relating these two theoretical concepts, or on the utility of a more social view of attributional style. In particular they comment on the possibility of applying social identity to an educational setting. This stems from the notion that individuals will strive for a positive identity by making favourable comparisons between theirs and others groups. The high status group (in the current research the privately educated) may be insecure because its position is threatened (for example by the Labour Party). Because of this the privately educated group "... might actively engage in intergroup differentiation." (Hewstone et al, 1982, p 258). (See also Robinson, Tayler, and Piolat, 1990). This issue is speculative, however, and will be returned to later in this thesis.
Finally, exploring the role of the school in the socialisation process has lead researchers and educationalists to the issue of political education. Political education is described by Patrick (1977) as "... learning and instructing about politics and political actors" (p 191). It is the deliberate attempt to inculcate certain forms of political orientation through school experience. Many researchers have commented on the low level of political awareness in young people in Britain. In a study of over 4,000 school leavers, low levels of political knowledge were found (Stradling, 1977; see also Furnham and Gunter, 1987). Recent work has shown that formal teaching of politics in schools increases levels of political knowledge (Denver and Hands, 1990a, 1990b). The low levels of political literacy reported has prompted others to call for a more comprehensive programme of political education in schools (Jennings and Farah, 1980; Dunn, 1984; Mardle and Taylor, 1987; Palonsky, 1987), as well as education for economic understanding (Furnham and Cleare, 1988). Education and preparation for unemployment has also been suggested (Fleming and Lavercombe, 1982; Stirling, 1982). In exploring political socialisation and the role of the school in this, the current study is likely to be able to comment on issues such as political education.

4.3 Summary and Research Rationale

This Chapter has focussed on the central issues involved in the exploration of the school experience in political socialisation. This section summarises the main points of this literature, and presents the rationale for the empirical study which emerged from this literature.

A number of fundamental issues in political socialisation research were discussed. From this discussion, the following was proposed: that individual and societal levels of investigation must be addressed; that individuals are active in their own development; that concepts from both psychology and
political science must be integrated; that there is no single objective model of society for young people to be socialised "to", rather there are different representations of political and social reality; that a cognitive-developmental approach to human development is useful, but that the importance of social influence and group membership in this process must be acknowledged. The Chapter also discussed the nature, definition, and remit of "politics". A wide variety of definitions were identified, but a narrow range of areas were found to have been explored within research, with exploration of voting intent particularly common. Politics was defined as perceptions of patterns of human relationships. A broad definition of the political remit was proposed, including areas normally incorporated in socio-economic research. The main areas of research undertaken on political and socio-economic socialisation were described.

The role of school experience in political socialisation was described as an under-researched area. The view of Dawson et al (1977) was accepted, that adolescence is the period in life when the most enduring political orientations are developed. Thus the investigation of the effects of school experience are particularly important. Research findings on the effects of school experience were described. A theoretical approach (Himmelweitz and Swift, 1969) was described which models the role of the school as a socialising agent. Finally, there was a summary of research which has explored the perception of patterns of human relationships amongst private and state educated young people, the focus of the research.

The majority of research on the role of school experience in political socialisation was shown, however, to have left important questions unanswered. In particular, much research has failed to separate the influence of school experience from family background, the latter generally identified as
the most powerful predictor of political orientation. Similarly, much research has explored only one or two political phenomena in randomly selected groups of young people. Little empirical work has focussed on how different educational structures affect political socialisation, using a broad remit of politics, and incorporating the socio-economic domain. The current research therefore aims to explore the political socialisation of females matched for socio-economic background, but attending different types of school (private and state).

The research rationale is presented in detail in Chapter 6. The following chapter (Chapter 5) presents first the research context of the study, grounding the research in the realities of the political, social, and economic world. The Chapter discusses both the current experiences of young people against a backdrop of recent social and economic changes, and describes attempts by researchers to map out the effects of these changes. The nature of education (and private education in particular) is also discussed.
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH CONTEXT

This Chapter details two areas which form the background and context to the research. The first section (5.1) grounds the research in the political and economic environment of the 1980s, focusing on education, youth policies, and the youth labour market. The ESRC 16-19 Initiative, from which the study emerged, is also described. The second section (5.2) discusses the nature of private education in Britain, and details research undertaken on young people in the private sector of education.

5.1 Politics, Education, and the Youth Labour Market in the 1980s

The 1980s have seen a transformation in the lives of young people in Britain. Change has occurred in many different areas of the lives of the young, and these changes in the political, social, and economic climate of Britain provide the context for the present study. This section will detail the major changes of the 1980s, their impact on young people, and how the ESRC 16-19 Initiative aimed to explore youth socialisation against this background.

Changes in labour market structure

Changes in the political and economic climate of the 1980s resulted in three levels of labour market changes: international, national and individual. These will be briefly summarised. First, in an international context, an increase in the use of new technology was matched in many European countries by a corresponding increase in unemployment levels, particularly among the young (Wilpert, Durganand and Taft, 1986). The fluctuations of international markets and the growth of the EEC are just two examples of influence from outside Britain's borders. The second level of change in the youth labour market occurred in the national context. In political terms, most important was the effect of a Conservative government since 1979. The government have been responsible for increasing the extent of state intervention in the
post-16 years, in particular with the introduction of the Youth Training Scheme (YTS) (see Raffe, 1984; Senker, 1990 for details). Even pre-16, the government are continuing to radically alter the structure, content, and evaluation of education. Examples include the introduction of the GCSE examination, the increase in the vocational emphasis of compulsory and further education, and the introduction of the national curriculum.

The national economic context has also been an important catalyst for transforming the experiences of the young, with the rise in levels of unemployment in the early 1980s affecting young people as well as adults, and young women and the poorly educated in particular (Walker, 1981; Dunn, 1984). Changes in benefit rules and part-time education allowances have further affected young people's circumstances. These changes in the political and economic domains have involved a corresponding change in other areas of the lives of the young, with leisure and spare-time activities, political and social attitudes, and domestic/home lives affected by these developments. In all, the experiences and lifestyles of the young have been fundamentally altered in comparison with the lives of earlier generations. (See also Jackson, 1985; Bynner, 1987a; Roberts, 1987a).

The transformation of the youth labour market has meant that the uncomplicated transition from school into work described by researchers in the 1960s (Carter, 1969), is very much a minority experience in the 1980s. Roberts (1987b) states that in 1974, 61% of 16 year-olds went into employment; in 1984 this figure was 18%. Many young people now enter the labour market via YTS, which effectively became compulsory in 1988 as benefit was withdrawn from those not in education or employment. The link between education, training and employment is now far more complicated (Banks, 1988). Overall, the normal transition described by Carter has been
replaced by extended transitions, with the state playing an increasing role in education, training, and early careers (see Senker, 1990).

A final level of change has been at the individual level, and the way in which young people themselves have adapted to these new expectations, prospects, and lifestyles. Bynner (1987b) says that the changes of the 1980s have lead researchers to ask how young people perceive this new world and how they see themselves fitting into it. Researchers have therefore aimed to highlight the experiences of both individuals and groups of young people in the new labour market structures of the 1980s. This is discussed further below.

**Impact of labour market changes on the young**

These labour market transformations have been shown to have different effects on different groups of young people. Roberts (1987a) claims that young people have not been affected uniformly. The impact of labour market changes on the young are determined by both structural factors (geographical location, local labour market situation) and personal factors (gender, age, social class). Both factors are closely linked in their influence on post-16 experiences. Consequently, studies such as the National Youth Cohort Study are exploring the link between young people's backgrounds, personal characteristics, labour market and educational experiences, with their individual career paths (Clough and Gray, 1986).

The academically able are a group identified as having felt less of an impact from the economic recession of the 1980s. Roberts (1987a) suggests that "...there has been little change at the top..." (p 18), ie for those going on to higher education at age 18 via A Levels. Indeed, he adds that even those planning to enter work after A Levels have fared well after the changes of the 1980s:
"... demand for better qualified young people has proved far more resilient than the less qualifieds opportunities" (Roberts, 1987a, p 17).

This group have been only partially examined by social scientists, who have tended to focus more on the impact of social and economic changes on the unemployed and those on YTS, and to a lesser extent those going straight into employment. The present study was designed to give the academically able a renewed focus, exploring their experiences in the 1980s.

The ESRC 16-19 Initiative, to which the current study is linked, aimed to address the above issues. (A brief description only of the background to the Initiative is given below; further details of the design of the Initiative are given in Chapter 7).

Exploring youth socialisation: the ESRC 16-19 Initiative

The 16-19 Initiative, set up in 1987, had as its focus the investigation of the economic and political socialisation of young people. It emerged from a preliminary exploration of the issues undertaken by psychologists and sociologists, and was primarily a response to the lack of understanding of the impact of the social and economic changes detailed earlier. The aim was to investigate a large representative sample of young people from four different geographical locations in Britain. An additional aim was to integrate different theoretical and methodological perspectives, in particular from sociology, education, and psychology.

The Initiative aimed to integrate the psychological and structural approaches detailed in earlier Chapters. Bynner (1987a) describes the conceptual framework for the Initiative in relation to four main areas, many of which have been explored in the previous literature review:

(1) structural influences: the labour market, gender, race and sex.
(2) socialising agents: education, work, family, peer group, and mass media.
(3) social-psychological influences: identity, social representations, and attributions.
(4) socialisation outcomes: educational and political status, behaviours and attitudes.


It is of note that the privately educated, the focus of the current study, were excluded from the main 16-19 Initiative sample. Bynner (1987a) adds that this group are an interesting group for study, due to the relationship of private education with better educational resources, higher educational achievement, and privileged access to the labour market. The following section details the recent literature relating to the private sector of education in Britain.

5.2 Private Education in Britain

The politics of private education

The private education system accounts for just over half a million children and young people aged 5-16 in England and Wales. As Walford (1987) demonstrates, the numbers in private education have increased steadily throughout the 1980s, with 6% of the school age population in 1984, and 6.5% in 1986; current figures show a rise to 7.4% (TES, 26/4/91). Particularly in light of the declining number of school age children, this represents a considerable proportion of children undergoing education outside of the state sector. This section briefly discusses the politics of private education, and research on the private sector to date. It proposes that significant gaps remain
in our understanding of the influence of private education on the children and young people who attend these schools.

The 1980s have been a distinctive period in the history of education and educational policy. The Conservative government has aimed to promote both parental choice and an increase in educational standards. The aim of the right-wing (or 'new right') of the Party in particular has been to restore traditional educational and social values in schools and extend parental choice (see Quicke, 1988, for a discussion). Johnson (1990) comments that "Parental choice is now an important consideration in all plans made by schools and local authorities" (p 3).

The educational policy of the 1980s can be seen in particular in government attitudes to, and policy towards, the private sector of education.

The main political parties have shown different stances in relation to private education and whether it would be acceptable under their government. Tapper (1984) shows that whilst the Conservative Party accepts the principle of private schools and supports their continued existence, the Labour Party views the private sector as divisive and would remove all the state subsidies the sector receives. The centre Parties, Tapper continues, believe in the right of individuals to pay for education, but members disagree about the role of the state in supporting the sector.

Other means have been used for describing the different ideological stances taken in relation to private education. Johnson (1987) proposes two main views relating to private education in the 1980s. First, described as the individualist standpoint, is the view that there should be no state run, institutionalised schools; those taking this viewpoint stress market forces and propose the introduction of vouchers. Second, the collectivist standpoint is
that state schooling should be available for all; private education would be banned. Johnson adds, however, that most people will lie somewhere on the continuum between these two poles, and uses the following diagram to detail these different standpoints:

Figure 5.1: Ideological Standpoints on Educational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical continuum</th>
<th>Collectivist</th>
<th>System of state education incorporating secular and religious strands</th>
<th>Public education freely available, meeting most/all educational needs. Individuals may 'opt out' and use independent institutions at their own expense. Central coordination of these institutions, but no government support for such institutions or transactions</th>
<th>Mixed economy of education (a combination of publicly and independently funded institutions)</th>
<th>Public education freely available, meeting most educational needs. Some government assistance enabling access to approved independent institutions</th>
<th>No publicly provided education. Public money funding educational 'vouchers' for families. Free market of independent educational institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy for public education</td>
<td>Monotheistic state system of education</td>
<td>No opting out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible role for independent education</td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Competitive/Complementary</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for parental choice in education</td>
<td>No parental choice (except by moving house to change neighbourhoods)</td>
<td>Parental choice between secular and faith-linked institutions within the public system of education</td>
<td>Parental choice between public and independent education, but latter option must be fully backed by personal finance.</td>
<td>Parental choice between public and independent education. Full economic cost of use of independent education not borne by family in all cases.</td>
<td>Parental choice between public and independent education. Latter option needing to be backed by personal finance, except in selected means tested cases.</td>
<td>Essential for parental choice to be exercised. Possibility of coupling personal finance to public money 'vouchers'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from Johnson, 1987, p 7)

Johnson suggests that each column represents the view of one or more of the political parties. The Labour Party are described as being in column one, some Labour and Liberal supporters in column two, the SDP/Alliance in three, the Thatcher government in four, and right-wing Conservatives in column six.

The arguments for and against private education had been developed long before the Conservative government came into power in 1979. (For a detailed exploration of these arguments see Edwards, Fulbrook, and Whitty, 1984; Griggs, 1985; Cibulka and Boyd, 1989; Walford, 1990). Debate over the
private provision of education are not restricted to this country. The numbers of privately in Europe (at secondary level) ranges from 2% in Sweden to over 7% in England and Wales, 21% in France and 72% in the Netherlands (see James, 1988). The role private education plays in each of these countries, and the debate about the private sector, is detailed in full in Walford (1989).

The private sector since 1979

Central to the continued existence of the private sector of education has been the level of support given to them by the Conservative government. Walford (1987) concludes that

"Since 1979 the government has offered considerable support for the independent sector both ideologically and financially. (p 276)."

This support has taken many forms. Changes in taxation policy have been shown to increasingly favour the private sector (see Robson and Walford, 1989). Further, Walford (1987) identifies three principle means of Conservative support for the private sector, both covert and overt:

1. **The Assisted Places Scheme (APS):** these are state funded (means tested) places for children and young people to attend private schools. It was introduced in 1980, and by 1985/86 over 21,000 pupils were on the APS, with 1,400 of these pupils at boarding schools.

2. **Ideological support:** the existence of the APS implies that private schools are more able to supply a good academic education than state schools. Overall, Walford identifies the main ideological support to be general criticism by the government of the state sector in comparison to the private sector (see also Walford, 1990).

3. **Financial support:** clearly the APS provides a considerable amount of financial support for private schools. Most private schools are also registered charities and so qualify for many VAT and tax exemptions. Additionally,
many schools are able to stay open only because of the financial support of
the APS (see Edwards, Fitz and Whitty, 1989).

The APS is a particularly important component of the private school system.
The scheme was originally announced in the 1980 Education Act, and by 1981
the first pupils entered schools with the support of the APS (see Walford,
1988, for the workings of the APS in Scotland). Dowse, in 1985, suggested
that 13% of all private school pupils were on the APS. By 1986, of the 21,000
APS pupils 40% had free places, with the rest paying reduced fees (Fitz,
Edwards and Whitty, 1986; Edwards, Fitz and Whitty, 1989). By law, 60% of
the places have to go to those who are not already in the private sector,
though current levels are actually less than 40% (see Walford, 1987).

The aim of the APS, according to the Department of Education and Science,
was to give able children a wider range of educational opportunity, with the
idea of providing private school places for academically able children from
working-class and disadvantaged backgrounds (DES, 1985). Much research has
shown, however, that this aim may not have been achieved. A longitudinal
study of the APS by Fitz et al (1986) concluded that:

"... although the Scheme has brought into the independent
sector some pupils who otherwise would not be there, it has not
attracted large numbers of pupils from inner-city areas or from
manual, working-class backgrounds". (p 169).

Overall, Fitz et al conclude that the majority of APS places have not been taken
up by the working-classes but by the "...submerged middle-class..." (p 185) (see
also Blunden, Shaw and Walford, 1990). Johnson (1987) adds that although
many APS parents are single mothers, they were often artificially poor because
of death or divorce; often, they also had a high educational level.
In a survey of 110 schools participating in the APS, Dowse (1985) found that 20% of those on the APS already had a brother or sister at a private school, and 32% had at least one parent with professional or graduate qualifications. This suggests that the APS was attracting those parents already committed to the private sector. Overall Douse concluded that

"... relatively few APS students come from unambiguously working-class backgrounds." (p 216).

A major study on the effects of the APS confirmed these findings (Edwards, Fitz and Whitty, 1989). It is possible that this is one reason why the Scheme is not now to be extended as was originally planned (TES, March 1991).

Research on the private sector

The increasing size of the private sector has not, however, been reflected in the amount of research conducted within the private sector:

"There is very little writing which seeks... to add and clarify our knowledge of policy and practice in public schools through the results of academic research." (Walford, 1984, p 3)

The result is what Walford (1989) describes as debate characterised by "...impressions, isolationism, and insularity..." (p 3). Work has though been undertaken on the history and politics of private education (Johnson, 1987), and on life in the prestigious public schools (for example Walford, 1986c). Mackinnon (1987) adds that research on the private sector is not only limited, but that most of it has only been concerned with the politics of its fairness. Fox (1989) notes that most of the studies on the privately educated have focused on boys, with the result that there are "... virtually no details about girls in the private sector" (p 334).

Research on the APS (as described earlier) has received a great deal of attention from researchers. However, much of this latter work has focused on the background of APS students and the politics of the Scheme. No work
could be found that has aimed to identify whether attending a private school affects the socialisation processes and outcomes of those on the APS. This is addressed in the current study. If some APS pupils are from different occupational or value backgrounds to non-APS pupils, the value orientations of the APS pupils will be worthy of particular attention. Comparisons of the political orientations of APS and non-APS pupils, and of pupils and parents, are therefore an aim of the empirical study.

One area that has been investigated in some detail is the reasons given by parents for choosing private education for their children. In a study of 330 parents of boys in private schools, it was found that the most often named reason for choosing the private sector was that education was poorer in state schools (Bridgeman and Fox, 1978). In particular, size of class and rate of teacher turnover in state schools was mentioned, as was the lack of formal, academic teaching. The researchers added that parents of boys at the most expensive boarding schools were often closed to the state school system, in that they would not even consider using it (see Fox, 1984, 1985; Tapper and Salter, 1984). Research also found two main types of private school users: the "naturals" for whom private schooling is a tradition, and those mainly new to the system who believe private education is likely to be better (Johnson, 1987).

Much of the research that has investigated private education has focussed on issues of careers, and entry into higher education. Work has identified the specialist careers work undertaken in private schools. Most schools use the services of the Independent School's Careers Organisation (see Walford, 1986b). Walford also demonstrates that the 14-18 year-old age group has always been a distinct and coherent stage at private schools, a change of emphasis only recently occuring in the state sector.
The majority of the privately educated therefore stay on at school at 16, mainly to do A Levels. Data from the Oxford Mobility Survey (Halsey, Heath and Ridge, 1984) showed that in 1981 20% of all those pupils in education after age 16 were in private schools. Similarly, researchers have demonstrated that while there are mixtures of routes post-16 for those in state schools (A Levels, YTS, work), this situation is rare for private school pupils, as the importance of the academic route only is stressed (Walford, 1987). Work by Eglin (1984) demonstrated that private school pupils aim for more prestigious courses in higher education (for example law and medicine), and are subject to more peer pressure than state school pupils to stay on in education longer.

The academic emphasis in private schools is reflected in the high academic achievement of its pupils. In 1981, 45% of those privately educated left school with three or more A Levels, with an equivalent figure for the state school of 7.1% (Halsey et al, 1984). Twenty five per cent of all University students are from private schools, as are 50% of undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge (Walford, 1990). It is of note also that many people in prestigious and policy making occupations are from private schools. Of the 21 members of the current Conservative Cabinet, for example, 19 were educated privately.

This section has detailed the current state of the private sector of education in Britain. It has also shown differences in outcomes between private and state educated young people in terms of access to higher education and examination results. The majority of the research on private education has, however, concentrated solely on such factual, tangible outcomes. It is possible that the impact of different types of education on the young may, however, be less easily defined and illustrated.
It has been proposed that private schools provide training for high status occupations in the cultural mainstream (Fitz et al, 1986). In a useful extension of this notion, researchers have proposed that private schools impart social capital (Tapper and Salter, 1984). The authors describe this as an individual's network of social relations, used to advantage in the job market. Some researchers have therefore investigated whether private schools allow individuals to acquire middle and upper class values, the values of the ruling class (for example Cookson and Persell, 1989). It has been suggested that

"... public schools can be seen as preparing their pupils for expected positions of dominance in the economic, political and legal power structure of capitalist society." (Eglin, 1984, p 89).

The implication of proposals such as these is that children and young people in private schools acquire different attitudes, values and goals to those in state schools. It is the investigation of this notion, which is often implicit in the statement of politicians, educationalists, and researchers, that is one of the foci of the current research. The next chapter (Chapter 6) details the rationale for the empirical study designed to explore whether school experience does, in fact, influence or determine the content or process of political socialisation.

**Note:** in concluding this section on private education in Britain, it is necessary to clarify the terms used. Fee-paying schools in this country have been variously described as 'public', 'commercial', and 'private', with the schools themselves (and the DES) promoting the use of 'independent'. The term private rather than independent is used in this thesis for the following reasons (from Walford, 1990):

(1) It is the term used in almost every other country for schools that are not provided for or financed by the state (see Walford, 1989).
(2) Independent is not an accurate description of the relationship between state and private schools, in particular in light of the fact that private schools have become increasingly dependent on the state both financially and ideologically (Walford, 1987).

(3) Recent government education policy has in fact blurred the distinction between independent and state-maintained schools (see also Johnson, 1987). In addition to the above reasons, the term "private" most commonly applies to something to which access is limited and regulated by the organisation itself; this is a primary characteristic of all private schools.

The following chapter (Chapter 6) summarises the literature, and the research rationale for the empirical study that emerged from this literature.
CHAPTER 6: LITERATURE SUMMARY AND RESEARCH

RATIONALE

This Chapter summarises the main points of the previous chapters (6.1). It then details the research rationale and objectives of the empirical study which emerged from this literature (6.2).

6.1 Summary: The Role of the School in Political Socialisation

Youth in the 1980s

The focus of the study is on the experiences of young people during the adolescent period. Adolescence is a stage in the life cycle characterised by certain physical, psychological and lifestyle changes. As individuals, young people will experience this stage differently, depending on the interaction between personal characteristics and situational factors. Collectively, each generation of young people is likely to experience this period quite differently to previous generations, as a result of changes and developments in the economic, political and social contexts. Information on the experiences of young people in the 1960s and 1970s may therefore not be applicable to a new generation of young people for whom the 1980s and 1990s provide the context for their development.

Changes in the political, social and economic spheres have been particularly noticeable during the period of the present government, and many of these changes have had a direct impact on the lives of the young. The introduction of the Youth Training Scheme, for example, has had considerable impact on the lives of young people, and these (and other) changes have removed the smooth transition from school and into work reported by researchers in the 1960s (Carter, 1969). The impact of such changes have, however, affected different groups of young people in different ways. The aim of the ESRC 16-
19 Initiative, to which the current study is linked, was to explore young people’s experiences in the late 1980s.

The political socialisation of youth
The main theme of both the 16-19 Initiative and the current study is youth socialisation. Socialisation is a process of adaptation to new experiences in the adolescent years, during which the development of attitudes, values, goals and behaviours appropriate to an adult role takes place. Socialisation comprises different components, including socialisation to work, to politics, and to gender roles. Varying approaches to exploring youth socialisation have been adopted by those in different disciplines, with contrasts particularly evident between sociology and psychology. The integration of concepts from these disciplines is central to the research. Further, the study focusses on female socialisation: less is known about the socialisation of this group compared with males.

Political socialisation was identified as an area that has received relatively little attention from psychologists. Research in this area emerged mainly from the work of political scientists aiming to explain the persistence of political systems. More recent work has focussed on the political development of individuals. However, much of the research undertaken on young people and politics has been limited in both method and scope, being mainly questionnaire based and dealing with single issues, typically voting. Further, although past theoretical and empirical work has been useful, much of it is now effectively out of date as it concerns young people for whom the 1970s provided the political and socio-economic context for their development. The necessity for more theoretically driven work on political socialisation has been proposed, as well as work which extends beyond studies of voting and attitudes to topical issues (eg Merelman, 1986).
Politics was defined as the perception of patterns of human relationships. The study of political orientations therefore includes the following: party politics, voting, and the workings of the political system; interest in politics and use of political media; perceptions of pressure groups and trade unions; perceptions of the rule of law, authority and civil disobedience; view of political and socio-economic organisation; view of class, human nature, (in)equality and the redistribution of wealth. This remit of the political arena necessitates the incorporation of economic and social areas (as proposed by Furnham, 1987a), these areas more commonly explored independently to politics. Areas also explored in the study therefore include: attitudes to work and work commitment; career goals and planning; attitudes to training; job entitlement beliefs; perceptions of the local and national labour market; and attributions for unemployment and poverty.

Theoretical frameworks
A cognitive developmental approach to human development, that acknowledges the vital role of social influence, was proposed; the possibility that different social groups develop different representations of social reality was also accepted (Emler et al, 1990). The model of Dawson et al (1977), which proposes that the most enduring political orientations are developed in childhood and adolescence, was also accepted. Thus the educational period is potentially of considerable importance for the political orientations of adulthood.

Four main psychological frameworks are utilised in the current study. The first three - social representations, social identity, and attribution theory - aim to explain rules governing human behaviour. All three have been widely used in social psychology and to a lesser extent in research on political socialisation. Each is utilised primarily in the interpretation of results. The
fourth psychological framework is Erikson’s theory of identity development in adolescence, which is part of an overall theory of human development.

Identity development in adolescence is a central theme of the research. The identity literature has a process focus, concentrating on how young people address occupational and political issues. The majority of political socialisation research to date has concentrated on political content. The current research explores socialisation in terms of both content (as political attitudes) and process; the process analysis aims to determine whether individuals have a political identity commitment and how they have explored political issues in the past. Further, the process approach is particularly valuable for addressing gender issues. The process of identity formation in women is not yet well documented (Josselson, 1987). The study aims to describe the content and process dimensions of their political socialisation.

The role of the school

Much of the research into political socialisation has aimed to identify the role of agents in political socialisation, these agents including the family, the media, the peer group and the school. Each is viewed as affecting socialisation in a different way. The family has received most attention from researchers, and has generally been identified as the primary influence on political development. There is some evidence, however, that in certain circumstances the school experience may also be an important factor in political socialisation (e.g. Himmelweit and Swift, 1969). Early work on the role of the school was mainly sociological, with little work undertaken to establish the psychological processes involved. It has been proposed that more research is necessary to establish the school’s role (Stevens, 1982; Palonsky, 1987).
Two main approaches have been used by researchers to identify school effects. First, the influence of aspects of a school's organisation on children has been explored (for example streaming or teacher style). Using this approach samples were often randomly selected from a single school. The second approach is to explore the impact of different educational structures on socialisation. The current study adopts this latter method, comparing young people who have experienced different types of schooling. This methodology responds to those who have proposed that political socialisation research should explore different subcultural groups distinguished by factors such as education (Kavanagh, 1972).

The private and state sectors of education are used in the study to operationalise different educational structure. Although the privately educated account for over 7% of the school age population, very little is known about the effects of a private education on the young people who experience it (Walford, 1984; 1990). Research which has been undertaken on this group has mainly focussed on tangible outcomes such as academic achievement and career paths. The study aims to contribute to knowledge about the impact of different educational structures on the political socialisation of youth, and also on the specific impact of a private education on the development of political attitudes in young females.

6.2 Research Rationale and Objectives

To summarise, the objective of the research is to isolate the role of the school experience in the political socialisation of youth, using a broad definition of politics, and exploring both the content the process of political socialisation. The content focus originates from notions of different socialising agents in youth socialisation, and is operationalised in the exploration of political attitudes; the aim of the content focus is therefore to describe and map out
the political attitudes and orientations of the samples. The aim of the process analysis is to investigate the making of political commitments and the exploration of political alternatives.

The aim of the empirical study is to compare young people who have experienced different types of education, but who are from similar family backgrounds (derived from parental occupation). The rationale is that by controlling for socio-economic background, the research will isolate the school effect in political socialisation. Parental occupation has been shown to encompass a wide range of socio-economic characteristics (Osborn and Morris, 1979; Duke and Edgell, 1987), and parental occupation has been used by earlier researchers into political socialisation to measure social class (for example Stradling, 1977). Social class has generally been identified as the primary distinguishing characteristic in relation to political orientation (eg Curtice, 1986; Roberts and Parsell, 1988).

The null hypothesis of the study is that there are no differences in the political socialisation of young females matched for socio-economic background, but who are educated in two different types of schools. The objectives of the research are:

1. To explore whether there are differences in the **content** of political and socio-economic attitudes of young people educated in private and state schools.

2. To explore whether there are differences in the **process** of developing a political identity in private and state educated young people.

3. If differences are found, a further objective is to isolate factors in the school experience which may lead to different socialisation outcomes or processes.
The following chapter (Chapter 7) describes the empirical study designed to address the above questions.
CHAPTER 7: METHOD

The empirical study was designed to address the research objectives detailed at the end of Chapter 6. This Chapter describes the rationale for the study (7.1), details the measures used (7.2 and 7.3), and describes the sample and the fieldwork procedure (7.4). It goes on to detail the coding of the content data (7.5), the analysis of the process data (7.6), and the analyses of the content and process data (7.7). Finally, a summary of the methodology is given (7.8).

7.1 Research Design and Rationale

7.1.1 Sampling Strategy

A brief summary of the design and sampling strategy of the 16-19 Initiative is necessary to understand the design of the research. The 16-19 Initiative (see Chapter 5 for background and details) sampled two age cohorts: those young people aged 15/16 and in their last year of compulsory education (the younger cohort) and those aged 17/18 and eligible to leave school two years previously (the older cohort). Representative samples of young people were selected in four geographical locations: Swindon, Sheffield, Liverpool and Kirkcaldy. Questionnaires were administered once a year for three years (waves one, two and three). Most of the questionnaire items were common to the four areas, with some area or cohort specific pages also included. In-depth interviews were also undertaken with approximately 100 young people in each area in the first and third years of the study.

The rationale for the current study (as outlined in Chapter 6) was to sample two groups of females, one from a private school and the other from a state school. It was planned to sample two age cohorts, to match the two age cohorts in the 16-19 Initiative. The strategy was to sample both those currently at the schools in the fifth and seventh years, and those in the older
cohort who had left the school two years previously. From this initial sample a sub-group would be selected for in-depth study, sampling those matched for socio-economic background (derived from parental occupation). Parental occupation has been widely proposed as a measure of family socio-economic status (see for example Duke and Edgell, 1987). Giving equal weight in such analyses to the occupations of both mothers and fathers has been proposed (for example Stradling, 1977), and this was undertaken in the current study. The design would therefore enable the sampling of females from similar socio-economic backgrounds, but with different educational experiences. The null hypothesis of the study was that there would be no differences in the content or process of political socialisation between these two groups.

7.1.2 Measures

It was decided to use the 16-19 Initiative’s wave one (ie first year) questionnaire as the first of the measures in the empirical study. This questionnaire was useful both for contacting the sample initially, and also for acquiring basic demographic information and some coverage of their political and socio-economic attitudes. (A detailed account of the design and content of the questionnaire is contained in 7.2).

Chapter 4 proposed a broad definition of politics, incorporating social and economic areas. The 16-19 Initiative questionnaires were constrained in depth and breadth of coverage of political issues, however, being self-administered and mainly in fixed-choice format. Individual interviews were therefore chosen as the most appropriate method for collecting the majority of the content data in the study. This reflects the view of some researchers (for example Waterman, 1985) that questionnaires provide insufficient depth for exploring political issues. In particular a semi-structured interview schedule was considered appropriate, which would allow the exploration of
the same areas of political content for each subject, but would also enable further exploration of these issues as appropriate for each individual.

A questionnaire format would also be inappropriate for the investigation of the process of political socialisation. It was demonstrated in Chapter 3 that identity researchers generally use qualitative research methods, presenting descriptive results from interviews and often using case studies. Waterman (1985) describes the individual interview as the most accurate tool for tapping current stage of identity development. Similarly, Josselson et al (1977a) propose the use of interviews. Individual interviews were therefore used in the empirical study to provide data on the process of developing a political identity on the content of political attitudes.

The design of the research comprised two stages and is represented in Table 7.1 below. The aim of the first stage was to administer questionnaires to all females at the two types of school (private and state), sampling both age cohorts (including older cohort leavers). The aim of the second stage was to interview those who were matched for socio-economic background, derived from parental occupation.

Table 7.1: Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Younger cohort</th>
<th>1st stage</th>
<th>2nd stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/16 year-olds</td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>individual interviews for those with at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older cohort</td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>for those with at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18 year-olds (and those able to leave school two years earlier)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design and content of the two measures are given below: the 16-19 Initiative questionnaire (7.2) and the interview schedule (7.3)

7.2 Questionnaire Design and Content

The questionnaire was designed by the four core teams of the 16-19 Initiative (see Chapter 5 for details). The wide range of academic and empirical approaches in these teams was reflected in both the construction of the questionnaire and in its contents.

Two versions of the questionnaire were used in the first wave (year one) of the 16-19 Initiative. Twelve pages of questions were common to both questionnaires and are detailed below. Other questions were asked of the younger or older cohorts only (four pages each). Questions asked of the younger cohort only included post-16 plans, attitudes to education and part-time employment. Those questions asked of the older cohort only explored activities since age 16, examination results and attitudes to education and YTS.

The twelve pages common to both cohorts explored a broad range of areas. Four main areas were included:

a) Youth culture and lifestyle:
- favourite personalities
- facilities in the home
- who spends time with
- plans for marriage/children
- how often participates in a list of leisure activities

b) Multi-item scales:

A number of scales were included in the questionnaire: some of these measured political and socio-economic orientations and were utilised in the study. The scales were derived from a series of attitudinal statements, from which respondents chose one option from a five point scale (ranked on a
Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree). The following scales were derived from these questions:

**Employment and training scales:**
- support for new technology
- employment commitment
- work commitment
- belief in work (summary of two previous scales)
- support for YTS

**Self-perception scales:**
- self-esteem
- motivation
- depression
- self-confidence
- GHQ-12 (4 point scale)

**Politics scales:**
- anti-police
- opposition to authority
- anti-politics

c) **Political orientations**
One page of the questionnaire explored a limited range of political phenomena using fixed-choice responses. Respondents were asked about the following:
whether they would vote and if so for which party; whether they planned to join a trade union in the future; which social class (if any) they viewed themselves as being in; whether they had taken part in seven different political activities; how interested they were in politics.

d) **Biographical details:**
The final page of questions asked about the respondent's family, parents occupation, information about housing and disability, and ethnic origin. The last two pages contained space for personal comment, and asked respondent's to give their name and address.

The cohort specific and the core pages of the questionnaire are included as Appendix 1. Questions utilised in the current study are numbered; items comprising multi-item scales are also listed.
7.3 **Interview Design and Content**

This section describes the method of construction of the interview schedule, describes pilot work, and presents a summary of the content of the schedule.

7.3.1 **Interview Design Rationale**

The interviews were designed to provide the majority information on political attitudes (i.e., content), and also for the political process data. The development and content of the interview is given below.

7.3.2 **Original Areas and First Draft**

The first draft of the interview schedule included some questionnaire items areas in expanded form, and also introduced new areas derived from the literature. Some individual questions were taken directly from the literature, whilst others were devised by the author. Some question areas were also included in the interviews as a result of the author's involvement with the interview stage of the ESRC 16-19 Initiative. These unstructured interviews were undertaken first in late 1987 with one in ten of the main sample. Those interviews conducted by the author provided information about those areas of politics pertinent to young people.

The first draft of the interview schedule included questions on the following political and socio-economic areas (listed with their origin where appropriate):

- **Political interest and activity**
- Membership of political party (past and present)
- Voting plans (which party)
- History of party support
- If not planning to vote: reasons
- Discussion of politics with friends and family (from Stradling, 1977)
- Level of interest in politics
- Use of political media: TV news, newspapers etc
Knowledge of and attitudes to:
Main political parties and leaders
Local political parties and issues
Parliamentary procedures

Trade unions:
Anticipated future membership
View of trade union power
Right to strike
Strikes by public sector workers

Political power:
Political action and change
Attitudes to protest and civil disobedience
Expectation of violent change
(based on Gaskell and Smith, 1985; Breakwell, 1986; Banks and Ullah, 1987)

Careers and work:
Personal career planning
History of career planning
Importance of work

Pressure groups:
Membership (past and present)
Knowledge of different pressure groups and their aims
Attitudes to main pressure groups aims

Attributions:
Attributions for unemployment and poverty

Educational issues:
Perception of quality of education in private and state schools
Difference between two types of schools
View of fairness of private education
(different questions for two samples as appropriate)
View of political education in schools (based on Furnham and Gunter, 1987)

Social structure:
Own social class
Difference between social classes

Youth policy:
View of YTS
View of benefit changes

This first draft of the interview schedule focussed on collecting data on the content of political attitudes. The early draft also included questions designed to explore the process of political socialisation using Erikson's framework. Questions in the interview schedule therefore asked about respondents' level of interest in politics, voting behaviour and reasoning, history of political party support, and attitudes to the present government. These questions would
provide information on both existence of political commitment and history of exploration of alternatives.

7.3.3 Second and Third Drafts

Two subsequent versions (drafts two and three) of the interview schedule were undertaken. Draft two resulted from the comments of staff and students at the MRC/ESRC Social and Applied Psychology Unit. Draft three was a result of comments from researchers and lecturers in the Departments of Politics, Education and Sociology at the University of Sheffield.

Modifications were made to some existing questions to improve phraseology, and new question areas were added to the schedule. These covered the following areas (with their origin where appropriate):

- Job entitlement: for those with good qualifications, and for everyone (based on Derber, 1979).
- Estimate of benefit levels for the unemployed; views of increasing payments.
- Political process: view of the two party system and proportional representation.
- Taxation and the re-distribution of wealth: view of the community charge; distribution of wealth via tax policy; existence of north-south divide.

Questions relating to the above areas were incorporated into the first draft of the interview schedule. Each question area was included in the appropriate section of the interview schedule so as to ensure continuity of questioning. On completion of the third draft of the interview schedule, pilot work was undertaken at the private school.

7.3.4 Pilot Work

The first phase of pilot work was carried out early in 1988. It was undertaken at the private school with three females in the sixth year (ie 16 and 17 year-olds), who were not going to be included in the main sample. It was explained
to these pupils that the aim of the meeting was to find out more about them and their political views, and that pilot work involved checking that interview questions were understandable. They were therefore encouraged to comment on the structure and wording of the interview. The three interviews were undertaken separately and lasted between one and two hours, and each was tape recorded.

As a result of this pilot work some key changes were made to the interview schedule. The early sections of the interview schedule were altered in order to expand the information available on individuals and their career plans, and also to facilitate an easier and more informal opening to the interview. Additional questions were included about whether respondents had a religious commitment, as two of the pupils in the pilot study had strong religious commitments. A question exploring whether the respondent would protest against a law they thought was wrong was also amended. Four separate types of responses were specified, three that were within the law and one which involved breaking the law, as pilot work suggested this was an important distinction. The section on attitudes to education and the educational system was also expanded to further detail attitudes to private and state education.

7.3.5 Fourth and Final Drafts
The third version of the interview schedule was then sent to the Headteacher of the private school for her approval and comments. She recommended some minor changes in question phraseology to make the schedule more understandable, in particular for those questions exploring parental voting and political attitudes. These suggestions were included to create the fourth draft of the interview schedule. The fourth draft was again circulated for comment to staff and students at the University. A lower sixth pupil at the
private school was also interviewed as the second stage of pilot work; some minor changes to some questions were made as a result of subsequent discussions. Three related questions were also added, asking respondents how they defined capitalism, socialism, and politics. These terms are used frequently in the literature, but their meaning to different groups is rarely explored in empirical studies of political socialisation.

The final draft of the interview schedule (draft 5) is included as Appendix 2. This version of the interview schedule was used for both the private and state school sample. Some minor changes were necessary, however, to make the questions appropriate to the two sample of private and state educated samples. For example all references to the name of the school were changed. A question was also added to the private school interview schedule, asking whether pupils were on the Assisted Places Scheme. Finally some questions were altered so as to be appropriate to those in the older cohort who had left the school, and who were currently at work or in further education. (Those questions used for only one of the school types, or one cohort, are indicated in the final version of the schedule in the Appendix).

The final version of the interview schedule included pre-coded responses for some questions. Remaining questions were left open-ended so that the respondent could make a free response, and these questions were then category coded after the interviews were completed. (The mode of analysis of both the content and process data is detailed in section 7.5 and 7.6 of this Chapter).

7.3.6 Summary of Interview Content

The interview was structured so as to enable a smooth and logical flow from one area of questioning to another. This was the main criteria for ordering
the questions, and significant re-structuring of the interview was undertaken after the pilot work in order to achieve this. During the process of constructing the interview, however, individual questions and areas were also grouped into nine main themes. These themes were used to check that the interview schedule was complete, and to aid an understanding of the conceptual basis of the schedule. They were also used to structure the presentation of the results of political content. The content of the interview schedule is summarised below, using the nine themes:

1) Biographical/ personal details
   Age/sex/ school year
   Number of years at current school
   Experience of private education
   Plans for after leaving the school
   History of occupational planning
   Intended job/career
   Religious affiliation

2) Parents and family background
   Parents employment
   Family involvement in politics
   Parents party support

3) Attitudes to education
   Private sample - why sent to private school
   - benefits of private education
   - disadvantages to private education
   - fairness of private education
   - whether on APS
   State sample - experience of private education?
   - view of private/ state differences
   - whether private education should be allowed

Both groups - importance of educational qualifications

4) Work, training, and employment
   Reason for career choice/influences
   Importance of working
   Reasons for working
   Job entitlement beliefs
   Whether leave work if sufficient money
   Local and national labour market perceptions
   View of YTS
   View of YTS allowances
   View of unemployment benefit allowances
   Attributions for unemployment
   Role of trade unions/right to strike
   View of benefits for unemployed
5) Political environment
Level of interest in politics
Political activity
Discussion of politics: home and school
View of political education in schools
Use of political media: TV, newspapers, radio

6) Voting
Whether they would vote
Which party would vote for and why
Tactical voting
History of party political support

7) Party politics and the political process
Knowledge of (and support for) local and national politics and parties
Support for government policies
Policies of opposition parties
Party system: attitudes to electoral system and proportional representation
Role of/ types of taxation
Knowledge of, and support for, pressure groups
Join a pressure group in future?
Perception of local government

8) Rule of law
Possibility of violent change
Attitude to violent change
View of law-breaking and civil disobedience
View of life with no government

9) Society and social order
Impact of religious views on political views
Definitions of politics, socialism, capitalism
Causes of poverty
Treatment of women in society
View of human nature
Social class they belong to/ differences between classes
Is Britain/Sheffield divided?
View of development of personal morality and rules

7.4 Sample Selection and Collection of Data

This section details the method of selection and characteristics of the two sample schools, how subjects were contacted, and the subsequent procedure.

The private school sample is described (7.4.1) followed by the state school sample (7.4.2). Response rates and the final sample size are detailed.
7.4.1 Private School Sample

Choice of school and initial contact

In the area where the research was conducted, there were only a few private schools. One of these was approached first for access as it was the only school taking pupils up to the age of 18. This age group was necessary in order to select the older cohort (ie those aged 17/18). The private school was a large, single sex (girls only) private school in the north of England. For the previous two years a small number of boys had been admitted into the sixth form. The school took pupils from age 5-18, and participated in the Assisted Places Scheme. The school was well known in the city, and there was keen competition for places. Generally, it had a reputation for discipline, high academic standards, and good examination results.

Having contacted the school by letter, an initial meeting was held between the Headteacher, the author, and the supervisor of the research in November, 1987. As a result of this meeting the Headteacher agreed to allow access to the pupils in the age groups required. The Headteacher agreed access to all girls in the fifth year (those eligible to leave school in 1988) and the seventh year (those in the second year of A Levels, who were in the fifth year of education in 1986). Access was also agreed to the names and addresses of pupils in the older age cohort who left the school in 1986.

After the initial meeting with the Headteacher, some months were spent finalising the mode of selecting and contacting the sample. The Headteacher declined to give out the home addresses of the sample (as it was felt parents might object to this), and she therefore proposed contacting them through the school. The Headteacher asked that a letter addressed to parents be included in the initial contact with the pupils, so that parents could withdraw their child/children from the research if they wished.
Discussions with the Headteacher at the private school also led to some modifications to the initial research design. First, the Headteacher suggested the inclusion in the study of the boys currently at the school (thirteen boys who were all in the sixth form doing A Levels). This was agreed to by the author, with the aim of using this sample for comparisons with the main study of girls. Second, the Headteacher gave permission for some parents of pupils to be contacted and interviewed. The parent interviews were planned to provide both background information on the motivation of parents in sending their children to private schools, and to explore the political values of parents. The purpose of the latter information was to confirm pupils' perceptions of their parents' political orientations. Finally, the Headteacher stressed the need for feedback to be given to all those taking part in the study, and this was agreed to by the author.

Agreement with the Headteacher was reached to contact the four main groups to be sampled. These groups (and the numbers within each group) were as follows:

1) younger cohort: all 5th year girls (59 pupils).
2) older cohort: all 7th year girls (52 pupils).
   : those girls who left the school in 1986 (see later for details of this group)
3) all boys in the sixth form (13 pupils).

The total sample available was therefore 124 pupils, not including those who had left the school in the older cohort.

**Progress of the research: 5th and 7th year girls, and boys**

This section describes questionnaire administration to the fifth and seventh year pupils currently at the school, and the boys. (Questionnaire administration to those who left the school in 1986 is detailed in the following section).
The Headteacher agreed to distribute the initial package, via form tutors, to those in the three groups listed above. The package contained a letter from the author introducing the research, a letter to parents, and the Initiative's wave one questionnaire. The two age groups received either the older or younger questionnaire, as detailed in section 7.2. Packages were given out by form tutors in registration periods to all fifth years, seventh years and boys in early February, 1988. Form teachers were asked to keep packages for those absent from the registration period, and to give them out when they were next in the school.

The two letters explained the nature of the research, the link with the 16-19 Initiative and the University of Sheffield. The likely time commitment was detailed, and it was explained that some pupils would be selected and approached for an individual meeting. The confidentiality of all information given was stressed, and a contact address and phone number was given for parents or pupils who had questions about the research. The importance of subjects' adding their names and addresses to the back page was also stressed, as otherwise the person would not be able to be contacted for an interview. A copy of the letter to students is included as Appendix 3. A pre-paid envelope was included in the package for the return of the questionnaire.

Two weeks were allowed before contact was made with those who had not returned questionnaires. During this period 46 completed questionnaires (both cohorts combined) were returned, 37% of those sent out. In addition two questionnaires were returned with no name or address on the back cover (both seventh year questionnaires), and one package was returned with a note saying that the subject did not wish to take part in the research (a fifth year questionnaire). Two telephone enquiries were also received, one pupil
wanting more information about the research and one requesting another
questionnaire as they had lost the original.

Discussions were held with the Headteacher concerning how best to contact
those who had not returned questionnaires. It was agreed that letters via form
tutors would be inappropriate as form tutors would then be responsible for
sorting out those who had (and who had not) replied. Personal contact with
the sample was also considered likely to increase the response rate. Three
weeks after the first round of questionnaires were distributed, subjects were
brought together in the assembly hall during an extended registration period
and addressed by the author with no teachers or staff members present. The
purpose of the research was again explained to them, but in greater detail
than was possible in the original letter. Those who had already returned the
questionnaire were thanked for doing so, and reminded that some of them
would be contacted for interview over the next few months; several questions
were asked about this, mainly relating to the location and timing of the
interviews. Those who had not returned the questionnaire were asked to do
so as soon as possible. Several pupils who had not received packages from
their form tutors or who had lost them were given replacement packages. The
remainder of the meeting involved questions and discussions about the
research. Overall, pupils appeared to understand the nature and purpose of
the research, and many who had not returned questionnaires said that they
would now do so.

Over the following two weeks 34 more questionnaires were returned. In total,
80 questionnaires were returned from the private school, comprising 38 from
the fifth years, 34 from the seventh years, and 8 from the males. If all 124
pupils had initially received questionnaires, this gives a response rate of
64.5%.
Progress of the research: the 1986 school leavers

The Headteacher of the private school agreed to provide the names and addresses of those in the older cohort who left the school in 1986. However, an examination of school records showed that very few pupils left the school at the age of 16; the majority stayed on in the sixth form to do A Levels and so were included in the older cohort already contacted. The Headteacher and other members of staff confirmed that the 1986 cohort were not unusual: very few pupils left the school at age 16.

The group of 1986 school leavers was therefore smaller than anticipated, and only eight pupils were found to have left the school in 1986. The school did not have addresses for four of these pupils. The remaining four were contacted by post, receiving a similar package to the older cohort currently at the school. Three packages were subsequently returned as not known at the addresses they were sent to. The remaining package was not returned despite a reminder letter being sent. Thus none of the eight pupils who left the school in 1986 were able to be included in the study.

Private school: interviews

The research rationale was to select for interview those pupils at both schools who had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation, derived from parental occupation. After completing administration of questionnaires, an examination was made of parental occupations. To be included in the two categories at least one parent's occupation had to be either a professional one (lecturer, doctor, accountant), or be a managerial occupation (eg owner and manager of a business). Following the recommendation of Duke and Edgell (1987) both mothers and fathers occupations were coded; further, as Stradling (1977) proposed, if one parent's occupation was in a higher occupational category, the family as a whole was
coded as being in that category. Those retired were coded according to their pre-retirement occupation. Those occupations that were classified as being (and not being) in the professional/managerial categories are listed in Appendix 4. Further details of the occupational coding of this group, the coding of the parents of the state sample, and the results of a second coders ratings, are given in section 7.4.2.

Seventy-eight of the 80 subjects at the private school had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation. Of these 78 subjects, two of the questionnaires had been returned with no name or address and were therefore not able to be contacted for interview. Interviews were consequently planned for 76 of the private school sample, comprising 38 in the younger cohort and 38 in the older cohort (the latter group including the eight boys). Letters were sent to the two pupils at the private school who were not being interviewed. They were thanked for their help in completing the questionnaire, and told that a feedback sheet would be sent to them detailing the results of the study. Letters were then sent to the home addresses of the 76 pupils selected for interview, the letter thanking them for returning the questionnaire, and informing them that they would be contacted for an individual interview.

Subjects were told in the letter that the interviews would take 1-2 hours, and would be held on a date and time convenient to them in the evening, at the weekend, or if possible during the day. Further, they were told the interview could be held either at their home, at the University, or during a lunchtime at the school. The confidentiality of the interview was stressed. Arrangements were subsequently made with the Headteacher of the school to conduct interviews at the school in the lunchtime if pupils requested it, with one classroom set aside for this purpose during the period of the research.
The interviews with the private sample began in late March, 1988, and continued through to the end of August. The number of interviews conducted each week ranged from two to ten. No interviews were held during a five week period during late April and May as most pupils were taking GCSE and A Level exams. The procedure for arranging interviews was as follows: one evening a week six or seven subjects were telephoned and a date and time for the interview was arranged for sometime during the following week or ten days. Where a date could not be agreed between the author and the pupil (often because of subjects’ holiday or part-time employment commitments) they were contacted again approximately four weeks later. Only one subject (a seventh year pupil) declined to be interviewed when they were telephoned.

In total, 75 interviews were conducted with pupils at the private school. Of these, 54 were conducted in subjects homes, one at the University, and 20 at the school; several of those at the school were held over two successive lunchtimes. Length of interviews ranged from one and a half hours to two and three-quarter hours, and each interview was tape-recorded. Notes were made by the author during the interview, and the pre-coded items were coded straight onto the interview schedule; a detailed summary was also written immediately afterwards. At the end of each interview subjects were thanked for their help and told that they would receive a detailed feedback sheet on the results of the research. Many subjects asked questions about the research and these were answered as fully as possible after the interview.

**Private school: interviews with parents**

Interviews with the parents of some privately educated pupils were also undertaken. Twelve pupils were selected at random at the end of the interview stage of the research. Each was sent a letter explaining that the author would like to speak to their parents. It was stressed in this letter that
parents would not be contacted without subject's agreement and permission, and that parents would not be told anything the pupil had said in the questionnaire or the interviews. Of the 12 selected seven replies were received, and one letter was returned as not known at the address it was sent to. Five subjects agreed to their parents being contacted for an interview, and each added that they had discussed the matter with their parents. Two did not want their parents to be interviewed. Letters were sent to the five sets of parents in November, 1988, and one week later the parents were telephoned and a date and time arranged for the interview. None of the parents refused to be interviewed.

Interviews were held with parents over twelve weeks (November, 1988 - January, 1989), and were conducted in the respondents' homes. Of the five interviews, three were held with both parents, one with the mother only and one with the father only. There was no interview schedule devised for the meeting, rather the author had a list of areas to be used as a framework for the meeting. These areas included:

1. parents own educational and career history
2. perceptions of the state education system, and reasons for sending their children to a private school.
3. view of the private school: standards, values, influence of political development.
4. parents political values.

The interviews with parents lasted between forty minutes and two and a half hours. Each was tape recorded and a detailed summary written after the meeting. (The results of these interviews are not presented separately in the results chapters; however, they are mentioned in the discussion. Further information is available from the author if required).
7.4.2 State School Sample

Choice of school and initial contact

In selecting a state school, the aim was to locate one that was similar to the private school in terms of the socio-economic backgrounds of pupils attending it. This would satisfy the research aim of sampling those from similar backgrounds but with different educational experiences. A state school was therefore required that was likely to have a sufficiently high number of pupils with parents in professional and managerial occupations.

Three schools were located in the same geographical area as the private school that were likely to satisfy this criteria. The three schools comprised the top (i.e., most advantaged) end of a scale of advantage/disadvantage devised by the Local Council. The scale was based on census data utilising information on unemployment levels and type of housing in the area. One school was chosen from these three to be approached first for access, this approach proving successful.

A letter sent to the Headteacher of this School in September (1988) explained the purpose of the research and detailed the samples required. As for the private school this comprised those girls currently in the fifth year and seventh years. The letter also requested access to the names and addresses of those who were eligible to leave the school in the same year as those in the seventh year. Two meetings were subsequently held with the Headteacher and two year tutors during October 1988, when details of the study arranged.

The state school was a large co-educational comprehensive school, located in an affluent part of the city and near to the private school. Younger pupils (those aged 11-14) were on a site separate to the main school. The main school took pupils from the age of 14-18, had a large sixthform, and generally
had a reputation for discipline and high academic standards. The characteristics of this school were very similar to those of the private school. Most importantly, the Headteacher viewed the pupils at the school as having "very similar" backgrounds to those at the private school, thus contributing to the aim of selecting pupils with similar home and family backgrounds, but with different educational experiences. The Headteacher commented that:

"...the students at the school here are very similar to those at [private] School. Their parents are mainly professional people, though there are some from poorer backgrounds here too. Most of our parents here could have sent their children to a private school but didn’t. The two groups of students... well I think they’re as similar as they could be."

The Headteacher agreed to provide the names and addresses of all girls in the fifth and seventh years. He was unable to do this for those in the older cohort who had left the school two years earlier, however, as school records for this group were incomplete. He therefore suggested the author contact the local Careers Service, whose records were more likely to be up to date. The fieldwork procedures for these two groups (ie fifth and seventh years at the school, and those who left two years previously) are described separately below.

**Fieldwork procedure: 5th and 7th years**

During the first meeting between the author and the Headteacher, the latter suggested that pupils (and parents) would have to be notified about the research before a questionnaire was sent to them. Consequently, the Headteacher sent a letter to all girls in the fifth and seventh years via form tutors. This letter explained that the researcher might be contacting them to ask for their participation in a research study of young women and their attitudes to politics and related issues. Those who did not want to participate
in the research were asked to send a note to the Headteacher or to give their names to their form tutor.

Letters from the Headteacher to this group were distributed in early October, 1988. Letters were sent to 84 fifth year girls and 54 seventh year girls (assuming that each pupil did receive a letter). Six letters/names were passed to the Headteacher from those who did not want to be included in the study, five from the fifth year and one from the seventh year. Further, some pupils were not included because they were already taking part in the main 16-19 Initiative. The total number of girls available for sampling was therefore 68 fifth years and 48 seventh years, totalling 116.

Questionnaires were sent to the home addresses of this sample in late October, 1988. Included in the package were the Initiative's Time One questionnaire (using the older and younger cohort versions as appropriate), a letter from the researcher (an amended version of that sent to the private sample) and a pre-paid envelope. The covering letter explained the purpose of the research, stressed confidentiality, and explained that some people would be contacted for an individual interview.

During the following two weeks 48 completed questionnaires were returned. Three questionnaires were returned blank, with one returned with no name or address. Reminder letters were later sent to all those who had not returned questionnaires. As a result an additional 32 completed questionnaires were returned. The total number of questionnaires received from the state sample was therefore 80, which represented a response rate of 68.9% (using 116 as the base of questionnaires sent out).
Fieldwork procedure: the older cohort school leavers

The author contacted the Careers Office by letter in October 1988, regarding the older cohort leavers who left the school in 1987. This was followed by a meeting at the Office with a senior member of the careers staff. Agreement was reached to provide the names and addresses of all girls who left the state school in 1987, which according to records was 66 girls. The Careers Service requested that a letter from the Service be included in the packages sent to this group, explaining that participation in the study was voluntary, and that all information collected would be kept confidential. This was included in the packages sent out.

Packages were sent to all this sample, except for four individuals who were participating in the main 16-19 Initiative study. The package sent to the group included the older cohort questionnaire, a pre-paid envelope, and a letter introducing the research (an amended version of the private school letter included as Appendix 3). The letter explained that the author was contacting those currently at the school, as well as those who had left at age 16. It was also explained that some people would be contacted for interview, and that each person would receive a feedback sheet on the results.

Packages were sent to this group on 19 December, 1988. Over the following four weeks, 14 completed questionnaires were received. A further 6 packages were returned as not known, and two were returned uncompleted. Reminder letters to those who had not returned questionnaires were sent in January, 1989 and a further 15 questionnaires were returned completed. The total number of questionnaires returned was therefore 29. Not including the six packages returned as not known, and the four subjects in the Initiative, 29 returns from 56 represents a response rate of 51.7%. The majority of this group were found to be on YTS or in full-time employment.
The "state school sample" referred to below (and in the rest of this thesis) includes both those at the school at the time of the study, as well as those contacted via the Careers Service. The total state school sample was therefore 109.

State schools: interviews

At the private school (see section 7.4.1) subjects were chosen for interview by selecting those with parent(s) in professional and managerial occupations. The same process was followed for the state sample (including those contacted via the Careers Service), with subjects selected for interview if they had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation.

A second coder (a postgraduate psychology student) undertook the task of coding parental occupation to ensure accuracy of coding. This was done for both the private and state school samples. A list of those occupations classified as being (and not being) in the professional/managerial category is included as Appendix 4 for the two schools combined. Coding of parental occupation achieved a high degree of agreement between the author and the second coder. Where an occupation was difficult to classify, the partner's occupation was often found to be professional or managerial so the pupil was included for interview. In the list of occupations of private school parents, disagreements were only found for two occupations, and these were resolved after further discussion. For the state school parents four occupations were coded differently by the author and the coder. For two of the parents concerned, their partner was in a professional or managerial occupation and so were included in the interview study. The remaining two occupations were discussed, with one allocated to the professional/managerial category, and one not in either of these categories.
Following coding of parental occupation at the state school, 62 of the 109 pupils were selected for interview. Of the older cohort 36 were currently at the school, with three from those who had left two years previously; 23 were in the younger cohort. Letters were sent to each of those not being interviewed on 12th January, 1989. These subjects were thanked for their help in completing the questionnaire, and told they would receive a feedback sheet on the results. Two days later letters were sent to those who were to be interviewed, saying that they would be telephoned sometime during the following few months to arrange an interview date and time. Again, respondents were told that interviews would be held on a date and time convenient to them, and could be held in their home, at the University department, or during a lunchtime at the school.

Interviews with the state school sample began in late January, 1989, and continued through to July, 1989. Numbers of interviews per week ranged from two to eleven, with only a few interviews conducted during the exam period (mid-April to mid-June). In total, 60 interviews were conducted from the original 62 selected for interview. The two not interviewed declined to be interviewed when they were telephoned; both were in the older cohort and currently at the school. The majority of subjects (46) were interviewed in their homes; of the remainder two were interviewed at the University and 12 at the school during the lunchtime (with some undertaken over two lunchtimes). The method of conducting the interviews was the same as for the private school: Notes were made during the interview, and pre-coded items were coded on the interview schedule. Each interview was tape-recorded, and a detailed summary written immediately after. Length of interviews ranged from one to two-and-a-half hours.
Summary of the samples: both schools combined

The total number of subjects in the study (at the questionnaire and interview stages) are given below in Table 7.2:

Table 7.2: Description of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>younger</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>left '87</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>younger</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>left '88</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both schools</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: this figure includes the eight males.

7.5 and 7.6 Analysis of the Data

Two distinct modes of data analysis were undertaken, one for the content and one for the process data. The first type of analysis investigated differences in the content of political attitudes of those educated in private and state schools. Data for this was taken from both the questionnaires (selected parts) and the interviews. The second type of analysis investigated differences in the process of developing a political identity in private and state educated young people. Data for this was taken from the interviews only, and follows the modes of analysis of Erikson and Marcia (as described in detail in Chapter 3). These two modes of analysis are therefore described separately below.
7.5 Coding of Content Data

This section describes the coding of the content data from the questionnaires (7.5.1) and interviews (7.5.2).

7.5.1 Coding of Questionnaire Data

Only certain parts of the questionnaire were utilised in the current study. However, it was decided to code the entire questionnaire in order to use the information to write the feedback sheets for the respondents. The core pages of the questionnaire, and the four pages for each age cohort, are included as Appendix 1. The majority of questions used fixed choice options (including Likert items which formed the scales) and were coded accordingly. Those questions which were open-ended were coded according to the 16-19 Initiative wave one coding manual, developed in conjunction with MARPLAN. Data were entered onto the SPSS-X data analysis system. Each subject was given an identifying case number, followed by codes for sex, school type and year (cohort). Data were then entered for the two sets of cohort specific sections (ie the first four pages), and then for the core sections.

Questions relating to such areas as favourite personalities, spare time activities, attitudes, and voting, were used to write the detailed feedback information sent to the two samples. The feedback sheets, six pages long for each school, were sent to all those who returned questionnaires. Copies were also sent to the Headteachers at each school, and the author had individual meetings with them to discuss the results of the study further.

Seven of the scales included in the questionnaire were used in the author's study. Certain individual items were reversed so that there were positive and negative poles for each scale. Some individual items on three scales were removed to increase the alpha coefficient of the scale. (Details of the scales
and scale items are included in Appendix 1). The scales used, with their alpha coefficients, were as follows:

**Employment and training scales**

- employment commitment (alpha .7)
- work commitment (alpha .7)
- belief in work (alpha .7)
- support for YTS (alpha .6)

**Politics scales**

- anti-police (alpha .6)
- opposition to authority (alpha .7)
- anti-politics (alpha .6)

Additionally, the questionnaire included (for the older cohort) information on CSE and GCSE exams and results. These were coded according to the ILEA points system to obtain a single score. Points were allocated and totalled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Level</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.5.2 Coding of Interview Data**

The three types of coding of the interview data, with examples, were as follows:

1. **Questions taken from the literature**: responses were coded according to the original author, and the code was noted during the interview.

   Eg 'How interested are you in politics?'
   - Code 1 = very interested
   - Code 2 = quite interested
   - Code 3 = not very interested
   - Code 4 = not at all interested
   (from Mardle and Taylor, 1987)

2. **Questions devised by the author (a)**: some of these questions were coded before the interview, with responses coded during the interview itself.

   Eg 'How often do you discuss politics with your parents?'
   - Code 1 = never
(3) Questions devised by the author (b): those not coded in (a) above were coded according to a standardised coding schedule after all the interviews were completed.

Eg 'Are there any disadvantages to private education?'
   Code 1 = narrow mix of people
   Code 2 = too academic
   Code 3 = teased/called a snob
   Code 4 = don't know young people in own area
   Code 5 = very hard work
   Code 6 = no disadvantages

The coding frame used for both (2) and (3) above was discussed extensively with researchers at the Social and Applied Psychology Unit, resulting in some modifications. The length of the interviews made it impractical for a second coder to undertake coding of the interviews. However, the considerable discussion of the coding frame is considered to have ensured accuracy and consistency of coding. The interview schedule and coding frame for all questions is included as Appendix 2.

Coding of the 135 interviews was undertaken shortly after the final interview at the state school, using the interview schedule and the tape-recording of each interview. Data from the interview for each individual were added to the appropriate SPSS-X file containing the questionnaire data.

7.6 Analysis of the Process Data

Two analyses were undertaken to explore political identity in the sample, using the interview data. The aim was to gain two pieces of information for each individual:

(1) whether or not subjects showed evidence of having, or not having, a political identity. This was defined as evidence of a clear, firm, and integrated commitment to a political ideology.
(2) which identity status subjects were in, using Marcia’s four-fold typology of identity achievement, diffusion, moratorium, or foreclosure.

The reader is referred to Chapter 3 for details of these categories.

Information used to code political identity was taken from question areas including level of interest in politics, voting behaviour and reasoning, history of political party support, and attitudes to the present government and its policies. These areas revealed both current political commitments, and how the individual had dealt with political issues in the past; these were the central two tenets of both Erikson’s and Marcia’s work. To isolate the information relating to the above areas, the section of the interviews covering these questions were transcribed for each individual. An example of a political transcript can be seen in Appendix 5. The author then undertook two tasks for each transcript, coding whether the subject showed evidence of having (or not having) a political identity, and coding which of the four categories the subject was in. This method would reveal both process in terms of both current commitment and history of exploration in the political domain.

In addition to undertaking these two tasks for political identity, it was decided to undertake the same tasks for occupational identity. This decision was taken for two reasons. First, it was suggested earlier that the development of occupational plans is a key component of an individual’s socio-economic framework. Thus the early part of the individual interviews investigated subjects’ current career aims and how they had explored career options in the past. Exploring this aspect of identity might reveal differences between private and state educated young people in the development of an occupational identity.
A second reason for coding occupational identity emerged from identity theory itself. The literature review discussed research which has identified a link between movements in one identity domain and movements in another (e.g., Meilman, 1979; Grotevant and Thorbecke, 1982). Coding of occupational identity would therefore enable exploration of patterns of identity development, investigating the relationship between exploration and commitment in one domain (politics) with exploration and commitment in another domain (occupation).

The same two tasks were therefore undertaken for the occupational domain as for the political domain. To do this, sections were transcribed from the 135 interviews relating to occupational planning. These sections included questions relating to the following areas: plans for after leaving school and the next few years; type of work aimed for eventually; development of interest in chosen career area; length of time wanted to pursue a particular occupation. For those with no career plans, their past thinking about different types of work was explored. These question areas would provide evidence of current occupational status and also mode of past exploration of occupational issues. The questions were very similar to those used by Marcia (1966), who operationalised identity in terms of commitment to an occupation and types of decision-making in occupational planning. An example of an occupational transcript is included as Appendix 6.

Two transcripts were therefore available for each of the 135 individual subjects (totalling 270 transcripts), one relating to political identity and one to occupational identity. Each subject's transcripts were coded on the two criteria highlighted earlier; i.e., evidence of commitment and identity status for the domains of occupation and politics. The four statuses (from Marcia, 1966) are as follows:
(a) Identity achievement: individuals in this status have seriously explored options and alternatives and come to a decision to which they are committed.
(b) Moratorium: individuals in this status are currently 'in crisis', uncertain about their views in the area but showing attempts to resolve the crisis.
(c) Foreclosure: individuals in this status have commitments, but have not experienced a period of exploration of alternatives.
(d) Identity diffusion: individuals in this status have no commitments, and show no evidence of trying to make any. They may never have had a period of uncertainty, or they may have had one but been unable to resolve it.

The first task, deciding whether or not the subject had a political (or occupational) identity, effectively determined the second task, that of coding according to the four statuses. This was because if a subject was coded as having an identity in a domain, they would have to subsequently be coded (in the second task) as either in the identity achievement or foreclosure statuses; ie the two statuses for those having an identity. Similarly, a subject not having a political or occupational identity must subsequently be categorised as being in the moratorium or identity diffusion status.

The transcripts for political and occupational identity were also coded by two postgraduate psychology students. The two coders were given coding instructions which included details of the sample and the interviews. The content of the transcripts was described, and the two tasks to be undertaken for each transcript were detailed. The author met with each coder, and went through each of the tasks to ensure they were understood. Each coder and the author then independently undertook coding of four pilot transcripts taken from interviews with subjects at the private school who had been involved in pilot work. Any issues about which coders were uncertain or unclear were clarified during this period. Coders were then given the 135
subjects transcripts (totalling 270 transcripts), and coding sheets on which to score the two tasks. A "not enough information" category was added for both task 1 and task 2 to be used when coders felt unable to score a transcript. (Copies of both the coding instructions and score sheets are included as Appendix 7. A clearer understanding of this part of the analysis is likely if the reader refers to these at this stage).

The scores of the two coders were combined with those of the author. The first stage of analysis for inter-rater reliability used the criteria of agreement between all three raters. The results were as follows:

Table 7.3: Agreement Between Three Coders on Identity *
(n=135 for each of the four categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>127 (94.07%)</td>
<td>122 (90.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>127 (94.07%)</td>
<td>115 (85.18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: scores per task are given, with percentage agreement between all three coders for that task in parentheses.

For the remaining cases (ie where all three coders were not in agreement), the criteria was used of agreement between two out of three raters. As there were no cases on which all three coders disagreed, two out of three rater agreement was therefore used to code all the remaining cases not included in Table 7.3 above. These figures for inter-rater reliability compare well with agreement rates given by earlier researchers (for eg Kroger, 1988).
7.7 Data Analyses

Results presented in the following two chapters give the content and process data for the 135 respondents who were interviewed, and primarily for the 127 female respondents, (67 from the private school and 60 from the state school). Type of school was used as the main comparative analysis undertaken. Some analyses are also given by cohort. Results for the eight males and the 21 females on the Assisted Places Scheme at the private school are given in summarised form at the end of Chapter 9, giving both content and process results for these two groups.

7.7.1 Content of Political Socialisation

The nine content themes (see section 7.3.6), with selected parts of the questionnaire data also incorporated, were condensed into seven themes for use in analysis and presentation of results. The first two themes (detailing biographical/personal details and parents and family background) were combined, and are presented separately in the first results chapter (8.1). The seven remaining themes were those on attitudes to education (8.2) and the six main political and socio-economic areas (8.3-8.8). Each theme is sub-divided into its main topic areas. Data within the seven themes were analysed using school type as the main unit of comparison. It should be noted that the primary aim of the content analyses was to describe and "map out" the samples' political attitudes, comparing one sample with the other and not in relation to national samples or other populations of young people. The content analyses were therefore undertaken using frequencies and percentages per school, with chi-squared analyses used as a measure of association between school type and individual variables. T-test analyses were undertaken for the scales and continuous measures.
A measure of overall political orientation was also derived from the interviews. The aim was to provide an assessment of the general political orientation of the respondent, which could then be used within both the content and process analyses. The assessments of political "type" were derived from the interview transcripts used for the political identity domain.

Following an analysis of the content of the interviews, four categories of overall party support were noted: Conservative, Labour, Liberal/SDP, and Green. In addition two categories were added: one for those respondents who were undecided, and one for those who were anti-politics and who said they would not vote. This method of coding for overall political orientation enabled an assessment that was not based solely on voting intent. Each of the 135 respondents was consequently assessed by the author for overall political type.

As in the analysis of the process data (described in section 7.6 earlier), two additional coders therefore undertook the same task for 30 randomly selected respondents. (Instructions for this coding are included as Appendix 8). In addition to the six categories of political type described above, a "none of these" code was added. The results of this reliability coding demonstrated a 100% agreement rate, with all three coders agreeing for all 30 transcripts. These overall political type results were then used in the content and process analyses.

7.7.2 Process of Political Socialisation

Section 7.6 earlier described the analyses of the interview data undertaken to reveal political identity commitment and identity category. The same two tasks were undertaken for the occupational identity domain. Comparative analyses were undertaken for the two schools on these measures, and also for the APS/non-APS students, per age cohort, and for the male sample.
Additional analyses were also undertaken relating the results for political content (using the overall political type measure) to political process, and also by relating the results for the political identity domain with those for the occupational identity domain. Additionally, four case studies of the political identity categories are included.

The majority of the results for the process data are presented using frequencies and percentages per school. Comparative analyses were undertaken using the chi-square test, a statistical test designed for use with data where subjects are in categories. The chi-square statistic tests a hypothesis of the likelihood of subjects falling into different categories by chance, by comparing observed with expected frequencies per cell (see for example Green and D'Oliveira; 1982). Following widely used conventions, chi-squared results are not used where expected frequencies are less than five (see Hagenaars, 1990). Further, following Hammerton (1975), categories are grouped where necessary in order to increase cell sizes; however, this is only undertaken where these groupings might have naturally occurred.

7.8 Summary of Method: Measures, Samples, Analyses

The aim of the research, which emerged from a review of the literature, was to explore the role of the school experience in the political socialisation of youth. This was operationalised in a comparison of the political and socio-economic attitudes of private and state educated females. A primary aim of the empirical study was the exploration of both the content and the process of political socialisation.

Two samples of girls were selected for study, one from a private school and one from a state school. Two age cohorts were selected, matching the age cohorts in the 16-19 Initiative. Those in the older cohort who had left the two
schools were also included. One hundred and eighty nine respondents completed the Initiative's wave one questionnaire, including eight boys at the private school. From this initial group respondents were selected for individual interview, matched for socio-economic background using the criteria of parental occupation. A semi-structured interview schedule was constructed, exploring political, socio-economic and occupational values in detail. In total 135 individual interviews were conducted, 75 from the private school and 60 from the state school. In addition, interviews were undertaken with a small number of private school parents and careers staff at both schools.

Data from both the questionnaires and interviews were used in the analyses. The interview data was used in two ways. First, it was coded according to a coding schedule based on content analysis of responses; additionally, a measure of overall political type was included. The information from the questionnaires and interviews was then used to investigate the content of political socialisation. A second mode of analysis used the interview data (in the form of transcripts) to code political identity commitment and category (based on the framework discussed in Chapter 3). This gave information on political commitment and identity status, with high levels of inter-rater reliability achieved for three coders. These two tasks were also undertaken for occupational identity.

Analyses were undertaken separately for the content and process data, (and these are therefore presented separately in the following two chapters). The content results (given in Chapter 8) are presented according to seven themes, which explore the political and socio-economic attitudes of the school groups. The process data (presented in Chapter 9) are presented using cross-tabulations, giving frequencies, percentages and chi-square tests. As for the
content results, analyses were undertaken primarily comparing the two school groups. Chapter 9 additionally relates the occupational and political identity results, and explores the link between overall political type (from the content data) and the process results. Additionally, the content and process results for the APS/non-APS pupils and the males at the private school are summarised at the end of Chapter 9.

The following two chapters presents the results of the empirical study, with Chapter 8 presenting the content data and Chapter 9 the process data.
CHAPTER 8: RESULTS (1): THE CONTENT OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

This Chapter gives the results for the content of political socialisation. It is divided into three parts. Part One details the samples' characteristics (8.1.1) and their career plans (8.1.2). Part Two gives the results for the seven themes of political and socio-economic attitudes (sections 8.2 to 8.8). A brief summary is included at the end of each theme. Part Three gives the results for the assessment of overall political type by school (8.9.1), and by comparing parents and pupils (8.9.2). Finally, there is a summary of the results of the content of political socialisation (8.10).

Notes:

(1) The questionnaire and interview questions (and their coding frameworks) are included as Appendices 1 and 2. Questions are referred to in this Chapter (at the beginning of each section) by their question number in those appendices. Those questions beginning with 'Q' indicate questionnaire items (with the addition of a 'Y' indicating a younger cohort only question and an 'L' an older cohort one). Questions beginning with an 'I' refer to interview questions. Original question phraseology and mode of coding are also given in the appendices.

(2) Many of the tables in this Chapter give numbers per school: unless otherwise indicated, figures in parentheses following these numbers are percentages per school.

PART ONE

8.1 Sample Characteristics and Career Plans

This section gives demographic and other information about the sample, relating first to the characteristics of the sample (8.1.1), and second to their future occupational plans (8.1.2).
8.1.1 Sample Characteristics
(Questions Q5L, Q13, I1, I2, I8ab, I14, I16, I17)

a. Numbers in each group

The numbers within each of the groups, with mean ages, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Both cohorts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Both cohorts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. This sample includes 21 female pupils on the APS.
      2. Eight older cohort males were interviewed who are not included in this table.

Table 8.1 above shows a higher mean age of 17.3 for the state school sample, reflecting the larger proportion of subjects in the older cohort at the school.

b. Current status

The majority of subjects in the study were full-time school pupils at the time of data collection. This accounted for all the private school females (67 subjects) and for 57 of the 60 females in the state school sample. All the younger cohort females were undertaking GCSE examinations in the year of the interviews, and a minority had taken these exams at the time of the interview. The older cohort females currently attending the two schools were all undertaking (A Level) examination courses. Included in the older cohort of the state sample were three subjects who left the school in 1987; each had pursued a different career path.
since leaving the school at the age of sixteen, involving education, employment and unemployment. At the time of the interview two were working and one was in full-time education.

c. Academic achievement

The private sample had a significantly higher level of academic achievement. The O Level examination results (available for older cohort subjects only) were coded according to the ILEA points system, with a higher composite score demonstrating a higher level of academic achievement. Table 8.2 below gives the results (means and standard deviations) per school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=29)</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=37)</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 above shows a higher mean score for the private school sample (58.0) than the state sample (51.5). The difference of 6.5 between the means is equivalent to approximately one good O Level pass. T-test results showed a very significant difference between the means of the two samples (t=2.9, df 63.9, p<.01).

d. Educational history

For the private sample, the total number of years in private education ranged from three to 14 years (mean 8.25 years; standard deviation 3.07). The number of years at the private school they were currently attending also ranged from three to 14 (mean 6.88 years; standard deviation 2.73). Just under one half of
this group had attended a state sector school in the past, mainly at primary level. All 60 of the state sample had been educated within the state sector, except for one older cohort female who had attended a private school for one year to re-take her O Levels.

e. Family background

It was a criteria for interview selection that each subject had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation. All the private school fathers were working full-time, as were 55 of the 60 state school fathers (the remainder were unemployed or retired). The majority of mothers of both samples were also working. The APS pupils were found to have distinctive backgrounds. Of the 21 pupils on the APS, 14 had parents who were divorced. The majority of APS pupils also had only one parent in a professional or managerial occupation, compared with the majority of non-APS pupils, who generally had both parents in these categories. Further, the APS parents’ occupations were generally more managerial than professional, often those occupations subject to dispute between the two coders as to whether they should be classified in the professional or managerial categories. This suggests some differences in the backgrounds of APS and non-APS pupils, the implications of which are discussed in Chapters 9 and 10.

Results for educational history of parents showed that a greater proportion of private school parents had been educated privately. Of the 67 privately educated pupils, 27 mothers and 27 fathers had been to a private school (40.3% of each group). For the state school parents six mothers (10.0%) and five fathers (8.3%) had been educated privately.
f. Religious commitment

Results showed a greater level of religious commitment amongst the private sample. Of the 67 in the private sample, 40 (59.7%) described themselves as having a religious commitment; of these 38 pupils were Christian, one was Jewish and one was Hindu. For the state sample 26 subjects (43.4%) had a religious commitment; this comprised 22 Christian, one Jewish, two Hindu, and one Buddhist.

8.1.2 Career Plans by School

(Questions Q1Y, Q4Y, Q6L, 14, 16)

Age planning to leave school

Results for the younger cohort on age planning to leave school were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18 or over</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(94.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: one subject at each school had missing data on this question; valid percentages used.

Table 8.3 above indicates that the majority of the younger cohort at both schools were planning to stay on at school until the age of 18 or over, with a greater proportion in this category at the private school. A crosstabulation of those leaving school aged 18 and over, with all other categories, showed a very significant association between attending the private school and staying on at school longer (chi-squared = 7.2, df = 1, p < .01).
Routes and plans post-16

The majority of subjects at both schools (but a greater proportion at the private school) were planning to take A Levels. Of the 67 in the private sample, 65 (97.0%) said they were planning to do A Levels; this compared with 52 of the 60 (86.7%) in the state sample. The remainder at both schools were either planning to look for work, attend other (mainly vocational) courses, or were undecided.

The majority of those aiming to undertake A Levels were then planning to enter higher education. This is shown by the post-18 routes given in Table 8.4 below:

Table 8.4: Plans Post A Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=65)</th>
<th>State (n=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University/ Polytechnic</td>
<td>57 (87.7)</td>
<td>28 (56.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for work</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/ College course</td>
<td>4 (6.2)</td>
<td>8 (16.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year off/ then Univ/Poly</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>6 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ undecided</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
<td>6 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: two subjects at the state school had missing information on this question; valid percentages used.

The results of this Table shows that the majority of both samples were planning to continue their education on to University or Polytechnic. Combining these figures with those who planned to enter University or Polytechnic after a year off increases the numbers to 89.2% of pupils at the private school and 68.0% at the state school, showing that a greater proportion of private school pupils were aiming for University or Polytechnic. A crosstabulation of those pupils planning to go to University or Polytechnic (with and without a year off), and all other categories, showed a significant association between the private sample and planned attendance at University/ Polytechnic (chi-squared = 7.96, df1, p < .01).

It must also be remembered that Table 8.4 (above) details the post-18 plans only
for those planning to do A Levels, which was previously demonstrated to account for a greater proportion of private school pupils.

Career aims and history of occupational planning

A greater proportion of the private sample were planning to enter the highest level professional careers. Results for expected job type were as follows:

Table 8.5: Expected Job Type by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job type</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional 1</td>
<td>41 (61.2)</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 2</td>
<td>22 (32.8)</td>
<td>15 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4 (6.0)</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5 shows almost two-thirds of the private sample were aiming for the highest status professional careers (such as law, medicine, and accountancy), compared with one third (33.3%) aiming for these careers at the state school. A crosstabulation (combining the two professional categories, and the three other categories) showed a very significant association between school type and job type (chi-squared = 20.3, df1, p < .01). It is also of note that one third of the state sample were undecided about their future work.

The private sample had also made their career choices much earlier than the state sample. Using mean number of months each sample had wanted to do their chosen work, the private school mean was 24.5 months (standard deviation 17.7), the state school mean was 17.3 months (standard deviation 14.5). T-test results showed a significant difference between the two samples on length of occupational planning (t = 2.22, df 90.0, p < .05), with the private sample having
decided on an occupation earlier; it should be noted that there was a predominance of older cohort pupils at the state school.

PART TWO
Chapter 7 detailed the nine conceptual themes which comprised the content of political and socio-economic attitudes, with seven of these themes subsequently used to provide the framework for presenting these results. The results for the seven themes are given here, with a brief summary given at the end of each theme. (Where described, results are for one age cohort or one school sample only).

8.2 Theme 1: Attitudes to Education
Different questions on attitudes to education were asked of the private and state samples. The results are therefore presented separately below, for the private school (8.2.1) and the state school (8.2.2). Additionally, results are given of a number of questions asked of both samples (8.2.3).

8.2.1 Results for the Private School Sample
(Questions I11, I12, I13, I15ab)

Reasons for attending a private school
The private sample believed their parents had sent them to a private school primarily because of the better academic education they would receive there. Also, many parents felt that the local state school was poor; as the private school pupils were drawn from a wide geographical area this included a range of schools. These results are in Table 8.6 below, which gives first, second, and third reasons for being sent to a private school. The total number of times each reason was given is also included, with each total expressed as a percentage of the total number of reasons given, i.e. 182:
Table 8.6: Reasons for Attending a Private School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded an APS place</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better academic education</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better overall education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local state school poor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents educated privately</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better type of person</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6 above shows that the belief that pupils would obtain a 'better academic education' was the reason most often named for attending a private school (31.3% of the combined responses). One student was representative of many when she said in response to this question:

"Well, I mean it has to be that you get a better academic education doesn't it? There'd be no point in coming here otherwise. At this school people get more O and A Levels and at better grades, everyone does."

The view that the 'local state school was poor' was also an important reason (15.9%), in addition to the view that a 'better type of person' attended private schools (13.2%). Those referring to the latter reason often explained this in similar terms to the following student:

"What do I mean? Well it's just that here people's families are quite well off. They're here to learn and get a really good education. Basically, there's no idiots around as there are in state schools."

It is of note also that 16 of the 21 APS pupils named gaining an APS place as a reason for attending the school.

Benefits of private education

The benefits of a private education were seen by pupils mainly as gaining a better academic education and better discipline. This is demonstrated by the
results of Table 8.7 below (with up to three responses listed and totalled as previously):

Table 8.7: Benefits of Private Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and status</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better academic education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better overall education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better discipline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better group of people</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(66*) (65) (23) (154)

* note: one subject had missing data on this question

Table 8.7 indicates considerable similarity between the benefits of private education as perceived by the pupils, and the reasons they believed their parents had sent them to a private school. The main benefit of private education (accounting for 38.3% of total responses) was seen as 'better academic education'. Additionally, 'better discipline', a 'better group of people' and 'better overall education' were named as benefits.

Disadvantages of private education

The disadvantages to private education related mainly to teasing and abuse from pupils at other schools, and also the very hard work involved. This is shown by the results of Table 8.8 below:
Table 8.8: Disadvantages of Private Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow mix of people</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too academic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased/called a snob</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know young people in own area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very hard work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disadvantages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.8 show that being teased and "called a snob" was seen as the main disadvantage to private education (accounting for 28.4% of total responses). The following student explained the problem:

"It is very difficult for many of us. The uniform is the main problem, because everyone knows which school you're from. It's very unpleasant being called a snob and having things thrown at you. It's particularly bad for the younger year groups, they have a lot of it directed at them".

Additional disadvantages were the 'very hard work' and the 'narrow mix of people' who attended the school.

Fairness of private education

Almost all of the private school sample believed that, overall, private education was fair. The results of Table 8.9 below demonstrate this:

Table 8.9: View of Fairness of Private Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These views on fairness were explored further. The three subjects believing private education was unfair each added that despite this, this was "just the way things are". Those viewing private education as fair (61 subjects) named one of
three different reasons. First, the existence of the APS; second, that everyone has a choice about what to do with their money; third, that fees are not particularly high and most people could go if parents were prepared to make real sacrifices.

8.2.2 Results for the State School Sample
(Questions I18ab, I19)

Differences between private and state schools
The majority of the state sample viewed private schools as different to state schools. This accounted for 58 (96.6%) of the 60 subjects, with the remaining two subjects believing there were no differences. The subjects who believed there were differences focussed on the better academic achievement of private school pupils, and the view that only rich people attended them. These results are given in Table 8.10 below:

Table 8.10: Differences Between Private and State Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better academic achievement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better teaching/facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended only by rich people</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered environment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that in addition to the two differences described above, private schools were described as having better teaching and facilities, and to be a sheltered environment.

Should private education be allowed?
The majority of the state sample did not think that private schools should be abolished, as demonstrated in Table 8.11 below:
Table 8.11: Continued Existence of Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be allowed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be banned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.11 shows that less than one third (31.7%) of state school pupils believed that private schools should be abolished.

8.2.3 Results for the Two School Groups

(Questions I20ab, Q2Y, Q3Y)

Importance of education

The majority of pupils at both schools considered education and educational qualifications were very important, both to get on in life and to them personally.

This is demonstrated in the results of Table 8.12 below:

Table 8.12: Importance of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>a) &quot;In life&quot;</th>
<th>b) &quot;To you&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
<td>State (n=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>61 (91.0)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>36 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.12 shows the high level of importance attached to education by both samples. The results also show that the private sample were more likely to say that education and educational qualifications were 'very' important, both in life and to them personally. Further, no privately educated pupils believed that
education and qualifications were 'not very' important, compared with 9% and 18.3% respectively of state school pupils.

Satisfaction and value of education

The younger cohorts at both schools were found to be generally satisfied with their education, and to believe it to have been of value. Table 8.13 below gives these results:

Table 8.13: Satisfaction (a) and Value (b) of Education (younger cohort only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=38)</th>
<th>State (n=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>16 (42.1)</td>
<td>5 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
<td>20 (52.6)</td>
<td>15 (65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied/dissat.</td>
<td>2 (5.2)</td>
<td>2 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Value*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very valuable</td>
<td>30 (78.9)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly valuable</td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very valuable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: one state educated pupil had missing data on this question; valid percentages used.

It is of note that, as for the previous question on views of the importance of education, the private sample were more likely to say they were 'very' satisfied and believe their education to have been 'very' valuable. (Chi-square analyses not undertaken on the attitudes to education questions because of expected frequencies of less than five).

Summary of Theme 1: Attitudes to Education

The private sample believed they received a better academic education at their school, and that the school was more disciplined; their views on the benefits of
private education reflected the reasons given for why their parents had sent them to a private school. Disadvantages to private education mainly related to teasing and bullying, and the hard work involved. Almost all this group believed that overall private education was fair, justifying its existence in terms of the APS, freedom of choice, and the low level of fees. The majority of the state sample believed private schools were different to state schools, in particular because of the better academic results achieved in the private sector and the wealthy families who use the schools. Less than a third of the state sample wanted private education banned, however. The majority of both samples believed education was important, and most were also satisfied with their education and believed it to have been of value.

8.3 Theme 2: Work, Training, and Employment

8.3.1 Career Plans: Reasoning and Influences

(Questions 15, 17)

It was demonstrated earlier (8.1.2) that the majority of both samples were aiming for careers in professional occupations. It was also shown, however, that the private sample were more likely to be aiming for the highest level professional(1) occupations, and that a third of the state sample were undecided about their future occupation. Additionally, a significant difference was found on length of time the samples had wanted to pursue their chosen occupation. This section gives further results on career planning for the two samples.

The two samples demonstrated similar reasons for pursuing their chosen career, and for the influences on their career choice. Table 8.14 below gives the results for each sample on why they wanted to pursue their chosen career. (Note: only those subjects who did have a career aim are included in this Table; valid percentages are given for this group only).
Table 8.14: Reasons for Pursuing Chosen Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good career prospects</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status/prestigious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a &quot;service&quot; job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good career prospects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good salary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status/prestigious</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a &quot;service&quot; job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.14 above shows that the reason most often given by both samples for pursuing their named career was that it was 'interesting', accounting for 50.4% of the private and 48.7% of the state sample. A typical response to this question was given by one of the state school pupils, who was planning to pursue a career in advertising:

"It's mainly because it's just really interesting work that I think I'll enjoy a lot. It's... I'd just hate to do a job that was boring and uninteresting."

Additionally, Table 8.14 demonstrates that 'good career prospects' and a 'good salary' were important to the private sample. The state sample additionally named the fact that their job was a 'service' one (eg physiotherapy, teaching, nursing).

The majority of both samples could not identify anything in particular that first got them interested in their chosen job/career. Of those who did name a reason,
the private sample named a 'family member' (12 pupils) and 'careers fair/careers staff' (11 pupils); the state sample also named a careers fair or staff (9 pupils).

8.3.2 Perceptions of Work and Employment
(Questions I2I, I22, I23, I24ab; scales 1, 2, 3)

There was a significant difference between the two samples on importance of working in the future. Ranked on a scale of 1-10, the private school mean was 8.8 (standard deviation 1.0), the state school mean 6.9 (standard deviation 1.4). This represented a significantly higher level of importance attached to work by the private sample (t = 8.5, df 105, p < .001).

Differences between the two samples were found for the main reason given for working in adult life, with the private sample mainly focussing on job and career satisfaction, and the state sample giving a variety of reasons. This is demonstrated in Table 8.15 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need an income to live</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone does/its expected</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>15 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get job/career satisfaction</td>
<td>50 (74.6)</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To earn a lot of money</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have something to do</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>2 (3.0)</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.15 demonstrates that the majority of the private sample (74.6%) specified the need to get 'job and career satisfaction' as the main reason for working in adult life. By comparison, only one third (33.3%) of the state sample gave this response, with a quarter of this group giving the reason that 'everyone does/ its expected'. The categories of 'need an income', 'everyone does' and 'to have something to do' were combined (they are all functional aspects of work),
and in a three by two crosstabulation were compared with the categories 'to get job satisfaction' and 'to earn a lot of money'. The private sample were more likely to name job satisfaction, and the state sample one of the three combined categories which focussed on practical and functional aspects of later work (chi-squared = 22.6, df2, p < .01).

Investigation of job entitlement beliefs showed that a majority of both samples did not believe that those with good educational qualifications were entitled to a job. However, a greater proportion of the private sample believed that they were. This is demonstrated by the results of Table 8.16(a) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (38.8)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38 (56.7)</td>
<td>46 (76.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.16(a) demonstrate that a greater proportion of the private sample believed that the well-qualified were entitled to a job (chi-squared = 26.4, df2, p < .01). It is of note however, that one of the private school pupils (who was in favour of job entitlement) pointed out the following:

"Well yes as I said, I think if you’ve worked hard and got good qualifications you are entitled to a good job. But really you’re also more likely to actually get a job aren’t you, because you’ve got those qualifications?"

A greater level of agreement was evident between the two samples on the question of whether everyone was entitled to a job. The majority at both schools
believed everyone was not entitled to a job. Table 8.16(b) below gives these results:

Table 8.16(b): Job Entitlement Beliefs for Everyone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61 (91.0)</td>
<td>48 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.16(b) shows that a large majority of both samples did not agree with universal job entitlement (chi-square analyses not undertaken because of the small proportion of respondents answering yes to this question). Some varying interpretation of entitlement was again evident, however, reflected in the following comment by a private school pupil:

"Well I suppose it depends on what you mean by entitled doesn't it? I think yes to your question, yes everyone should have a job if that's possible, if there's enough work to go round. But that's just an ideal, because it'll never be like that, not with new technology and automation. So in theory yes, but in practice no."

The private sample were more likely to say that they would stay on at work if they had sufficient money to live on (for example via an inheritance). This accounted for 60 of the 67 in the private sample (89.6%) compared with only 26 of the 60 (43.3%) in the state sample (chi-squared = 30.9, df2, p < .01). Those at both schools saying they would not give up work mainly gave the reason that they wanted to pursue a career and experience job satisfaction, and some added that they would become bored if they did not work.

Three scales measured work-related values. No significant difference was found between the two samples on the scale measuring employment commitment. The scales measuring work commitment and belief in work did show significant differences, with the private sample having significantly higher means on both.
Results are given in Table 8.17 below (a higher score indicates a greater belief or commitment):

### Table 8.17: Means and Standard Deviations for Work-Related Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th></th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Commitment (3 item scale; range 3-15)</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment * (2 item scale; range 2-10)</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Work ** (5 item scale; range 5-25)</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: * significant difference between mean scores

\[(t = 3.19, \text{ df 120}, p < .01)\]

**significant difference between mean scores

\[(t = 1.94, \text{ df 117}, p < .05)\]

The significantly higher means for the private sample on the scales of work commitment and belief in work, reflect the findings earlier in this section that working in later life was significantly more important to this group.

### 8.3.3 Attitudes to Training and YTS

(Questions I25a, Q7abL, scale 4, I25bcde)

Experience of YTS was quite different for the private and state samples. Only a minority of the private sample (15 subjects; 22.4%) were found to know someone who is (or who had been) on a YTS, compared with the majority (54; 91.7%) of the state sample (chi-squared = 61.4, df1, p < .001). The private sample were also generally more positive about the YTS, as demonstrated by those agreeing with three attitudinal statements (questionnaire items asked of the older cohort only):
Table 8.18: Attitudes to YTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YTS schemes....</th>
<th>Private (n=29)</th>
<th>State (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;help unemployed people find a job&quot;</td>
<td>24 (82.8)</td>
<td>21 (56.8)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;are a useful way to get training&quot;</td>
<td>28 (96.6)</td>
<td>29 (78.4)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;are a good preparation for adult life&quot;</td>
<td>16 (55.2)</td>
<td>8 (21.6)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

note:  
* chi-squared = 5.1, df1, p < .05  
** chi-squared = 4.5, df1, p < .05  
*** chi-squared = 7.9, df1, p < .01

The results of Table 8.18 indicate a more positive view of YTS by the private sample, with a significantly larger proportion of this group believing that YTS performed each of the functions listed.

Further questions confirmed the more positive attitude of the private sample to YTS and training in general. Responses to whether YTS was "mainly of value to employers, to young people, or both" (a questionnaire item asked of the older cohort only), showed that 72.4% of the private sample believed that it was of equal value to both; only 35.1% of the state sample gave this response, the rest believing it was mainly of value to employers (chi-squared = 14.3, df1, p < .01). The private sample also had a significantly higher mean on the attitude to training scale (range 3-15 with a high score indicating a more positive attitude). The private sample mean was 13.57 (standard deviation 2.4), the state sample mean 12.30 (standard deviation 2.4). This demonstrated a significant difference between the means (t=2.9, df 123, p < .05), with the private sample having the more positive attitude to training.
The state sample were also more in favour of increased levels of allowances for YTS. There was no difference between the means of the two schools on their estimates of current YTS levels (private school mean £27.34; state school mean £26.52). The results for how much subjects thought YTS trainees should be paid, however, did reveal a significant difference (t = -10.5, df 117, p < .001). The private school mean was £27.95 (standard deviation £5.38), the state school mean £37.06 (standard deviation £4.16). Thus the state sample proposed an average of a £10 a week increase in YTS allowances, whilst the private sample wanted allowances left at present levels.

The majority of the private sample were in favour of YTS becoming compulsory, with 50 subjects (74.6%) supporting the benefit changes which would lead to this. Two main reasons emerged in support of this view: (1) that YTS gives young people good quality training and (2) that YTS stops young people who don't want to work from "just signing on". The majority of the state sample were very much against making young people attend YTS, with 56 (93.3%) of this group against the benefit changes. Reasons given by these subjects mainly related to the right of young people to choose what they do after leaving school, and the view that young people were being "used" by the government to reduce the unemployment figures. A crosstabulation of those in favour and those against the benefit changes showed the private sample more in favour (chi-squared = 71.8, df 1, p < .001).

8.3.4 Labour Market Perceptions
(Questions Q8L, Q5Y, I26c)

A greater proportion of the private sample were planning to move out of the local area to get a job in the future. Results on this question were as follows:
Table 8.19: Likelihood to Move Out of the Area to Get a Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=58)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>34 (50.7)</td>
<td>21 (36.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>28 (41.8)</td>
<td>13 (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>13 (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11 (19.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: two subjects had missing data on this question; valid percentages used.

The results of Table 8.19 indicate that the majority of both groups planned to move out of the local area to work eventually. The private sample were more likely to be planning to move however (chi-squared = 22.5, df3, p < .001). In addition, a large number of the private sample said that they planned to work abroad.

Differences between the two samples were found on views of difficulty in job-getting. When asked what sorts of young people they thought found it difficult to get jobs in Sheffield, the majority of the private sample (39 respondents, 58.2%) focussed on those who were 'poorly educated' and who had 'few qualifications', thereby focussing on individuals. A majority of the state sample (32 respondents, 53.3%) believed that 'all groups who are disadvantaged' (including the long-term unemployed, the disabled and ethnic minorities) found it difficult to get work. The remainder of both groups referred to those looking for unskilled work, or said that they did not know. Excluding those who did not know, this represented a greater emphasis on the abilities of the young unemployed themselves by the private sample (chi-squared = 19.3, df2, p < .01).

8.3.5 Unemployment
(Questions I26abde)
It was shown earlier that only a small number of the private sample had any experience of YTS amongst their family or friends. The same was found for personal experience of unemployment. Those without any experience of the unemployed accounted for 46 (68.7%) of the private sample and nine (15%) of the state sample. A much larger proportion of the private sample therefore had no experience of the unemployed (chi-squared = 38.2, df1, p < .001). The causes of unemployment were also viewed differently by the two samples. The private sample focussed mainly on unemployed people and their characteristics, the state sample mainly on government policies. These results are demonstrated in Table 8.20 below:

Table 8.20: Causes of Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private school</strong> (n=67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many unemployed lazy and don’t look for work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many unemployed lack skills and qualifications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Fact of economics&quot;: not enough jobs for everyone</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government policies causing unemployment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World recession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) (51) (118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **State school** (n=60)                        |     |     |       |    |
| Many unemployed lazy and don’t look for work   | 4   | --  | 4     | 4.6 |
| Many unemployed lack skills and qualifications | 2   | --  | 2     | 2.3 |
| "Fact of economics": not enough jobs for everyone | 8   | 12  | 20    | 23.0|
| Government policies causing unemployment      | 30  | 2   | 32    | 36.8|
| World recession                               | 2   | 7   | 9     | 10.3|
| Other reason                                  | --  | 6   | 6     | 6.9 |
| Not sure/don’t know                           | 14  | --  | 14    | 16.1|
| (60) (27) (87)                                 |     |     |       |    |
Table 8.20 shows that the first two categories focus on the unemployed themselves, i.e., that many unemployed people are lazy or lack skills and qualifications. These reasons accounted for 46.6% of responses at the private school, but only 6.9% at the state school. In contrast, over a third of the state sample (36.8%) believed it was government policies that caused unemployment. A crosstabulation was undertaken which combined the two reasons relating to the unemployed themselves (individual factors), the 'fact of economics' and 'world recession' categories (external causes), and government policies. This three by two cell crosstabulation showed the private sample were significantly more likely to name individual level factors, the state sample government policies (chi-squared = 50.4, df2, p < .001).

As was found for YTS allowances, the state sample were more likely to believe that unemployment benefit should be raised. Mean scores for how much respondents thought current benefit was showed a mean of £28.71 (standard deviation £5.03) for the private sample, and £28.05 (standard deviation £3.21) for the state sample, with no significant difference between the means. However, differences emerged on views of whether the samples thought the level of benefit should change, as demonstrated by Table 8.21 below:

Table 8.21: View of Unemployment Benefit Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should go up</td>
<td>4 (6.0)</td>
<td>46 (76.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should go down</td>
<td>10 (14.9)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s about right</td>
<td>52 (77.6)</td>
<td>10 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.21 shows that whilst the majority of the private sample thought unemployment benefit was 'about right' (77.6%), the majority of the
The majority of both samples planned to pursue their chosen career primarily because it was interesting. The private sample attached greater importance to working in the future and had significantly higher means on three scales measuring work and training orientations. A significantly larger proportion of the private sample named job and career satisfaction as their main reason for working, and this group were also less likely to leave work if they had enough money to live on. A significantly larger proportion of the private sample also planned to leave the local area to work. In comparison to the state sample, the private sample had a low level of experience of anyone on a YTS or who was unemployed. Further, there were significant differences between the two groups on preferred levels of benefit for these two groups, with the state sample generally wanting them raised. The private sample were more positive about YTS and in favour of it becoming compulsory. Views of the causes of unemployment showed that the private sample focussed more on the deficiencies of the unemployed; the state sample focussed on government policies.

8.4 Theme 3: Political Environment

8.4.1 Attitudes to Politics

(Question 127, scale 7)

The private sample had a higher level of interest in politics than the state sample. This is demonstrated in Table 8.22 below:
Table 8.22: Level of Interest in Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>9 (13.4)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interested</td>
<td>41 (61.2)</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td>17 (25.4)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.22 demonstrate a higher level of interest in politics amongst the private school sample (chi-squared = 18.5. df3, p < .001). For the private sample 50 respondents (74.6%) were 'very' or 'quite' interested in politics, compared with 26 subjects (43.3%) in these two categories at the state school. Additionally, no privately educated subjects were 'not at all' interested, compared with 20% of the state sample in this category. The private sample also had a more positive attitude to politics and the political process. On the political alienation scale, the private sample had a lower mean score (mean 6.94; standard deviation 1.7) than the state sample (mean 8.16; standard deviation 2.1), with a very significant difference between the two school means (t = 3.51, df 112, p < .001).

8.4.2 Political Discussion and Activity

(Questions 128ab, I10, Q11)

Pupils at both schools discussed politics more frequently with their friends than they did with their family. The private sample, however, discussed politics more frequently with both these groups. This is shown in the results of Table 8.23 below:
Table 8.23: Frequency of Political Discussion with Family and Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice a week</td>
<td>40 (59.7)</td>
<td>19 (28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ times a week</td>
<td>24 (35.8)</td>
<td>46 (68.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice a week</td>
<td>30 (50.0)</td>
<td>36 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ times a week</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
<td>10 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.23 show that a large proportion (68.7%) of the private sample discussed politics with their friends three or more times a week, compared with only a minority (16.7%) of the state sample. Further, those discussing politics with their parents either 'rarely' or 'never' accounted for 23 state school pupils (38.3%) and only three private school pupils (4.5%). The categories of 'never' and 'rarely' were combined, and two crosstabulations undertaken for the friends and family questions. These showed the greater frequency of discussion by the private sample with both friends (chi-squared=37.1, df2, p <.01) and family (chi-squared =25.8, df2, p <.01).

A similar level of political activity was found for the two samples, with the majority of both groups having discussed politics with their parents and watched party political broadcasts in the past. Only a minority of both groups had attended a meeting or handed out leaflets. These results are given in Table 8.24, with numbers and percentages per school for those who had undertaken a particular activity:
Table 8.24: Type of Political Activity Undertaken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended a public meeting, rally, or march</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>16 (27.1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed politics with parents</td>
<td>57 (85.1)</td>
<td>48 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written to an MP</td>
<td>12 (17.9)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched a party political broadcast</td>
<td>61 (91.0)</td>
<td>48 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handed out leaflets</td>
<td>14 (20.9)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to organise a public meeting or event</td>
<td>15 (22.4)</td>
<td>16 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed politics with friends</td>
<td>59 (88.1)</td>
<td>45 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: one subject had missing data; valid percent used.

Chi-square analyses for the political activities of the two samples showed that the state sample were more likely to have attended a public rally or march (chi-squared = 7.2, df1, p < .01), with similar numbers undertaking all other activities.

A greater proportion of the private sample were found to know someone amongst their family or friends who was actively involved with a trade union or a political party (chi-squared = 23.1, df1, p < .001). Those who did know someone accounted for 30 (44.8%) of the private sample, and eight of the state sample (13.3%).

8.4.3 Use of Political Media
(Questions 129abc)

In their use of political media, a greater proportion of the private sample read a newspaper regularly (chi-squared = 12.9, df3, p < .01). Of the private sample 55 subjects (82.0%) read a paper either a 'few times a week' or 'every day'; 26 (43.3%) of the state sample were in one of these two categories. The remainder
of both groups read a paper less than once a week or never. All subjects said they watched a news programme on television 'most days'.

8.4.4 Political Education in Schools
(Questions I41, I42)
Both samples reported that there was very little formal political education at their school. This is demonstrated in Table 8.25 below:

Table 8.25: Level of Political Education at School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>62 (92.5)</td>
<td>56 (92.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4 (6.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.25 shows that over 90% of both samples said that there was only 'a little' political education at their school. The majority of subjects at both schools believed, however, that there should be more organised political education schools. This is demonstrated by the results of Table 8.26 below:

Table 8.26: View of Increased Level of Political Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=65)*</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>54 (83.0)</td>
<td>32 (53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No increase</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
<td>9 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9 (13.8)</td>
<td>19 (31.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: 2 subjects had missing data; valid percent used.

Table 8.26 shows that a majority of both samples were in favour of more political education in schools. A greater proportion of the private sample were in favour however (chi-squared = 13.5, df2, p < .001). The majority of those in favour added
that political education should be strictly controlled with for example, no racist or extremist teaching allowed.

**Summary of Theme 3: Political Environment**

The private sample had a higher level of interest in politics than the state sample, had a significantly lower mean score on the measure of political alienation, and discussed politics more frequently with their family and friends. Similar levels of political activity were found for the two samples, although a larger proportion of the private sample knew someone who was politically active. The majority of both samples (but a greater proportion of the private sample) were in favour of increased political education in schools.

**8.5 Theme 4: Voting Intent**

**8.5.1 Voting Intent and Tactical Voting**

(Questions I31a, I32)

Differences in voting intent were evident between the two samples. One quarter (15 pupils; 25%) of the state sample claimed they would not vote in an election; only one private school pupil took this view. Of those who said that they would vote, the private sample were mainly committed to voting Conservative; for the state sample, nearly one half were undecided about who they would vote for. This is demonstrated in Table 8.27 below (note that this Table only includes those who said that they would vote):

**Table 8.27: Voting Intent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Private (n = 66)</th>
<th>State (n = 45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>44 (66.6)</td>
<td>4 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>4 (6.1)</td>
<td>11 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/SDP</td>
<td>11 (16.6)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>2 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/undecided</td>
<td>6 (9.1)</td>
<td>22 (48.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who would vote for the Labour, Liberal/SDP or Green Parties were combined, and a crosstabulation was undertaken of this group with Conservative voters and those who were undecided. This demonstrated the higher proportion of private school pupils who would vote Conservative (chi-squared = 48.2, df2, p < .01). It is of note also that combining those who would not vote and those who were undecided shows a much larger proportion of the state sample in these two groups: 37 (61.7%) of the state sample and 7 (10.4%) of the private sample.

Evidence of tactical voting was found amongst both samples. For the private sample seven people would vote tactically, (six of those who had said they would vote for the Liberal/SDP, one for Labour and one for the Green Party). For the state sample, six subjects said their voting intent was tactical; this accounted for four of those who said they would vote Labour and two Liberal/SDP. In total, tactical voters accounted for 13 of the 111 pupils (11.7%) who said that they would vote. This suggests that asking people about their voting intent may be an inaccurate indicator of their actual political stance. As a result of this finding a measure of overall political type was designed for use in the study. (The results of this coding, based on the analysis of interview transcripts, is given in Part Three below).

The majority of those who did not know who they would vote for (combining both those who were undecided and who said they would not vote) were not found to feel closer to any one political party. Of the 44 who were uncertain or who would not vote, only 15 felt closer to one party than another. None of these individuals felt sufficiently committed to these parties to vote for them.

**Summary of Theme 4: Voting Intent**

Differences between the samples were found on both intention to vote and who they would vote for. A much larger proportion of the state sample would both
not vote in an election, and (of those who intended to vote) were undecided who they would vote for. Of those who would vote, the private sample were overwhelmingly committed to voting Conservative, the state sample mainly Labour. Evidence of tactical voting was found amongst both samples, with voting intent proposed as an inaccurate indicator of political stance.

8.6 Theme 5: Party Politics and the Political Process

8.6.1 Attitudes to the Current Government

(Questions 136, 137)

The majority of the private sample supported the current government, compared with only a minority of the state sample. This is demonstrated in Table 8.28 below:

Table 8.28: Support for the Current Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>52 (77.6)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not support</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>30 (50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/no opinion</td>
<td>4 (6.0)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.28 demonstrates the higher level of overall support for the current government amongst the private sample, (accounting for 77.6% of this group but only 13.3% of state school respondents). In contrast, half of the state sample said they did not generally support the government. Overall, there was a significant association between the private sample and support for the government (chi-squared = 49.3, df2, p < .01).

Similar results were found when respondents were asked about the government's social and economic policies separately. The private sample generally supported
both aspects, with the state sample generally opposed to both aspects. This is demonstrated by the results of Table 8.29 below:

Table 8.29: Support for the Governments Economic and Social Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Policies</th>
<th>Private (n = 67)</th>
<th>State (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support 'all' or 'most' aspects</td>
<td>51 (76.1)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not support</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>36 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Policies</th>
<th>Private (n = 67)</th>
<th>State (n = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support 'all' or 'most' aspects</td>
<td>49 (73.1)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not support</td>
<td>13 (19.4)</td>
<td>34 (56.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.29 demonstrate a higher level of support amongst the private sample for both government economic policies (chi-squared = 53.9, df2, p < .001), and social policies (chi-squared = 51.0, df2, p < .001).

8.6.2 View of the Opposition Parties

(Questions I38ab)

Perceptions of the policies of the main opposition parties (if in power) showed similar views between the two samples for the Liberal/SDP, but different views for the Labour Party. These results are given in Tables 8.30(a) and (b) below, with summarised codes in both Tables as follows:

The Party would....

1. Do everything different
2. Do nothing different
3. Close private schools
4. Get rid of nuclear weapons
5. Raise taxes for the rich
6. Give trade unions more power
7. Spend more money in the public sector
8. Other
9. Don’t know
First, Table 8.30(a) gives views of the policies of the Labour Party:

Table 8.30(a): View of Policies of the Labour Party if in Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Private sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close private</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nuclear</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise taxes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) State sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nuclear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise taxes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(59)*</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: one subject had missing data on this question

Second, Table 8.30(b) gives the views of the policies of the Liberal/SDP (coded as above).
Table 8.30(b): View of Policies of the Liberal/SDP if in Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Private sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nuclear</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise taxes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) State sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close private</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nuclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise taxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the results of Table 8.30(a) show that differing views were evident between the two samples on the policies of the Labour Party if they were in power. Just under a half of the total responses of the private sample described a Labour government as 'closing down private schools'; many pupils added that this policy generally prevented them from ever considering support for the Labour Party. Additionally, the private sample believed Labour would 'raise taxes for the rich' and 'do everything different'. For the state sample almost one third believed a Labour government would 'spend more in the public sector', with 'everything different' and 'get rid of nuclear weapons' also frequently named.

Second, views of what the Liberal/SDP (Table 8.32(b)) would do if in power were more similar for the two samples. The private sample mainly believed that they would do 'everything different' (25.9% of total responses) and 'spend more
in the public sector' (18.5%). The state sample also named these two categories (21.2% and 27.2% of total responses respectively). Note, however, that for both samples a number of pupils said they did not know what the Liberal/SDP would do if in power, accounting for 19 private school pupils (23.4%) and 26 state school pupils (39.3%).

8.6.3 The Party System
(Questions I39, I40)

Views of the 'first-past-the-post' electoral system demonstrated that over three-quarters of the private sample supported the current electoral system, compared with a minority of the state sample. This is demonstrated in Table 8.31 below:

Table 8.31: Views of the Electoral System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good system</td>
<td>51 (76.1)</td>
<td>24 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a good system</td>
<td>12 (17.9)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4 (6.0)</td>
<td>22 (36.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.31 shows that the private sample were more favourable to the current electoral system (chi-squared = 22.0, df2, p < .001). Reasons for subjects' stance on this question were explored. Those believing it was a good system gave as reasons that it is easy to understand, and that it give one strong party in government. Those believing it was not a good system focussed on the view that it doesn't represent all people's views, and that it causes swings from one party to another.

Related to this, the majority of the private sample were against the introduction of proportional representation (PR) to elect the government. As can be seen from Table 8.32, the majority of the state sample were unsure:
Table 8.32: Support for Introduction of PR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>10 (14.9)</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>49 (73.1)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8 (11.9)</td>
<td>41 (68.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.32 demonstrates that the private sample were more against the introduction of proportional representation (chi-squared = 48.9, df2, p < .001).

8.6.4 Local Government

(Questions I43, I44ab)

Differences between the two samples were found on their views of how well the Local Council run the city. The majority of the private sample thought it was not run well, in contrast to the majority of the state sample who were generally positive about the Local Council. These results are given in Table 8.33 below:

Table 8.33: Perception of How Well the Local Council Run Sheffield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>13 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>37 (61.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td>33 (49.3)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all well</td>
<td>7 (10.4)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.33 shows that those believing the city was 'not very' or 'not at all' well run accounted for 40 private school pupils (59.7%) and seven state school pupils (11.7%). A crosstabulation which combined the 'very' and 'reasonably' well categories (ie those generally in support of the Council) and the 'not very' or 'not at all' well categories (those generally against) showed the state sample more supportive of the Council (chi-squared = 30.3, df1, p < .001).
Knowledge of the local MP and his/her political party was much greater amongst the private sample. For the private sample 49 subjects (73.1%) knew the name of their MP, compared with a smaller proportion of the state sample (15 subjects; 25%). Knowledge was therefore greater amongst the private sample (chi-squared = 29.3, df 1, p < .001). Knowledge of the political party their MP belonged to showed 59 (88.1%) of the private sample knew, compared with 34 (56.7%) of the sample. Level of knowledge was therefore greatest amongst the private sample (chi-squared = 15.9, df 1, p < .001).

8.6.5 Taxation
(Questions I45ab)

The majority of the private sample were resistant to increased rates of taxation, the state sample overwhelmingly in favour. Results are given in Table 8.34 below, using categories represented by numbers as follows:

1. No: because lower taxes for the better off act as an incentive.
2. No: because the better off have earnt their money.
3. Yes.
4. Don't know.

Table 8.34: Attitudes to Higher Taxation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No - incentive</td>
<td>12 (17.9)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No - earnt</td>
<td>18 (26.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yes</td>
<td>16 (23.9)</td>
<td>35 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Don't know</td>
<td>21 (31.3)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.34 show that just under half of the private sample (30 respondents; 44.8%) believed that higher taxes should not be paid by the better off, both because they viewed lower tax rates as an incentive in business and because they believed the better off have earnt their money. In comparison, over
half of the state sample (35 respondents; 58.3%) believed that the better off
should pay higher rates of tax. Overall the state sample were more in favour of
increased levels of taxation (chi-squared = 28.9, df3, p < .001).

A greater proportion of the private sample were also in favour of the
introduction of the community charge to replace the rates (chi-squared = 22.2,
df2, p < .001). Of the private sample, 23 subjects (34.3%) supported it, compared
with only two subjects (3.3%) supporting it at the state school. Those against it
accounted for 36 subjects (53.7%) at the private school and 54 subjects (90%) at
the state school; the remainder at both schools were uncertain.

8.6.6 Trade Unions

(Questions I45abc)
Pupils in both samples believed that, overall, trade unions play a valuable role in
society. A greater proportion of the private sample, however, believed that trade
unions had too much power. Results on views of trade union power are given in
Table 8.35:

Table 8.35: View of Trade Union Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much power</td>
<td>32 (47.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little power</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>29 (43.3)</td>
<td>31 (51.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.35 reveals that a similar proportion of each sample viewed trade union
power as 'about right' (43.3% private; 51.7% state). Of the remainder, almost
half of the private sample believed trade unions had 'too much' power (47.8%),
with a number of state pupils believing, conversely, that trade unions had 'too
little' power (28.3%). These results suggest a more negative view of trade union power by private school pupils (chi-squared = 43.3, df3, p < .01).

Differences between the two samples were also evident for the right of all occupations to strike, with the majority of the private sample against a universal right. Results on this question are given in Table 8.36 below:

Table 8.36: View of the Right to Strike for all Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=66)*</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (3.0)</td>
<td>28 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57 (86.4)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7 (10.6)</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: one subject had missing data; valid percent used.

The results of Table 8.36 demonstrate the private sample as more opposed to a universal right to strike (chi-squared = 53.3, df2, p < .001). Many of the private sample who believed that some occupations should be denied the right to strike named the police, teachers, and doctors. It is of note however, that most pupils who believed in the right of all occupations to strike, added that this should always be a last resort.

8.6.7 Pressure Groups
(Questions I47ab, I48, I49)

There were high levels of knowledge of the seven pressure groups amongst both samples. Further, there were also very similar levels of support for the aims of each of the groups. Table 8.37 below gives the results for (a) subjects who knew the aim of the group, and (b) of those who knew the aim of the group, those who said they supported its aims.
Table 8.37: Knowledge of (a) and Support for (b) Seven Pressure/Campaign Groups

(a) Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CND</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
<td>58 (96.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>64 (95.5)</td>
<td>55 (91.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Front</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
<td>54** (93.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
<td>59 (88.1)</td>
<td>58 (96.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Apartheid</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
<td>59 (98.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Liberation Front</td>
<td>59* (90.8)</td>
<td>56 (93.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>67 (100)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

note:  * two subjects had missing data; valid percent used.
** two subjects had missing data; valid percent used.

(b) Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CND</td>
<td>14 (20.9)</td>
<td>27 (46.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>61 (95.3)</td>
<td>50 (90.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Front</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
<td>25 (42.4)</td>
<td>28 (48.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Apartheid</td>
<td>64 (95.5)</td>
<td>56 (94.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Liberation Front</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>61 (91.0)</td>
<td>57 (95.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

note: only those who knew the aim of the group were subsequently asked if they supported the aims of the group. Results in (b) are those who did support the group, also expressed as a percentage of those who knew the aim.

The results of Table 8.37(a) indicate high levels of knowledge amongst both samples for the aims of the seven pressure groups (chi-square analyses for each pressure group not significant), with similar results on support for the pressure groups' aims as presented in Table 8.37(b). Chi-square results showed higher levels of support by the state sample for CND (chi-squared = 24.8, df1, p < .01). High levels of support at both schools were evident for Amnesty International, Anti-Apartheid and Greenpeace. Low levels of support were found for the ALF,
with no subject supporting the National Front. It is of note that many subjects stressed that they supported the aims of a group, but not necessarily its methods.

Only a small proportion of both samples were members of any of these seven groups. Twelve of the private sample had been (or were currently) members of CND, Amnesty International, or Greenpeace. Seven of the state sample were members of either CND, Anti-Apartheid, or Greenpeace. The private sample were more likely, however, to say they would definitely (or probably) join a pressure group in the future, accounting for over 60% of this group. This is shown by the results of Table 8.38 below:

Table 8.38: Likelihood of Joining a Pressure Group in the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41 (61.2)</td>
<td>21 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 (14.9)</td>
<td>31 (51.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>16 (23.9)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.38 demonstrates the greater level of anticipated involvement in a pressure group by the private sample (chi-squared = 19.5, df2, p < .001).

Summary of Theme 5: Party Politics and the Political Process

The majority of the private sample supported the current government, and their social and economic policies when these were explored separately. This sample also had more negative views of the Local Council. In contrast, the state sample were mainly against the government and its policies, and supportive of the Local Council. Similar views of the opposition parties were found, although the private sample were more likely to focus on a future Labour government closing private schools. Knowledge of the local MP and their Party was greater amongst the private sample. The private sample generally supported the current electoral
system and were against proportional representation. A greater proportion of
the state sample were in favour of increased rates of taxation, and also against
the introduction of the community charge. All subjects believed trade unions
play an important role in society, although a large number of the private sample
believed that trade unions had too much power; the large majority of the private
sample were also against a universal right to strike. The two samples
demonstrated similar levels of knowledge of, and support for, a number of
different pressure groups, with the private sample more likely to join a pressure
group in the future.

8.7 Theme 6: Rule of Law

8.7.1 Rule of Law and Civil Disobedience
(Questions 151ab, 150a-d)
The majority of the private sample thought that there would never be an
undemocratic overthrow of the government in this country; a majority of the
state sample were uncertain, however, about whether this would happen. Table
8.39 gives these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59 (88.1)</td>
<td>9 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8 (11.9)</td>
<td>39 (65.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.39 shows that the private sample believed an overthrow as less likely to
happen than the state sample (chi-squared = 68.2, df2, p < .001). Differences also
emerged between the two samples about whether they would support an
overthrow if this were to happen:
Table 8.40: Support for an Overthrow of the Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=59)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not support</td>
<td>56 (83.6)</td>
<td>9 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &quot;in certain</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>47 (79.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: one subject had missing data on this variable; valid percent used.

The results of Table 8.40 show that the majority of the state sample would support an overthrow of the government "in certain circumstances". The types of circumstances named included the government banning all opposition parties or using secret police. The majority of the private sample would not support an overthrow (chi-square not calculated as two cells had an expected frequency of less than five).

The majority of both samples would consider peaceful protest action if the government passed a law they thought was "really wrong". However, the state sample were more likely to consider undertaking action which broke the law, which the private sample were opposed to. This is shown by the results of Table 8.41 (overleaf). The results of Table 8.41 demonstrate that the majority of both samples would undertake the first three activities named: writing to an MP, signing a petition, or taking part in a demonstration (chi-square not undertaken because of small cell sizes). However, the majority of the state sample (61.7%) would also consider breaking the law; the majority of the private sample (82.1%) would definitely not break the law (chi-squared = 50.1, df2, p < .001). One private school pupil expressed the comments of many at the school:

"You see, I believe people should act if they think the government does something wrong... it's important people are active to get things changed. That's why I said I'd sign a petition or go to a demonstration... But no... not break the law ever. If everyone did that when they disagreed with something the whole system would break down wouldn't it?"
Table 8.41: Participation in Acts of Protest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts and Response</th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Write a letter to an MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>36 (53.7)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>31 (46.3)</td>
<td>32 (52.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Sign a petition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>34 (50.7)</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>32 (48.8)</td>
<td>32 (53.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>4 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Take part in a demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>24 (35.8)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>37 (55.2)</td>
<td>34 (56.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Break the law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>36 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55 (82.1)</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7.2 Authority and Government

(Questions 158; scales 5, 6)

If there was no government, a larger proportion of the private sample believed that people would mainly look after themselves, the state sample that people would mainly help others and the less well off. The results are given in Table 8.42 (overleaf), represented by the following numbers:

1. people will mainly look after themselves
2. people will mainly help the less well off and less able
3. people will try to balance both
4. unsure
Table 8.42: View of Society Without Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (self)</td>
<td>24 (35.8)</td>
<td>4 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (others)</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>25 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (balance)</td>
<td>40 (59.7)</td>
<td>28 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (unsure)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.42 show that a large proportion of both samples believed that people would try to balance both the aspects mentioned, ie. looking after themselves and helping others. Of the remainder, the private sample were more likely to believe that people would mainly look after themselves (35.8%), the state sample believing that people would help the less well off and the less able (41.7%). Excluding those who were unsure showed the greater emphasis on the first (self) category in the private sample (chi-squared = 33.1, df2, p < .01).

The two questionnaire scales measuring attitudes to authority were the scales of opposition to authority and anti-police attitudes. Similar mean scores and standard deviations were found for the two samples on both scales, with t-test results showing no significant difference between the means on either scale.

Summary of Theme 6: Rule of Law

Differences between the two samples were demonstrated on whether there was ever likely to be an undemocratic overthrow of the government. The private sample were more likely to believe there would not be, compared with only a small number of state subjects taking this view. The state sample were also more likely to support such an overthrow in certain circumstances. A large majority of both samples would consider peaceful protest action in response to a law they disagreed with. However, the state sample would also consider protest action which broke the law; the private sample were almost all opposed to this. There were no differences between the samples on the scales measuring opposition to
authority and anti-police attitudes. The private sample were more likely to believe people would look after themselves if there was no government.

8.8 Theme 7: Society and the Social Order

8.8.1 Definitions of Politics, Capitalism and Socialism

(Questions 157abc)

Subjects were asked what they understood by the terms 'politics', 'capitalism', and 'socialism'. (Results for all three definitions will be given first, followed by a brief discussion of the results for all three definitions).

(a) Politics: the following five categories are represented on the Table below:

1. Making laws/ governing the country.
2. Different political parties trying to get into power.
3. The relationship of individuals to the law/ what people can and can't do.
4. Different ways of running societies or countries.
5. Don’t know/ can’t say.

Results are given in Table 8.53a below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 (19.4)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>21 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (10.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Capitalism: the following five categories are represented in the Table below:

1. People buying and selling.
2. People trying to get higher salaries/status/possessions.
3. A form of organisation that reproduces class and/or privilege.
4. A form of organisation designed to make profit.
5. Don’t know/ can’t say.
Results were as follows:

Table 8.53b: Definitions of Capitalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 (22.4)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41 (61.2)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Socialism: the following four categories are represented in the Table below:

1. The policies/philosophy of the Labour Party.
2. The type of government in Communist countries.
3. Way of organising society where profit comes second to welfare of the people and social policies.
4. Don't know/ can't say.

Results were as follows:

Table 8.53c: Definitions of Socialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (29.9)</td>
<td>26 (43.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 (37.3)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 (31.3)</td>
<td>22 (36.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of politics showed that over a third of both groups viewed politics as 'different political parties trying to get into power'. The same proportion at the private school (34.3%) viewed politics as 'different ways of running societies or countries', the broadest definition. A large number at the state sample viewed politics as the 'making of laws/ the government of the country' (28.3%), the definition concentrating on overt functions.

Definitions of capitalism showed more divergent views for the two samples. Of the private sample a majority (61.2%) viewed capitalism as a 'form of economic organisation designed to make profit'; only 10% of the state sample gave this
response. A majority of the state sample (65%) responded in either category one or two, focusing on both 'buying and selling', and 'people trying to get ahead in status or possessions'. This reflects a more general, global focus in the private samples' definitions.

Definitions of socialism showed that over a third (37.3%) of the private sample defined it in terms of the 'type of government in communist countries'. The state sample, however, focussed on socialism as 'the policies of the Labour Party' (43.3%), and the form of organisation where 'profit comes second to welfare and social policies' (36.0%).

8.8.2 Social Class, Gender and Societal Divisions
(Questions 152ab, 155, 154, 153, 156ab)

Social class
The majority of both samples viewed themselves as middle class; however, a greater proportion of the private sample believed they were upper or middle class, the state sample middle class or working class. Table 8.54 gives these results:

Table 8.54: Social Class Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>20 (29.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>47 (71.1)</td>
<td>35 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18 (30.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no class</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.54 demonstrates some differences in views of social class for the upper and working class categories (chi-square not calculated because of expected frequencies of less than five). Differences between the two samples were also evident for what subjects saw as the main difference between the social classes.
The private sample focussed on educational level and type of school attended, the state sample on income and wealth. These results are given in Table 8.55 below:

Table 8.55: Differences Between the Social Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State* (n=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income/wealth</td>
<td>15 (22.4)</td>
<td>41 (68.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>27 (40.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area/house lived in</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>5 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school attended</td>
<td>14 (20.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent/appearance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>10 (14.9)</td>
<td>8 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note: one subject had missing data; valid percent used.

The results of Table 8.55 demonstrate that the majority of the state sample (68.3%) viewed 'income and wealth' as the main difference between the social classes, with 'occupation' also named by this group. The private sample showed a more diverse range of views, with only 15 subjects (22.4%) naming income and wealth as the main difference. The most often named responses of this group were 'educational level' and 'type of school attended'; these two differences accounted for 61.2% of the total responses of the private sample (chi-square not calculated because of expected frequencies less than five).

Societal divisions

A large majority of subjects at both schools believed Sheffield was divided (accounting for all but one subject at the private school, and five subjects at the state school who said they did not know). One response by a state school pupil was typical of many:

"Well, it would be impossible to say its not wouldn't it? I mean you've got one half of the city with big houses, people with good jobs and money. Then the other side is all run down and people are poor... you just need to drive around the city to know that its divided".
The majority of subjects at both schools also believed that there was a north/south divide in Britain. This accounted for 63 subjects (94%) at the private school and 56 subjects (93.3%) at the state school; the remainder at both schools could not say. Perceptions of the nature of the differences between the north and south of the country were very similar at the two schools, with most subjects mentioning house prices, wages, unemployment rates and standard of living.

Perceptions of the causes of poverty showed that a majority of the private sample believed that poverty was inevitable, with many others at the school blaming the poor for their situation. The majority of the state sample, conversely, blamed the government. Table 8.56 below gives these results, with the numbers in the Table representing the following responses:

1. Many of the poor are to blame: eg lazy, workshy, careless with money.
2. No one is to blame for poverty; it is inevitable and "just the way society is".
3. The government and its policies are to blame for poverty.
4. Don’t know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.56: Explanations for Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (poor to blame)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (way it is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (don’t know)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.56 show that a majority of the private sample (58.2%) believed nothing was 'to blame'; poverty was inevitable. The majority of the state sample (55.0%) believed the government and their policies caused poverty. Additionally, it is of note that a much larger number at the private school blamed many of the poor themselves for their situation (response 1). A crosstabulation excluding the 'don't know' category showed the private sample
were more likely to give individual level attributions (chi-squared = 8.1, df1, 
p < .01).

The experiences of women

The majority of both samples groups believed women were treated differently to 
men in society. This accounted for 50 private school pupils (74.6%) and 56 state 
school pupils (93.3%). Six main types of difference between men and women's 
treatment were given, with both samples focussing on the types of work done by 
the sexes. Table 8.57 below gives these results. (Note: only those who believed 
there were differences are included in this Table).

Table 8.57: Types of Differences Between the Treatment of Men and Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of work they do</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion chances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care responsibilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist language/comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of work they do</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion chances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist language/comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.57 demonstrate that the majority at both schools (57.1% 
private and 52.6% state) believed the main difference between the lives of men 
and women was in terms of the 'type of work they do'. Additionally at both 
schools, pupils named 'childcare responsibilities' and 'income'.

8.8.3 Human Nature and Personal Morality

(Questions I61ab, I60, I59)

All the respondents said that they lived their lives 'according to a set of rules'.

There were some differences evident in the origins of these rules. These results are given in Table 8.58 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents and family</td>
<td>40 (59.7)</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>6 (9.0)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed own rules</td>
<td>17 (25.4)</td>
<td>23 (38.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken society's rules</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>10 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.58 shows that the private sample mainly focussed on parents and family as the origin of these rules (59.7%); of the state group many said they had developed their own rules (38.3%). (Chi-square analyses not undertaken because of expected frequencies of less than five).

Pupils with a religious commitment at both schools believed their religion affected their daily attitudes and actions. Of the 40 private school pupils with a religious commitment, 38 (95%) said that this affected their views and actions. For the 26 state sample with a religious commitment, 21 (80.8%) agreed that their commitment affected their views and actions.

Views of human nature revealed some differences between the samples. Although nearly half of both samples believed that there were selfish and peaceful aspects to everyone, differences were evident for the remainder. The private sample focussed on human nature as selfish and greedy, the state sample viewing it as peaceful and co-operative. These results are given in Table 8.59:
Table 8.59: Perceptions of Basic Human Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private (n=67)</th>
<th>State (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful/co-operative</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>27 (45.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfish and greedy</td>
<td>30 (44.8)</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both in everyone</td>
<td>34 (50.7)</td>
<td>28 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 8.59 show the different views of human nature of the two samples (chi-squared = 37.3, df 2, p < .01).

Summary of Theme 7: Society and the Social Order

Some differences were evident in definitions of politics, capitalism and socialism given by the two groups, with the private sample focusing on global aspects of each, the state sample on specific functions of each. Some differences between the samples in class perceptions were demonstrated, with different views on the differences between these classes. Both samples generally believed there were divisions in Sheffield and in the north and south of the country. Explanations for poverty showed the private sample focusing on its inevitability and on individual level factors, the state sample on government policies. Both samples believed there were differences between the treatment of men and women, and focussed on the types of work done by women. All respondents believed they lived according to a set of rules, with a variety of origins. Views of human nature showed a greater emphasis by the private sample on selfish and greedy aspects.

PART THREE

In Chapter 7 the method used for assessing respondents' overall political type was described. The measure was derived from the interview transcripts designed to explore the political identity process. Six categories of overall political type emerged from the transcripts: Conservative, Labour, Liberal/SDP, Green, undecided, and would not vote/anti-politics. Section 8.9 below gives the results
of the assessment of overall political type by school (8.9.1), and for the
comparison of the political type of the samples with the political orientation of
their parents (8.9.2). Finally, there is a summary of the content results given in
this Chapter (8.10).

8.9 Results for the Assessment of Overall Political Type

8.9.1 Results by School

Results for the assessment of overall political type are given in Table 8.60 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Type</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Lib/S</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Undec</th>
<th>Not vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73.1%)</td>
<td>(6.0)%</td>
<td>(7.5)%</td>
<td>(3.0)%</td>
<td>(9.0)%</td>
<td>(1.5)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.7)%</td>
<td>(13.3)%</td>
<td>(6.7)%</td>
<td>(3.3)%</td>
<td>(36.7)%</td>
<td>(33.3)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear differences between the two samples on the assessments of overall political
type are indicated by Table 8.60 above. First, differences are evident for the
existence (or not) of political commitment. A large proportion of the private
sample revealed a commitment to one of the four political parties (Conservative,
Labour, Liberal/SDP, or Green); this accounted for 60 (89.5%) of the 67
privately educated pupils. In comparison, the state sample revealed only 18 of
the 60 respondents (30.0%) with a commitment to one of these four political
types. The majority of the state sample had no overall political commitment,
being either undecided (36.7%) or anti-politics and declaring that they would not
vote (33.3%). The private sample were therefore more likely to reveal a political
commitment, rather than being undecided or anti-politics (chi-squared = 47.4,
df1, p < .001).
Further differences between the two school groups were revealed by the nature of the political allegiances demonstrated. The state sample revealed only four individuals with a Conservative political orientation, with the largest group (eight individuals) supporting the Labour Party. The private sample revealed a quite different range of political commitments. Eleven individuals had either a Green Party, Labour Party or Liberal/SDP orientation. However, a large majority of the private sample (49 students; 71.3%) had an overall political orientation supporting the Conservative Party. Thus while the majority of the state sample revealed no overall political orientation, the majority of the private sample revealed a right-wing, Conservative Party political orientation.

One additional finding for the private sample was important. This concerns the relationship between overall political type and the results for the seven themes presented above. Table 8.60 above showed that eleven of the private sample supported Labour, the Liberal/SDP or the Green Party. Further analyses of the data showed that it was this group who consistently revealed views and attitudes contrary to the majority of the private sample. For example they accounted for all (or the majority) of those saying they did not generally support the government, those who supported the right of all occupations to strike, and those who were in favour of increased levels of taxation to help the less well off. Overall, this group revealed views consistent with a centrist of left-wing political standpoint, and accounted for the majority of those who disagreed with the majority standpoint generally expressed.

It is of note that of the eleven private school pupils referred to above, eight were found to have an involvement with a group or organisation outside of the school. Some of these pupils identified their political commitment as stemming from their involvement with this outside group. In two cases, this was involvement with a political party - one with the Labour Party and one with the Liberal/SDP.
For four other pupils a religious commitment (all Christian) was central to their lives, and they identified their political philosophy as stemming from this. The remaining two were found to be strongly involved with environmental groups. These individuals therefore not only accounted for the majority of those expressing non right-wing political attitudes, but the central commitment of their lives was found to be outside the school. The importance of this is discussed in Chapter 10.

8.9.2 Comparisons of Political Type Between Subjects and their Parents (Question 19)

It has already been demonstrated that the political type of the private sample was overwhelming in support of the Conservative Party, with the state sample mainly undecided or anti-politics. Comparisons with the political commitments of parents partially reflects these findings. The results are given in Table 8.61 below, with political type coded 1-6, representing 1 (Conservative), 2 (Labour), 3 (Liberal/SDP), 4 (Green), 5 (undecided), and 6 (would not vote/anti-politics):

Table 8.61: Political Orientation of the Samples and their Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Private School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) State School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: one subject had missing data on this variable
Table 8.61 shows that the majority of the private school parents had a commitment to one of the four parties, accounting for 60 of the 67 mothers (89.5%), and 62 of the 67 fathers (92.5%). The nature of this commitment extended to the Liberal/SDP as well as to the Conservative Party. For the state school parents a political commitment to one of the four parties was shown by 39 of the 60 mothers (65.0%), and 40 of the 59 fathers (67.7%), these commitments mainly to the Labour Party and the Liberal/SDP. These figures indicate the greater level of political commitment of both the mothers and fathers of the private school pupils, reflecting the higher level of political commitment of the private school pupils themselves. It is also of note, however, that private school parents were committed to both the Conservatives and the Liberal/SDP, with a much higher number of pupils supporting the Conservatives only. The state pupils demonstrated a range of commitments. This issue is discussed further in Chapter 10.

8.10 Summary: The Content of Political Socialisation

A summary of the political content results is given below. They are presented as a list of the main similarities and differences between the samples on occupational planning and for each of the seven themes. A * in the differences column indicates a significant difference or association at the p < .05 or p < .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMILARITIES</th>
<th>DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to stay on at school to 18+ and then to go on to higher education</td>
<td>* Private more likely to be aiming for University/Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private planning entry into highest level professional occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private longer length of occupational planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1: Attitudes to Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and qualifications important</td>
<td>Private more likely to believe education and qualifications 'very' important, and education to have been 'very' valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 2: Work, Training and Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuing chosen career primarily because it's interesting</td>
<td>* Private give greater importance to working in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject job entitlelement for everyone and for well-qualified</td>
<td>* Private focus more on job satisfaction as a reason for working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View YTS as a useful way to get training</td>
<td>* Private more likely to stay on at work if not necessary to financially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private higher level of work commitment and belief in work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private little experience of anyone on YTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private more positive attitude to YTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Private more positive attitude to training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* State wanted YTS allowances raised
* Private in favour of YTS being made compulsory
* Private more likely to move from area to work
* Private little experience of the unemployed
* Private focussed on the deficiencies of the unemployed in explaining unemployment; state focussed on government policies
* State in favour of raised YTS allowances

**Theme 3: Political Environment**

Regular discussions of politics with family and friends
* Private higher level of interest in politics

Similar levels of political activity
* Private more positive about the political system

Little political education in either school; most in favour of increased political education
* Private discussed politics with friends and family more frequently
* Private more likely to know a politically active person

**Theme 4: Voting Intent**

Tactical voting evident
Larger proportion of state sample would not vote
* Private would mainly vote Conservative; state a number of parties and many undecided

**Theme 5: Party Politics and the Political Process**

Perceptions of policies of two opposition parties similar
* Private generally in support of present government, and social and economic policies; state mainly opposed

Majority against introduction of community charge to replace rates
* Private more supportive of current electoral system
| Trade unions are important in society | * Private more opposed to introduction of proportional representation |
| High level of knowledge of 7 pressure groups; similar levels of support | * State more positive about Local Council |
| | * Private higher level of knowledge of both local MP and the MP’s Party |
| | * State in favour of increased rates of taxation |
| | * Private in favour of a further reduction in trade union power |
| | * Private against a universal right to strike |
| | * Private more likely to join a pressure group in the future |

**Theme 6: Rule of Law**

| Would participate in peaceful acts of protest against a law they disagreed with | * Private rejected the possibility of an undemocratic overthrow of the government |
| No difference on scales of opposition to authority and anti-police attitudes | * State would consider supporting an undemocratic overthrow in certain circumstances |
| | * State would consider protest action which broke the law |
| | * Private more likely to believe people would look after themselves mainly if there was no government |

**Theme 7: Society and the Social Order**

| Most were middle-class | Private focussed on more global, broad definitions of politics, capitalism and socialism |
| Sheffield divided; also a north-south divide | Private more likely to say they were upper class; State working class |
| Women treated differently in society, primarily in terms of type of work | Private focussed on school type and educational level in describing differences between classes; state on income and wealth |
Live according to a set of rules

* Private focussed on poverty as inevitable and natural; State blamed government

* Private more likely to describe human nature as selfish and greedy; State peaceful and co-operative

Political Type

* Private more likely to have a political commitment; State undecided or would not vote

Private would mainly vote Conservative

The length of the differences column of this summary demonstrates the high level of differences between the private and state samples on the content of political socialisation. The following Chapter presents the results for the process of political socialisation.
CHAPTER 9: RESULTS (2): THE PROCESS OF POLITICAL SOCIALISATION

The second of the research objectives was to investigate whether there were differences in the process of political socialisation between the private and state educated samples, using Eriksonian concepts of identity commitment and exploration. Two tasks were undertaken for the process analysis. Task one explored whether or not the respondent had a political identity commitment (a "clear, firm and integrated" commitment to a political ideology), whilst the aim of task two was to code the respondent's political identity category (i.e., the four categories of achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). The same two tasks were undertaken for occupational identity. (The reader is referred to Chapter 3 for the theoretical background and to Chapter 7 for details of the measures and analyses undertaken).

The Chapter is divided into two parts. Part One gives the results for the process of political socialisation, with results by school and cohort (9.1); case studies of the four identity categories (9.2); grouping of political identity category by school (9.3); the relationship between political identity process and political content (9.4); and the relationship between the political identity domain and the occupational domain (9.5). Finally in Part One, a summary of the process results is given (9.6). (Note that results for the four identity categories are abbreviated in all tables in this Chapter to ach (achievement), mor (moratorium), fore (foreclosure), and diff (diffusion)). Part Two presents a summary of both the content and the process results for the two sub-groups at the private school: APS and non-APS pupils (9.7.1) and males (9.7.2).
9.1 Political Identity: Results for Identity Commitment and Identity Category by Total Sample, School, and Cohort

9.1.1 Political Commitment and Category: Results for the Total Sample

The results for tasks one and two (identity commitment and category) for the total sample (ie both school samples combined) are given in Table 9.1 below, with numbers and percentages per task:

Table 9.1: Political Commitment and Category Results for the Total Female Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Identity Commitment</th>
<th>(n=127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>No Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61.4%)</td>
<td>(38.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Identity Category</th>
<th>(n=127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Mor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.2%)</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploring the task one results first (whether or not respondents had a political identity commitment), several aspects of Table 9.1 are important. Almost two-thirds (61.4%) of the total sample had a political identity commitment. The higher proportion of respondents with a commitment than without is consistent with the literature (for example Meilman, 1979; Kroger and Haslett, 1988), which generally demonstrates a movement towards political commitment in adolescence. Results for task two (identity category) show that of the 78 respondents with a political identity commitment (ie in the achievement and foreclosure categories), the majority had first experienced a
period of exploration of alternatives (ie they were in the achievement category). This group accounted for over one-third of the total sample. Of the 49 respondents without a political identity commitment (ie in the moratorium and diffusion categories), the majority were not currently exploring among political alternatives and showed no interest in doing so (ie in the diffusion category).

The null hypothesis (see Chapter 6) was that there are no differences in the process of political socialisation between private and state educated young people, after matching for socio-economic background. If this hypothesis was supported, the distribution of respondents on tasks one and two should not be significantly different by school type. Results for identity commitment and category, however, did show considerable differences when explored by school. These results (numbers and percentages per school) are given in Table 9.2 below:

Table 9.2: Political Commitment and Category Results by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Identity Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>No Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(89.6)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.4)</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Identity Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Mor</td>
<td>Fore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.8)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(23.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.8)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Table 9.2 demonstrate differences in both identity commitment and category between the two samples. Differences were first evident for task one, whether or not subjects revealed a political identity commitment. The private sample accounted for 60 of those with a commitment, the state sample 18. Expressed as a percentage of those with a political identity commitment (i.e., as a percentage of 78), the private school respondents accounted for 76.9% of those with a political identity commitment, and the state school respondents 23.1%. A much greater proportion of the private sample therefore had a political identity commitment (chi-squared = 47.3, df1, p < .01).

The different numbers in each sample with and without a political identity commitment resulted in differences in the identity category results, i.e., the task two results. First, differences were evident for those with a political identity commitment (in the achievement and foreclosure categories). For those in the private sample with a political identity commitment, equal numbers (30 in each category) were in the achievement and foreclosure categories. For the state sample with an identity commitment 16 were in the achievement category and only 2 in the foreclosure category. As a percentage of those with a commitment at each school, only 11.1% of the state sample were foreclosed (i.e., 2 of 18), compared with 50% of the private sample (i.e., 30 of 60) in this category. Thus not only did a much larger proportion of the private sample have a political identity commitment, but a larger proportion of this group had achieved that identity without evidence of exploration of political alternatives.

Second, differences between the two samples were evident for the identity categories of those without a political identity commitment. For the seven privately educated respondents without a commitment, the majority (five pupils) were currently exploring (in the moratorium category), with the remaining two in the diffusion category. At the state school there were 42
respondents without a political identity commitment. Of these, 14 respondents were currently exploring among alternatives (moratorium) with the remaining two-thirds (28 respondents) in the diffusion category, not currently exploring alternatives and showing no interest in doing so. The identity category results therefore showed quite different patterns by school type (chi-squared = 55.3, df3, p < .01). Thus not only did a larger proportion of the state sample not have a political commitment, but a much larger proportion of this group showed no evidence of exploration of political alternatives.

The above results show different modes of political identity development between the two samples. A large majority of the private sample revealed a political identity commitment, secured both after exploration and without any evidence of exploration (i.e., in the achievement and foreclosure categories). In contrast, less than a third of the state sample had a political identity commitment; those with a commitment in this group had generally done so after a period of exploration of political alternatives. For the state sample without a political commitment, only a third were currently exploring among political alternatives, with the rest (comprising almost half of the state sample) not currently exploring among political alternatives and showing no interest in doing so.

9.1.2 Political Commitment and Category: the Effects of Cohort (age)
Chapter 3 demonstrated a progression towards identity commitment in the adolescent period. The sampling of two age cohorts in the current study (i.e., 15/16 year-olds and 17/18 year-olds) enabled further investigation of this. Table 9.3 below gives the results for identity commitment (task one), detailing numbers and percentages by cohort and per school:
Table 9.3: Political Commitment Results by School Type and Age Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and Cohort</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>No Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>38 86.8</td>
<td>5 13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33 93.1</td>
<td>2 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27 86.8</td>
<td>5 13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>23 26.1</td>
<td>17 73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6 26.1</td>
<td>17 73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12 32.4</td>
<td>25 67.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing cohort effects was compounded both by the different numbers of respondents in each age cohort per school (with a greater proportion of younger respondents in the private sample), and by the greater proportion of those with an identity commitment at the private school. Exploring the results as percentages of the cohorts (as in Table 9.3 above) however, demonstrates that the largest proportion of pupils with an identity commitment were in the older cohort at both schools (93.1% of private school pupils and 32.4% of state school pupils). Although these findings suggest increased commitment with age, the differences found were small; chi-squared results for a crosstabulation of commitment and cohort were not significant for either school sample. (It is important to note, however, that the results as presented in Table 9.3 are related to the issue of combining the categories. Exploring differences between groups using the criteria of commitment/no commitment is a commonly used method, but is problematic. Section 9.3 discusses the results of combining the categories using both the criteria of commitment and history of exploration).
9.2 Case Studies of the Four Identity Categories

Section 9.1.1 of this Chapter demonstrated both commitment and category differences between the private and state samples. This suggests the utility of the approach for exploring differences in process. In order to further demonstrate the distinctiveness of individuals in the four categories, this section presents four brief case studies, one for each of the four identity categories. Each is considered to be illustrative of those young people within the four categories, reflecting the richness of detail contained in all of the 135 interviews (Josselson et al, 1987a). The case studies contain a brief description of the respondent's current status and career plan, followed by a summary of their history of political exploration (and thus identity category) and whether or not they demonstrate a political identity commitment.

1. Identity Achievement: "Sarah" was an older cohort pupil at the private school, taking three A Levels and planning to study law at University. Her aim was to qualify as a barrister and specialise in corporate law.

Sarah repeatedly stated her support for the Conservative Party and its policies, describing herself as a "very strong" supporter. She stated that the government's economic policies were central to her support for the Conservatives; the need to "fight inflation" and to manage the economy efficiently should, she believed, be a government's central concern. The policies which stemmed from these economic policies were also strongly supported:

"Well I mean people say the NHS needs more money, and education, and defence, and everything. But it's crazy. The Government understands that you can only spend money once you've earnt and created it. I agree with Mrs T on that. We have to learn to live within our means."

Overall Sarah said she supported "just about" every policy of the current government as well as its general philosophy.
Sarah's political attitudes demonstrated the "clear, firm, and integrated" views characteristic of those with a political identity commitment. She said that she first began to understand general political issues at about the age of 13. For the next two years she supported the Liberal/SDP, partly (she believed) because her mother did, but also because their policies seemed less extreme than those of the Labour and Conservative parties. However, what she saw as the failure of the Liberal/SDP to agree on both policies and a name for the party, led to what she described as a period of "looking at what was on offer elsewhere". She listened to some party political broadcasts and discussed some of the issues with friends. Eventually she settled on a commitment to the Conservatives:

"Well it was really a gradual process. I never really got on with Labour Party ideas, they just seemed very extreme, and all spend, spend, spend. They just didn't seem to make economic sense. But the more I heard of the Conservative Party the more they did make sense. They wanted to get inflation down and try to spend efficiently, and encourage business and enterprise...and I think that's just what they've done."

It was this history of exploration of political alternatives before the current commitment to the Conservative Party that led to Sarah being classified as having a political identity commitment and to be in the identity achievement category.

2. Moratorium: "Cathy" was a younger cohort pupil at the state school, doing GCSEs. She hoped to stay on in the sixth form and do arts A Levels, and then apply to University to do either an English or a History degree. At the time of the interview she was planning to pursue a career in advertising.

During the interview, Cathy demonstrated no evidence of commitment to a political ideology, but clear evidence of being "in crisis" (the term used by Marcia, 1966, for those currently exploring amongst alternatives). She described herself as "totally uninterested" in politics up until the end of the
fourth year. However, her parents were quite interested in politics and talked about it a great deal, and this led to her developing an interest:

"Gradually I suppose I've just become more and more interested... maybe because they were always talking about it. I began to understand more about politics and how it works and that makes you more interested doesn't it?"

Although her parents both strongly supported the Labour Party, Cathy was unable to make up her mind:

"No, I honestly have no idea who I support or who I would vote for in an election. I think the environment is really important and so I'm looking at what all the parties have to say on that. I think the Tories are right in fighting the Unions, and in trying to get inflation down. But I really disagree with, like, the education cuts and the way they're treating the nurses and teachers. The Liberals are probably worth a look too. To be honest I just can't decide..."

Cathy did not reveal a "clear, firm and integrated" commitment to a political ideology. However, she was clearly currently exploring among political alternatives in an attempt to achieve a resolution:

"Well, as I said I am trying to find out more about all the issues and policies. I mean I get a paper each day now because I like reading about what's happening in politics... I do want to decide who I support because I think it's important to have a commitment and know who you would vote for."

Cathy was therefore classified as not having a political identity commitment and in the moratorium category.

3. Foreclosure: "Rachael" was an older cohort pupil at the private school, doing three science A Levels and planning to go to University. Her aim was to train as a civil engineer, and eventually set up her own engineering company.

Rachael was a strong and articulate supporter of the Conservative Party, and of Mrs Thatcher in particular:
"Basically I agree with their policies. I think the Conservatives are just the only reasonable party. I admire Mrs T in particular. She's tackling everything that previously has just been left... like the rates, and the unions, and standards in education. And the economy of course... you have to be tough to tackle that properly."

Overall, Sarah demonstrated a clear and integrated political commitment, revealing a right-wing commitment in the content results. In this sense, Rachael was very much like Sarah earlier. What distinguished the two, however, was the way in which they had reached their commitment. For Sarah it was after a period of exploration of the alternatives available; for Rachael there was no evidence of a history of exploration. When asked whether she had ever supported a different party, Sarah's reply was as follows:

"Well to be honest no, I've never even considered what the others have to offer. You see my parents are both strong Tory supporters as I said, so there were always Tory views around when I was growing up. Then as I got older I could just see that what they said made sense. There's never been any need to look elsewhere because they've just got it dead right. I've never even really found out what the rest's policies are."

This lack of exploration of political alternatives, combined with the clear, firm, and integrated commitment to a political ideology, led to Sarah being classified as having a political identity commitment and in the foreclosure category.

4. Identity Diffusion: "Anne" was an older cohort respondent at the state school. She was doing two A Levels and planned to go to a local College to do an arts foundation course. She hoped eventually to work in a job using art, but did not know what actual job.

Anne admitted to "hating politics and everything related to it", was "totally uninterested" in politics, and probably would not vote in an election. She disliked all the parties and could not say whether she felt closer to one party:

"Oh they're all as bad ... all lies and waffle. I can't bare any of them. The Tories are bad but I bet the others wouldn't do anything different if they were in power."
Later in the interview, Anne was asked whether she had ever felt differently to this: "No, never, I've always hated it all" she replied. There were single issues which she felt strongly about (arts funding and the environment in particular), but she rejected the stance of all the parties on these issues.

Anne was consequently classified as being without a political identity commitment. Unlike Cathy earlier, however, there was no evidence of Anne exploring amongst alternatives in an attempt to reach a commitment. She didn't read newspapers and rarely watched news programmes, adding "I refuse to join in if my parents or friends start talking about it. I try to change the topic." Anne was classified as having no political identity commitment and in the identity diffusion category.

The four case studies presented are considered representative of the respondents in the four identity categories. The case studies reveal the complexity of the political thinking of adolescents, but also demonstrate the contribution of the process method of identity commitment and category as a mode of exploring political development. The results of three further aspects of the process results are presented below: the grouping of identity categories, the relationship between the process and content results, and the relationship between the domains of occupations and politics.

9.3 Grouping of Political Identity Category by School

Chapter 3 demonstrated that two different modes of data analysis are generally used by researchers to explore identity category data. This involves the "collapsing" or grouping of the four identity categories (achievement, moratorium, foreclosure and diffusion) into two groups. These two methods of analysis were both undertaken in the current research, in order to explore whether either method reveals any distinctive characteristics of the two groups.
on the process of political development. (See Chapter 3, section 3.6, for a discussion of the issues underlying identity grouping).

The two methods of category grouping are based on different views of what is the most important distinguishing feature of each category. The first mode of analysis uses an outcome criteria, collapsing the categories of achievement and foreclosure (ie those respondents with a political identity), and moratorium and diffusion (ie those without an identity). (Note that this is the same method implicit in coding for task one, ie looking at who has and who has not developed an identity commitment). The second method adopts a process criteria, collapsing the categories of achievement and moratorium (ie those who have explored, or who are currently exploring, among alternatives) and foreclosure and diffusion (those who have not, or who are not currently, exploring among alternatives).

Table (9.4) overleaf gives the results of using the outcome and process criteria for grouping the categories by school. The use of the outcome and process criteria for grouping the four categories produces quite different results when presented by school. First, the outcome approach (as presented earlier in section 9.1.1) demonstrates the much higher proportion of the private sample compared with the state sample who have a political identity commitment. The use of this criteria for analysis (which is based on committed and uncommitted groups), obscures the actual mode of political development that led to the respondents' current status. This essentially results in a process approach that uses a content/outcome focus.
Table 9.4: Political Identity Category Grouped Using Outcome and Process Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome Criteria</th>
<th>Process Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach and Fore</td>
<td>Ach and Mor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>combined</td>
<td>combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Mor and Diff</td>
<td>Fore and Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>combined</td>
<td>combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
<td>60 (89.6)</td>
<td>35 (52.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=60)</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
<td>30 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some researchers consequently use the second approach to grouping the categories, using a process criteria which focusses on "questioners" and "non-questioners". Using this criteria, the second set of results of Table 9.4 above show almost no difference between the private and state educated samples. Chi-square tests for the outcome and process criteria for grouping the categories shows this clearly. Using the outcome criteria there is a significant association between school type and identity commitment (chi-squared =47.3, df1, p < .01), whilst using process criteria there is no significant association (chi-squared = .06, df1, not significant).

The results of using the process criteria (ie questioners and non-questioners) to group the four categories is important. Chapter 3 explained that some identity researchers (for example Fitch and Adams, 1983) propose the use of
this method because it distinguishes between 'high' and 'low' groups; high and low in terms of psychological health and mode of psychological functioning. These authors believe that a more complex identity formation requires a period of self-exploration. The categories which are characterised by current or past exploration are the achievement and moratorium categories (ie the questioners); these categories are seen as more "desirable". Using this method it was shown that the private and state samples are very similar in the proportion of pupils in these two categories. Thus whereas the private sample reveals a significantly higher proportion of pupils with a political identity commitment, the two samples are very similar when the two questioning statuses are combined.

Using the process criteria for grouping identity category therefore shows that at least half the subjects in both samples were in the high statuses of achievement and moratorium. Similarly approximately half the respondents in both samples were in the low statuses of foreclosure and diffusion. Although this suggests a high degree of similarity between the two samples, differences between the samples remain evident when explored via their two original categories. These are detailed in Table 9.5 below:

Table 9.5: Breakdown of Category Results for Process Criteria Analysis of Political Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Questioners&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Non-questioners&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach + Mor</td>
<td>Fore + Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
<td>30 + 5 (=35)</td>
<td>30 + 2 (=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52.2%)</td>
<td>(47.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=60)</td>
<td>16 + 14 (=30)</td>
<td>2 + 28 (=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.5 shows, as previously demonstrated, that almost half of both samples were in the questioners categories, i.e. in the achievement or moratorium statuses. The Table also shows that within this group a greater proportion of the pupils at the private school had experienced exploration before making a commitment, and were now identity achieved (30 of the 35). The state sample, however, has almost half of its questioners still questioning (i.e. in the moratorium category). This suggests that the private school questioners are more advanced in their development, being more likely to have resolved their exploration of alternatives and reached identity achievement (chi-squared = 8.1, df1, p < .01 for a crosstabulation of school by questioners categories).

For the non-questioners categories, there were also very clear differences evident between the two samples. The private sample were overwhelmingly in the foreclosure category, the state sample overwhelmingly in the diffusion category (chi-squared = 47.0, df1, p < .01). Thus the non-questioning private school pupils mainly showed a lack of exploration but clear commitments, with the non-questioning state school pupils lacking both exploration and commitment.

The results of this section on grouping the four identity categories are considered particularly important for understanding the process of political socialisation in private and state educated young people. The results show that, using conventional analyses, a much larger proportion of the private sample have a political identity commitment. Further analyses of this data shows that, in fact, it is also the history of questioning and exploration that distinguishes the two samples. This issue is discussed in Chapter 10.
9.4 The Relationship of Political Identity Process with Political Content

The results for the content of political attitudes (presented in Chapter 8) were explored in relation to the results for political identity process. The aim was to investigate whether different types of political orientation (using the overall political type measure) were related to particular histories of political exploration and commitment, and vice versa. It is useful at this point to be reminded of the distribution of political type by school (from Chapter 8, section 8.9.1). Results for this are given below with numbers and percentages in each type per school:

Table 9.6: Results for Political Type by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Type</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Lib/S</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Undec</th>
<th>Not vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.1)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=60)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One particularly interesting finding emerges from these results, and is indicated on the Table by two boxes. If the numbers within each box are totalled (ie 60 for the private school and 42 for the state school) these figures are identical to the results for identity commitment presented in Table 9.2 earlier. Thus 60 respondents at the private school were found to have a political identity commitment, compared with 42 respondents at the state school who did not. This therefore demonstrates a 100% agreement between those respondents classified as having a political commitment to either the Conservative, Labour, Liberal/SDP or Green Parties in the political type analysis, and later coding of political identity commitment from the
transcripts. It is important to note that these were the same individuals who were in these categories in each mode of analysis. In coding for evidence of political commitment, therefore, respondents were correctly coded as (for example) having a political commitment rather than being coded as undecided and vice versa. This offers considerable support for the accuracy of the coding of political identity commitment and category.

Investigation was made of whether those in the four identity categories were characterised by commitment to certain political types (ie Conservative, Labour, Liberal/SDP, or Green). It is important to note, however, that as 70% of the state respondents had no political commitment the results below relate primarily to the the private sample. The distribution of political type by identity category is given in Table 9.7 below:

Table 9.7: Relationship Between Identity Category and Political Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Type</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Lib/SDP</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 (n=60)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 ach</td>
<td>27 fore</td>
<td>3 ach</td>
<td>1 fore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ach</td>
<td>2 fore</td>
<td>8 ach</td>
<td>4 ach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Table 9.7 do suggest a relationship between overall political orientation and identity category. Although small in number, those with a Labour, Liberal/SDP or Green commitment were almost all in the achievement category, i.e., they had experienced a period of exploration of alternatives before settling on their political allegiance. For both samples combined, 25 respondents were in the Labour/Liberal/SDP/Green political type categories. Of these, only three were foreclosed with the remaining 22 identity achieved. The majority of those supporting these three Parties (88.0%) were therefore characterised by exploration of political alternatives prior to commitment.

For those with a Conservative political type however (53 respondents in total), the pattern was quite different. Of this group 29 (54.7%) were foreclosed, i.e., they had a political commitment to the Conservative Party but showed no evidence of ever having explored among political alternatives. This was particularly the case at the private school, where the majority supported the Conservatives. The following Chapter discusses whether this finding is a result of the fact that the majority of the Conservative supporters were from the private school (and therefore a tendency to foreclosure is a possible function of school effects), or whether the nature of Conservative political thought itself is a possible factor.

9.5 **The Relationship Between the Political Identity Domain and the Occupational Identity Domain**

This section gives the results for commitment and exploration in the occupational domain, and explores the relationship between the two domains. The identity commitment and category results for the occupational domain are given below, for the total sample and per school:
The results of Table 9.8 (task 1) show that for the total sample, 107 respondents (84.3%) had an occupational identity commitment: i.e. they showed evidence of a clear and firm commitment to a particular career plan. This compares with 78 (61.4%) of the total sample who showed a political identity commitment (see 9.1.1 earlier). The greater proportion of respondents with an occupational commitment than a political one is not unexpected, as occupational planning for this age group will be a concern for pupils, parents, and schools. However, there were differences evident in the
proportions who had an occupational identity commitment by school type, as was previously found for the political domain. A larger proportion of the private sample had an occupational commitment, with 95.5% having a commitment compared with 71.7% at the state school (chi-squared = 13.5, df1, p < .01).

Differences between the two samples were also found for identity category in the occupational domain. For example, no privately educated pupil was in the diffusion category, i.e., not currently exploring among occupational alternatives and showing no interest in doing so. Further, over a third of the private sample had an occupational commitment but showed no evidence of having explored occupational alternatives (i.e., in the foreclosure category); this finding reflects the larger proportion of privately educated pupils who were foreclosed for the political domain. The majority of both samples were, however, identity achieved for the occupational domain, accounting for 58.2% of the private sample and 63.3% of the state sample. (Chi-square analyses were not undertaken as two of the eight cells had an expected frequency of less than five).

Section 9.3 demonstrated that for the political domain, combining the four categories using process criteria showed that the two samples had similar outcomes (in terms of whether they had explored amongst alternatives or not), but that they had reached these statuses using different modes of exploration. For the occupational domain, Table 9.8 showed differences between the two samples when using the outcome criteria of occupational commitment, with a larger proportion of the private sample having an occupational commitment. Analysis of the occupational results using the process criteria for grouping the categories is given in Table 9.9 below:
Table 9.9: Breakdown of Category Results for Process Criteria Analysis of
Occupational Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questioners</th>
<th>Non-questioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach + Mor</td>
<td>Fore + Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39 + 3</td>
<td>25 + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>= 42 (62.7%)</td>
<td>= 25 (37.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>38 + 11</td>
<td>5 + 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>= 49 (81.6%)</td>
<td>= 11 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the Table 9.9 demonstrate that, as for the results for the political domain, using process and outcome criteria for grouping the categories produces quite different results. Using history of questioning rather than current commitment reveals a greater proportion of the state sample in the high statuses of achievement and moratorium (81.6% compared with 62.7%), although both groups show a majority in these two categories. A crosstabulation using the totals (ie questioners and non-questioners) showed the state sample were more likely to have experienced a period of exploration of occupational alternatives (chi-squared = 5.6, df1, p < .05).

A primary reason for coding occupational identity was to explore the relationship between commitment and exploration in one domain (politics) with commitment and exploration in another (occupation). Table 9.10 below gives the results of a crosstabulation of political identity commitment with occupational identity commitment (scores and percentages per school):
Table 9.10: Crosstabulation of Political Identity Commitment by Occupational Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Identity</th>
<th>Political Identity Commitment</th>
<th>No commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private (n=67)</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>57 (85.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Commitment</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (n=60)</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>14 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Commitment</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 9.10 above further reflect the differences already demonstrated in commitment for the political and occupational domains between the two samples. The Table shows that for the private sample, 85% of respondents had both an occupational and a political identity commitment; further, there were no private school pupils without a commitment in at least one of the two domains. (It is of note also that an examination of the category results revealed 13 privately educated pupils in the foreclosure category for both the occupational and political domains). These results for the private sample contrast with those for the state sample: just under half of this group (48.3%) had an occupational commitment but no political one. Further, over a fifth of the state sample (21.7%) had no commitment in both the political and occupational domains. A crosstabulation of those with a commitment in both domains by school showed the private sample more likely to be both occupationally and politically committed (chi-squared = 55.5, df1, p <.001). These results suggest that having a commitment in one domain is linked to commitment in another domain, as suggested by the literature review earlier.

Table 9.10 above gave a crosstabulation of the results for the political and occupational domains, based on those with and without a commitment in each
domain. Table 9.11 below gives a crosstabulation for occupational and political identity using the questioners and non-questioners mode of grouping the categories:

Table 9.11: Crosstabulation of Political and Occupational Domain Results Using Questioners and Non-Questioners Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Domain</th>
<th>Occupational Domain</th>
<th>Questioners</th>
<th>Non-questioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Questioners</td>
<td>25 (37.3)</td>
<td>17 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=67)</td>
<td>Non-questioners</td>
<td>10 (14.9)</td>
<td>15 (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Questioners</td>
<td>27 (45.0)</td>
<td>22 (36.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>Non-questioners</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of the political and occupational domain results using commitment/ non-commitment (Table 9.10 above) showed considerable differences between the two schools. The comparisons using questioners and non-questioners groupings (Table 9.11) shows fewer differences between the two samples. Those in the questioners categories for both politics and occupation, for example, accounted for similar proportions of both samples (37.3% private and 45% state). Also, a greater proportion of private school pupils were in the non-questioners categories for both politics and occupation (22.4% private and 13.3% state). A crosstabulation of those who had questioned in both domains by school, showed no association between questioning and school type (chi-squared not significant).
9.6 Summary: The Process of Political Socialisation

The results of a comparison of those with and without a political identity commitment revealed considerable differences between the two samples, with 89.6% of the private sample having a political commitment compared with only 30% of the state sample. Comparisons of the two schools for the four identity categories (i.e., for history of exploration and commitment) showed further differences. For those with an identity commitment, the private sample were more likely to be foreclosed (commitment without history of exploration) than the state sample; for those without an identity commitment, the private sample were more likely to be currently exploring (moratorium), with the state school mainly in the diffusion category.

The Chapter explored different methods of grouping identity categories. It explored the use of an outcome criteria using the criteria of commitment and no commitment, which combines the achievement/foreclosure and moratorium/diffusion categories. It was noted that some researchers criticise this because it focusses on the outcome (i.e., achievement or not) rather than on the history of exploration; the ability to question and explore alternatives has been identified as more developmentally mature. A comparison was therefore undertaken of combining the four categories using a process criteria. Using the outcome criteria there were significant differences between the samples. Using the process criteria, there were no significant differences between the two schools. Differences were evident within the two categories in the process criteria analysis, however. For the questioners the private sample were more likely to be identity achieved; for the non-questioners the private sample were overwhelmingly in the foreclosure category, the state sample mainly identity diffuse.
Analyses showed some evidence of cohort (ie age) effects in the two samples. At both schools there was evidence of greater levels of commitment and a greater proportion of achievers amongst the older cohort; the association was not significant however. Results for political process were found to be related to overall political type. The political type results showed that there were a majority of Conservative supporters at the private school; the majority of these Conservative supporters were found to be in the foreclosure category. For the supporters of the Labour, Liberal/SDP and Green Parties, the large majority (88%) were in the achievement category. It was suggested that this raises the question of whether it is the private school pupils who tend to foreclosure in the political domain, or whether the nature of Conservative thought is central to foreclosure.

The results for the occupational domain were similar to those for the political domain. For the total sample 84.7% of respondents had an occupational identity, compared with 61.4% with an identity in the political domain. The private sample revealed a significantly larger number of pupils with an occupational commitment, again with a much larger proportion at the private school in the foreclosure category, and with few identity diffuse. The use of a process criteria for combining the groups demonstrated quite different results, with the state sample having a greater proportion of respondents in the questioners categories.

A link was found between commitment in the domains of occupation and politics. For the private sample 85% of pupils had an identity commitment in both domains; this applied to only 23.3% of the state sample. There were no privately educated pupils without a commitment in at least one of the domains; 21.7% of state pupils lacked a commitment in at least one domain. It was suggested that commitment and exploration in one domain may be
related to commitment and exploration in another. Analyses undertaken using questioners and non-questioners categories for occupation and politics showed fewer differences between the two samples.

PART TWO

9.7 Summary of Content and Process Results for the Two Sub-Groups at the Private School

The main comparisons undertaken in the empirical study were between the private and state samples. Chapter 7 described how analyses were also undertaken for two other groups at the private school: APS and non-APS pupils, and males. This section gives some selected results for these two groups, giving a summary of both content results (as in Chapter 8) and process results (as in Chapter 9). First, the content and process results are given for the APS and non-APS pupils (9.7.1). Second, results are given for the private school males (9.7.2). (Chapters 5 and 7 detail the rationale for making these comparisons). Note that a selection of the main results only are given.

9.7.1 APS and Non-APS Pupils

There were 21 female pupils on the APS, with the remaining 46 pupils not on the scheme. Results presented in Chapter 8 demonstrated some differences in the family background of these two groups. Although all the APS and non-APS pupils had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation (the criteria for interview selection), some differences remained evident: both parents of non-APS pupils were generally in occupations in these two categories, compared with only one APS parent. Further, the APS parents were more likely to be in lower status managerial occupations, rather than professional ones.
Overall, the content results showed a considerable degree of similarity between the APS and non-APS pupils. There was no significant difference in the academic achievement of the two groups. The occupational plans of the two groups were similar, with a majority of both samples aiming for University degrees and careers in professional occupations. No difference was found on the measure of length of occupational planning. Attitudes to education revealed both groups focussed on the better academic education they gained at the private school; the majority of the APS pupils also added "being awarded an APS place" as a reason for attending the private school. Results on attitudes to employment and training demonstrated considerable similarities between the two groups. T-test results showed no differences between APS and non-APS pupils on the measure of importance of working, or on the scales of employment commitment, work commitment, belief in work, or attitude to training.

Similar results for the two groups were found for themes 4-7 on political and socio-economic attitudes. All but two of the 21 APS pupils were very or quite interested in politics, and there was no significant difference between the APS and non-APS groups on the measure of political alienation. All but one APS pupil said that they would vote. Of the remainder (using the political type measure) 18 APS pupils had a Conservative political type, two a Labour one, and one Liberal/SDP. The majority of the APS pupils' parents, however, supported the Liberal/SDP or were undecided. Both APS and non-APS pupils showed a high level of support for the current government and its policies, with 18 of the 21 APS pupils saying they generally supported the government.
The process results further demonstrated the similarity between the APS and non-APS pupils. Results for political identity commitment and category are given below:

Table 9.12: Political Commitment and Category for the Private School Sample: a Comparison of APS and non-APS Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Identity Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS (n=21)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-APS (n=46)</td>
<td>39 (84.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=67)</td>
<td>60 (89.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Identity Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS (n=21)</td>
<td>13 (61.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-APS (n=46)</td>
<td>17 (37.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=67)</td>
<td>30 (44.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 9.12 show that all 21 APS pupils and the majority of the non-APS pupils had a political identity commitment. Further, results for identity category show that both groups were primarily in the achievement and foreclosure categories. It is of note also that a greater proportion of the non-APS than APS pupils were foreclosed. All 21 APS pupils were also found
to have an occupational identity commitment; of these 12 were identity achieved and nine were foreclosed. (Chi-squared not calculated for commitment or category as a number of cells had an expected frequency of less than five).

9.7.2 Males
The eight males had attended a private school for between four and 14 years (mean 8.9 years). Each had completed their O Levels at a private school and was currently doing A Levels. Their academic achievement ranged from 44-62 (mean 49.1; standard deviation 6.2). T-tests showed a significant difference on the means for academic achievement between the private school males and females (t=3.18, df 11.37, p<.01), with the females having the higher mean score. All the males planned to go on to University or Polytechnic after A Levels; six were aiming for entry into professional(1) occupations (eg law and medicine) and two professional(2) ones. Mean length of occupational planning was 22.3 months, with t-test results showing no difference between the males and females on this measure.

The results on the seven content themes showed considerable similarity between the males and females; some examples are given here. The attitudes to education of the males reflected those of the females, the males mainly naming better academic education and a poor local state school as reasons for being sent to a private school. The main benefits of a private education was seen by all the males as a better academic education, with disadvantages being not knowing young people in their own area and attending a girls school. All the eight males believed that overall private education was fair.

Results for the employment and training theme also showed similarities. No differences were found between the males and females on the means for the
scales measuring importance of working, employment commitment, belief in work, or attitude to training. Further, only one male had experience of anyone on a YTS or who was unemployed; this reflects the low level of such contact amongst the private school females. Seven of the eight males were also in favour of YTS becoming compulsory.

All the males were very or quite interested in politics, and there was no difference on the political alienation scale between the males and females. Voting intent showed that seven males would vote Conservative and one Liberal/SDP; there was no evidence of tactical voting and analysis of the political type results revealed the same findings. Seven of the eight males supported the social and economic policies of the government. The majority of the results on the politics themes confirmed the similarity between the two genders: for example six of the eight were against increased taxation; six were against increased powers for trade unions; and all were against an absolute right to strike. Seven of the eight males believed an overthrow of the government would never happen, and none would support it if it did happen. Overall, the pattern of responses for the males on all seven themes of the content of political socialisation were very similar to the females.

The results for the males on the process of political socialisation were also very similar to the females. All eight males had a political identity commitment, with two identity achieved and six foreclosed. On the political type measure, six of those with a Conservative political type were foreclosed and one achieved; the other identity achieved individual had a Liberal/SDP type. Further, all eight males had an occupational identity commitment, with five identity achieved and three foreclosed. The process results demonstrated a high degree of similarity between the male and female private school pupils, with a high level of identity commitment in both the political and occupational
domains. The majority of both males and females demonstrated commitment to the Conservatives, with a large proportion of both groups showing commitment without exploration (foreclosure).

The results of section 9.7 therefore suggest a similarity in both the content and process of political socialisation between the private school males and females, and also between the APS and non-APS pupils.

The results of the empirical study, presented in Chapters 8 and 9, are discussed in detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 10: DISCUSSION

This Chapter is divided into six sections: a summary of the results of the empirical study (10.1); a consideration of the sample characteristics and their career plans (10.2); a discussion of the content (10.3) and process (10.4) results; a discussion of the role of the school in the political socialisation of youth (10.5); and a discussion of the broader implications of the results (10.6).

10.1 Summary of the Results

The content results (detailed in Chapter 8) demonstrated that the private sample were aiming for higher status professional occupations than the state sample, and had planned their occupations at a significantly earlier age. A larger proportion of the state sample were undecided about their occupational plans. The private sample attached greater importance to working in the future, and achieved significantly higher mean scores on a range of work-related scales. This sample also demonstrated a lack of personal experience of YTS, but were generally in support of it. The state sample were more critical of YTS, and were also more likely to know someone who had experienced it.

In comparison to the state sample, the private sample revealed higher levels of interest in politics, lower levels of political alienation, and a greater proportion knew a politically active person. Similar levels of political activity and views of political education were found. The voting intent of the samples revealed a large proportion of the state sample either anti-politics (and not intending to vote), or undecided about who they would vote for. The majority of the private sample planned to vote Conservative. Evidence of tactical voting was found amongst both samples.
High levels of support for the current government were found amongst the private sample, with generally negative views of the Local Council. Conversely, the majority of the state sample were opposed to the Conservative government, but were more positive about the Local Council. The private sample were resistant to such things as increased rates of taxation and benefit levels, and also a general right to strike. They believed that an overthrow of the government was unlikely, were less likely to support it if it did happen, and were opposed to protest action that broke the law; these views were in contrast to the state sample. There were differences between the samples on broader views of societal structures, for example on perceptions of social class, the causes of poverty, and view of human nature.

Differences between the samples on individual political attitudes and values were reflected in results for the measure of overall political type. A third of the state sample revealed no overall political type, compared with the large majority of the private sample who did reveal one. Of those with a political type, the majority of the private sample were Conservative Party supporters, the state sample mainly Labour Party supporters.

The results for the process of political socialisation (detailed in Chapter 9) reflected the differences found between the samples for the content results. Whereas almost all of the private sample revealed a political identity commitment, less than a third of the state school group did (these results confirming the overall political type measure above). The identity category results showed that many in the private sample revealed political commitment without history of exploration of political alternatives (foreclosure), and that a large proportion of the state sample were not currently exploring among political alternatives and showed no interest in doing so (diffusion).
Further differences between the samples were revealed by using history of exploration, rather than evidence of current commitment, as the mode of analysis. Although equivalent numbers of respondents at each school revealed a history of exploration of political alternatives (ie the questioners in the more psychologically mature categories), there were key differences between those in the non-questioners categories: the private sample were more likely to be foreclosed, the state sample diffuse. Some evidence of cohort (ie age) effects were found. Relating the process results to the measure of overall political type revealed a strong association between Conservatism (which was dominant in the private sample) and the foreclosure status.

A greater proportion of both samples had an occupational than a political identity commitment. As for the political domain, however, more of the private sample had an occupational commitment, again with more in the foreclosure category. Using the process criteria for grouping the categories, a greater proportion of the state sample were in the more psychologically mature categories of achievement and moratorium. Linking the occupational and political results showed that a large proportion of the private sample had a commitment in both the political and occupational domains. The results also showed a high degree of similarity between the males and females at the private school and the APS and non-APS pupils, results consistent for both the content and the process results. Overall, the majority of the private sample were characterised by right-wing political and socio-economic attitudes and values, with a majority also revealing clear identity commitments in the occupational and political domains.
10.2 Sample Characteristics and Career Plans

10.2.1 Sample Characteristics

This section comments on the sample selection, academic histories, and family backgrounds of the two samples. (A more general discussion of methodological issues arising from the research is included in section 10.6).

The method of sample selection (see Chapter 7) meant that the older cohort mainly comprised those currently at the two schools, but also included those who had left the schools two years previously at the age of 16. It is of note that whereas this latter category accounted for 66 pupils at the state school, it accounted for only eight pupils at the private school. Although the fifth year of the state school was larger than that of the private school, the proportion leaving school at 16 at the state school was still much larger; this appears to confirm the high staying-on rate at age 16 in the private sector (Walford, 1987, 1990). The fact that there were only eight pupils who left at 16 at the private school also means that the failure to contact any of this group may not have significantly affected the nature of the private sample.

One additional aspect of the sample selection is important, concerning the current status of the state sample. Of those who left the state school at age 16, only three of the 29 respondents were subsequently selected for interview, ie they had at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation. This compares with the majority (36 out of 39 respondents) who were selected for interview of those currently in the older cohort at the school. Thus those respondents with lower socio-economic backgrounds were more likely to have left the school at 16. This confirms the finding of many studies that children from higher socio-economic backgrounds are more likely to stay on at school at 16.
The private sample were shown to have a significantly higher level of academic achievement than the state sample. This confirms the findings of earlier studies (Halsey et al, 1984) that the private sector is associated with the achievement of higher academic results than the state sector; it is important to remember that the two groups were matched for socio-economic background. The mean scores for academic qualifications were high for both school groups, however, averaging seven O Level passes for the state sample and eight for the private sample: these results clearly suggest that both samples were amongst the most academically able pupils.

Two aspects of the family backgrounds of the samples are worthy of note. First, a significant proportion of the parents of the privately educated pupils had themselves been privately educated; this suggests some continuity of private education across generations. It is possible that these families are the "naturals" or "traditionals" described in research on parental motivation in choosing private education (Fox, 1985; Johnson, 1987, 1990). Johnson (1990) reports that these parents believed they had experienced a better education in the private sector, and felt "obliged" to provide their children with the same experience. The remainder of the parents may have chosen private education because of dissatisfaction with current educational policies and provision, or with their local school. This view is supported by the numbers of pupils naming the 'poor local school' as a reason for attending the school. It is additionally of note that the 54 mothers and fathers educated privately were all couples; this suggests that the privately educated are more likely to have partners who are privately educated.

The second aspect of note in the samples' family backgrounds concerns the use of parental occupation in matching pupils for socio-economic background. It was reported in Chapter 7 that a high level of agreement was reached
between two coders in coding parents occupations into those in professional or managerial occupations, and those not in these two categories. This method of matching for socio-economic background may therefore be useful in the future, as not only is it open to high levels of inter-rater reliability, but it has been shown by researchers to encompass a broad range of socio-economic characteristics (Osborn and Morris, 1979; Duke and Edgell, 1987). Only a very few studies have matched subjects for social class, and given equal weight to the occupation of both mothers and fathers (eg Stradling, 1977). Further, it was significant that the parents of APS pupils were often single parents, with lower status occupations than the non-APS parents. The comparisons of the APS and non-APS pupils (reported in 9.7.1 and discussed later in this Chapter) are made more valid if the two groups of pupils have some differences in their backgrounds.

10.2.2 Career Plans

Two sets of results were given concerning the occupational plans of the samples. The first related to subjects’ career and post-school plans (Chapter 8), the second to the results for occupational identity (Chapter 9). These are discussed separately below.

Although the majority of the younger cohort of both samples planned to leave school at the age of 18 or over, the state sample were more likely to be leaving earlier or were uncertain about their future plans. This confirms findings by earlier researchers that private school pupils are more likely to stay on at school at 16, with the 14-18 period a distinct phase in private sector schools (Walford, 1987). This is also interesting in light of Eglin's (1984) report that private school pupils experience greater peer pressure to stay on at school longer.
The results showed that a greater proportion of the private sample were planning to do A Levels and go on to University. These higher occupational aims were further reflected in the finding that all but four of the private sample had a career aim and were planning professional occupations; one third of the state sample did not know what type of work they wanted to do in the future. The finding that the private sample had a significantly longer length of occupational planning reflects the comments made by pupils in the interviews, that the early development of an occupational aim was encouraged by the school.

The differences between the schools in the content of their occupational aims were reflected in the process results for occupational identity commitment and category. Whereas all but three of the private school pupils had an occupational identity commitment ("a clear, firm and integrated commitment to a career plan"), over a quarter of the state sample had no such commitment. These results reflect the finding (earlier) that more of the private sample were able to name the particular career they wanted to pursue. This difference between the two samples is more significant because of the greater proportion of subjects in the younger cohort at the private school, who (it might be expected) would be less likely to have a clear occupational plan than those two years older.

The occupational category results showed both similarities and differences between the samples. The most common category for both groups (accounting for over half of both groups) was identity achievement, ie commitment after exploration. This confirms the findings of Waterman and Goldman (1978) and Kroger (1988), who found an increase in the occupational achievement status during adolescence. Although a number of state educated pupils did not have an occupational commitment, many of
these pupils were currently exploring among alternatives in an attempt to come to a decision (in the moratorium status). It is of note also that there were no pupils at the private school who were not currently exploring among occupational alternatives and who showed no interest in doing so (identity diffusion); 10% of state school pupils were identity diffuse. The importance attached to all pupils having a career plan at the private school (emphasised by careers staff during meetings held with them) may help explain this latter finding.

A large proportion of private school pupils (25 pupils, 37.3%) were found to be in the foreclosure category, revealing an occupational commitment but without evidence of prior exploration of political alternatives. This suggests that many private school pupils are identifying (or adopting from others) a particular career aim, and then pursuing it without consideration of other careers or options. Chapter 9 also demonstrated that, combining the categories using questioners and non-questioners criteria, it was the state sample who had a greater proportion of pupils in the more psychologically "desirable" categories of achievement and moratorium.

The implications of the results for occupational identity are open to different interpretations. It is possible that having a commitment to an occupational identity (whether in the achievement or foreclosure categories) is, in career terms, advantageous. This is because (as many of the private school pupils suggested), having a clear aim enables forward planning to secure entry into a career, by choosing appropriate GCSE and A Levels and undertaking periods of work experience. Many pupils additionally commented on the utility of an early and definite career plan for impressing interviewers for University and job entrance. Thus whilst achieving an early and firm occupational identity may be advantageous in securing success in a chosen career, having a more
psychologically mature mode of reaching that identity may have no advantages outside the individual level. (These issues are discussed further in relation to the results for political identity in section 10.4).

10.3 The Content of Political Socialisation
This section discusses the results presented in Chapter 8 on the content of political socialisation. First, the results of themes one and two on education, training, and employment are discussed (10.3.1). Second, the results of themes three, four and five are discussed, relating to political attitudes and orientations (10.3.2). Third, the results of themes six and seven are discussed, concerning wider issues of politics and society (10.3.3). Finally, there is a discussion of the results of overall political type (10.3.4).

10.3.1 Education, Training, and Employment
It was suggested earlier that many of the parents of the private sample may comprise what Fox (1985) described as "traditional" users of the private sector (those likely to have been privately educated themselves), as well as some first time users. This is supported by the results of reasons for attending a private school. The pupils' view that it was the 'better academic' and 'better overall' education that led their parents to send them to the school, were also the responses of many of the traditional parents in Fox's study. The new users of the private school system may be those giving reasons for attending the school such as the poor local state school, or that they had been awarded an APS place. For the latter group, a particular event or local circumstance appears to have led to the decision to use the private sector. Parents satisfied with the local state school may therefore never consider using the private sector.

It is notable that there were very similar reasons given by pupils for being sent to a private school, and what pupils saw as the advantages of private
education. Pupils focussed on better academic education, better discipline, and a better group of people at the school. Many commented, however, that the various advantages of a private education were closely related, with high ability and good discipline leading to 'getting more done', and consequently to a better academic outcome. Very negative comments about discipline and standards in state schools were made by many private school pupils during these discussions, although few had any experience of state education at secondary level. The majority of the private school pupils also believed that the disadvantages to private education were few in relation to the advantages. This was further reflected in the finding that the private school pupils were generally more satisfied with their education than the state school pupils, and believed it to have been of greater value. Further, the main disadvantage named - that of teasing by non-private school pupils - was not something to do with the private school itself, but with the reaction of other people to it.

The positive view of private education held by the private sample was reflected in the result that over 90% of the pupils believed that overall, private education was fair. For many private school pupils the existence of the APS in particular made the private sector fair, by making it open to anyone who was sufficiently academically able. It is of note that many of the private sample believed private education was not unfair because the fees were not actually that high, and that most parents could afford to pay if they were prepared to make some sacrifices. This suggests the unrealistic nature of the samples' views of the disposable incomes of many families. The private sample therefore rejected the view of private education as only available to the rich; the view of this group concerning social inequality will be returned to.
The state sample viewed considerable differences between private and state schools. They focussed on the better academic achievement of private sample (reflecting the view of the private school pupils above) and the belief that private schools are attended only by rich people (a belief in contrast to the views of the private school pupils). It is interesting to note, however, that less than a third of this group wanted the schools banned. This reflects the finding of the British Social Attitudes Survey, that only 29% of a national sample supported a reduction or abolition of private sector schools (Goldstein, 1986).

Considerable differences were found between the two samples on issues of training. It was reported that only a small minority of the private sample had any actual knowledge of someone on (or who had been on) the YTS, compared with the majority of the state sample. This suggests the social isolation of the private sample in contrast to the state sample. This finding was repeated for experience of the unemployed, with very few private school pupils having any experience of this group.

Despite their lack of contact with anyone who had experienced YTS, the private sample were more positive about YTS, were generally in favour of it becoming compulsory, and believed it to be of value to both employers and young people (rather than just one or the other). The state sample were generally more critical of YTS, with 93% of this group against it becoming compulsory. It was clear from their comments that the state school pupils' views were based largely on negative reports of YTS they had received from those they knew with experience of it. It is also possible that as the majority of the state sample did not support the government, their attitudes to YTS may have been part of a rejection of all government policies. The private sample, most of whom were supporters of the government, may have accepted the view of the government that YTS was a "good thing". The significantly
higher mean score achieved by the private sample on the attitude to training scale also suggests a more positive response of this group to all forms of training.

Attitudes to training (and YTS in particular) appeared to be closely linked to broader views of government and society. Many of the private sample proposed a view of obligation rather than entitlement in terms of the relationship between young people and the state. Many objected to what they saw as "lazy young people just signing on" and doing nothing in return for benefits. The private sample generally believed that even if some training was of poor quality, young people on YTS were still contributing to the economy and doing something in return for their allowances. The state sample, although generally endorsing training, viewed YTS as poor quality and designed primarily to reduce the unemployment figures.

The stance of the private sample may reflect the proposal of Stroebe and Frey (1982). This is that those who are seen as benefitting from, but not contributing to, a group, may be seen as violating equity norms and risk negative sanctions from group members (see also Kourilsky, 1981). This may also be revealed in the finding that whereas the private sample mainly wanted unemployment benefit payments to remain at their current levels, the majority of the state sample wanted them to be raised. If the young unemployed were viewed by the private sample as "violating equity norms", they are unlikely to support increased levels of benefit for this group. It is also possible that is reflected in the view of the majority of both samples that job entitlement should not be a universal right.

The employment orientations of the two samples revealed a number of differences. The private sample attached greater importance to working in
the future than the state sample, and gave reasons for working that centered
on achieving job satisfaction; the reasons for working given by the state
sample were more likely to include reasons such as because 'everyone does/
its expected'. A greater proportion of the private sample would also stay on at
work if they did not need to financially. The significantly higher mean score
for the private sample on the scales of work commitment and belief in work
confirm the above findings. These scales included such items as "A person
can get satisfaction out of life without having a job", with the private sample
more likely to disagree with this item. These results suggest high levels of
work centrality and commitment amongst the private sample. Although the
Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) was not measured directly in the empirical
study, these findings suggest that the private sample demonstrate high levels
of the ethic (see Furnham, 1984a; 1984c).

The above findings reflect the career centred ethos of the private school. It
has already been demonstrated that the private sample were mainly aiming
for the highest status professional occupations, and had planned their career
paths much earlier than the state sample. Interviews with the private school's
career staff revealed that the school was very career focussed, and saw high
level career ambitions amongst pupils as a central and desirable outcome. (It
was also suggested by several members of staff that having large numbers of
pupils gaining entry into University and the professions was necessary for the
school to continue to attract parents prepared to pay for their child's
education). The high degree of work centrality and career mindedness of the
private sample may also be linked to the right-wing political orientations of
the private sample demonstrated in Chapter 8. Furnham (1984a; 1984c)
d shows a strong relationship between those who endorse the PWE and
Conservative values; further, the PWE and Conservative values have been
linked to high levels of achievement motivation (Feather, 1984). This is discussed further below.

10.3.2 Political Attitudes and Orientations
The results of theme 3 (on the political "environment" of the two samples) demonstrated that the private sample had a greater level of interest in politics than the state sample, lower levels of political alienation, discussed politics more frequently with family and friends, and were more likely to know a politically active person. It is additionally of note that the private sample were more knowledgeable about the local MP and their political party.

These findings suggest that it was the state sample who were similar to other groups of young people in studies of youth and politics. The majority of the state sample, for example, were 'not very' or 'not at all' interested in politics, reflecting the findings of both Stradling (1977) and Furnham and Gunter (1987), who found low levels of interest in politics amongst young people. The greater level of interest in politics shown by the private sample was reflected in the higher level of political discussion of this group. It is of note, however, that both samples discussed politics with their friends more often than with their family, suggesting the importance of friends and the peer group in the political development of this age group. The private sample were less likely than the state sample to agree with the statements in the political alienation scale, suggesting for example that politicians were mainly self-interested, and that it did not make any difference which political party was in power. The fact that the private sample were more likely to know a politically active person might be related to the more positive attitude to politics of this group; seeing people engage in political activity may dispose a person to view the political system more positively.
Despite these differences, there were some similarities between the samples on the political environment theme. Both the state and private samples were in favour of increased political education in schools, and there were few differences between the groups in terms of actual political activity. It was evident also from the results for knowledge of, and support for, seven different pressure groups, that there were few differences between the samples. It is possible, however, that there are certain responses that are common to the majority of the population in relation to such groups as Anti-Apartheid or Greenpeace (with most people generally in favour), and the National Front (with most people against). There were also only low levels of membership of any of the pressure groups, although twice as many private than state school pupils believed that they would eventually join a pressure group, possibly reflecting the greater belief in the value of politics and political activity of the private sample.

The differences found in the voting intent of the two groups were considerable. One quarter of the state sample would not vote at all, possibly reflecting the lower level of interest in politics of this group, and their higher levels of political alienation in comparison to the private sample. Those at the state school who would not vote or who were undecided (37 of the 60 pupils; 61.7%), were in contrast to those in these two categories at the private school (7 of the 67 pupils; 10.4%). This suggests that both greater political alienation and lack of decision characterise the political orientations of the state sample, which is particularly interesting in light of the larger numbers in the older cohort at the state school. For those who would vote and did know who they would vote for, differences persisted between the two groups. The overwhelming majority of the private sample intended to vote Conservative, the majority of the state sample Labour. These results for voting intent
reflected the different views of the samples on the majority of the attitudinal questions.

The results for voting intent, however, showed evidence of tactical voting amongst both samples, accounting for 13 of the 111 respondents (11.7%) who said they would vote. Consequently, voting intent was proposed as an unreliable measure of political stance or actual party commitment. This indicator is widely used in studies of youth and politics, however, often without additional questioning on the possibility of tactical voting (for example Furnham, 1984a). Further, it is clear that tactical voting does in fact constitute relatively sophisticated political behaviour, behaviour which is rarely recognised as such. Voting tactically involves an understanding (and evaluation) of the relative position of the different parties and candidates in an election, in situations that vary depending on local political circumstances. Relatively little is known about this type of political maneuvering by adolescents, although political scientists have explored it amongst the adult population (see for example Johnston and Pattie, 1991).

The results on the elements of party politics and the political process (theme 5) revealed findings consistent with those presented in themes 1-4. The private sample revealed high levels of support for the current government, and for its economic and social policies when these were explored separately. A majority of this group were also critical of the (Labour run) Local Council. The opposite was found for the state sample. Other results in this theme also showed differences between the samples, and some of these (relating to attitudes to taxation, trade unions, and the opposition parties) are discussed below.
Research has suggested that views on the re-distributive function of taxation are linked to broader views concerning the causes of wealth and poverty (Lewis, 1982); further, these views have been shown to be linked to notions of justice. In the current study, attitudes to higher taxation rates revealed that whereas the majority of the state sample were in favour, the majority of the private sample were against. In particular the finding that over a quarter of the private sample objected because they believed that the better off "have earnt their money" suggests a greater belief amongst this group in reward appropriate to effort. Further, the findings are consistent with attitudes to taxation being related to work beliefs, and in particular with findings that those strongly endorsing the PWE are more opposed to taxation (Furnham, 1983a). Such attitudes are also clearly linked to attributions for social inequality, discussed in the following section (10.3.3).

Attitudes to trade unions revealed agreement between the two samples that, overall, trade unions play an important role in society. This reflects the findings of earlier work (eg Furnham, 1984a) that most people are in favour of "traditional" trade union activities such as pursuing higher wages and protecting workers' rights. However, the private sample were more likely to also believe that trade unions had too much power, and to overwhelmingly reject a right of all occupations to strike; clearly, these attitudes reflect the views of the current government. The views of the private sample were generally in contrast to those of the state sample in these areas.

Views of the policies of the two main opposition parties showed very similar views between the samples for the Liberal/SDP, although a large proportion of both groups were also unsure about their policies. Views of the Labour Party, however, showed some differences between the samples. The state sample focussed on a future Labour government doing 'everything different'
and 'spending more'; the private sample focussed on their belief that the Labour Party would 'close private schools'. The opposition of the Labour Party to the private sector clearly fuelled the general rejection of the Party and its policies. It will be proposed later in this Chapter that opposition and hostility to the private sector from the Labour Party and other groups in society, may have led to the development of a particular form of social identity amongst the privately educated (see sections 10.5 and 10.6).

This section has discussed the findings of themes 3, 4, and 5, on political and socio-economic attitudes and orientations. Overall, the results demonstrated that the majority of the private sample had right-wing political attitudes associated with a free-market individualistic orientation. This was demonstrated in such things as party support, attitudes to taxation, and view of trade union power. The state sample were less clearly defined, however, but many of this group showed attitudes reflecting a more collective, left-wing orientation. This ideological dichotomy reflects Furnham's (1987b) view that the structure of economic beliefs are either conservative/individualistic (representing a capitalist viewpoint), or radical/collectivist (representing a socialist viewpoint). The results of themes 6 and 7 discussed below, on broader issues of societal functioning, reinforce this proposal.

10.3.3 Politics and Society
The results of theme 6 (on authority and the rule of law) showed that the private sample had a higher level of support for the maintenance of current authority and legal structures. The majority of the private sample did not believe there would ever be an overthrow of the government, nor would they support such an overthrow if it did happen; this group also rejected protest action which broke the law. The state samples' views were much less certain
about these issues with, for example, 61% of this group saying they would definitely or possibly participate in protest action which broke the law.

These findings suggest that the private sample viewed current authority structures as permanent and secure, and rejected any undemocratic attempts to change them. The state sample, conversely, were neither certain about the permanence of authority structures, nor the sanctity of democratic rules. There were, however, no significant differences between the two samples on the two scales of opposition to authority and anti-police attitudes. It is possible that this can be explained by the nature of the questions asked in these scales, which ask about such things as the acceptability of breaking the law to help a friend, and not telling the police if they witnessed a break-in. As these questions relate to specific illegal acts, both groups may be reluctant to agree with these items; questioning on issues such as peaceful/violent protest action may (as shown above) be more revealing.

Closely linked to views of authority structures are the results for perceptions of human nature, and view of life in a society without government. Almost half of both groups believed that if there was no government, people would balance looking after themselves with looking after others. Of the remainder, however, the private sample were more likely to view self-interest as prevailing, the state sample viewing help for others as most likely. Similarly for views of human nature, whereas the private sample were more likely to view it as basically selfish and greedy, the state sample saw it as mainly peaceful and co-operative. Previous work has shown how theories of economic and political organisation reflect different views of human nature (Furnham, Johnson and Rawles, 1985). These authors suggest that Conservatism views basic human nature as essentially selfish and anarchic. As such, the finding that the private sample were more likely to see both human
nature and society without government as selfish, reflects these earlier findings.

The results for the three definitions of politics, socialism, and capitalism revealed both similarities and differences between the samples. For definitions of politics, approximately one third of both groups described the overt functions of government (different political parties trying to get into power). Of the remainder the private sample were more likely to describe politics as different ways of running countries, a global and broad definition; the state sample were more likely to define it in terms of making laws and government, a focus on one specific function of politics. The definitions of capitalism given by the samples reflected their definitions of politics. Again a more global description was more likely to be given by the private sample, focussing on capitalism as a form of organisation designed to make profit. The state sample defined capitalism more in terms of its individual aspects, such as individuals trying to get higher salaries and status. Definitions of socialism revealed a third of the private sample focussing on it as the type of government in socialist countries; these definitions were often accompanied by negative comments on lack of freedom and rights in these countries. The state sample defined socialism more often in terms of the policies of the Labour Party. The views of capitalism and socialism in particular reflect the different political attitudes of the two groups.

The nature of societal divisions and social inequality were investigated by attitudes to social class and the treatment of women, and attributions for unemployment and poverty. These aspects revealed some similarities but also a number of differences between the two samples. It was found that, despite the selection of samples matched for socio-economic background, there were differences in social class perceptions. Although the majority of both groups
described themselves as middle-class, just under one third of the private sample described themselves as upper class, and a similar number of the state sample working-class. This finding shows some agreement with Frazer's (1988) finding that her sample of private school girls viewed themselves at the top of the social class hierarchy. A higher level of agreement between the groups was evident concerning geographical and gender divisions in society. Both samples believed that women were treated differently to men, in particular in terms of the type of work they do. Similarly, over 90% of both samples believed that Sheffield was divided and also that there was a north-south divide in the country.

Considerable differences were found between the two samples on what they viewed as the differences between the social classes. Over 60% of the private sample described either educational level or type of school attended as the main difference; this compares with a majority (68%) of the state sample describing income and wealth as the main distinguishing feature of the social classes. The state school response is the more traditional view of social class differences; the private sample were focussing on their own distinctive characteristics and those aspects emphasised by their school and parents as important in affecting life prospects.

Differences were found in the attributional styles of the private and state samples. Furnham (1982b) and others have suggested that attributions for poverty can be either individualistic (in terms of personal characteristics), fatalistic (in terms of luck/chance), or societal (in terms of government policy). In explaining poverty the majority of the private sample believed that there was no actual cause, but was that it was 'just the way society is' (a fatalistic explanation), with a significant number (31%) also blaming the poor themselves (an individualistic explanation). A greater proportion of
individual level blame was also made by this group in explaining
unemployment, accounting for over 46% of their total responses. Conversely,
over one half of the state sample believed that the government was to blame
for poverty (a societal level explanation), with the government also named as
causeing unemployment.

The differences found in the attributional styles of the samples reflects much
of the literature. The results are consistent with Feather's (1983) finding that
private school pupils were more external in attributing unemployment.
Further, the findings are consistent with work demonstrating the link between
political Conservatism and individualistic attributions (Lewis, 1981; Furnham,
1982a; Furnham and Gunter, 1984). The attributions of the private sample
are also consistent in relation to their more negative attitudes towards
increased social security payments (see Furnham, 1982a, 1983b). Attributions
have also been shown to be related, as demonstrated earlier, to fiscal attitudes
and views of the re-distribution of wealth (Lewis, 1982). The relationship
between attributional style and the broader political and socio-economic
attitudes of the two samples are discussed further in section 10.5.

10.3.4 Political Type
The political type measure was designed to explore the overall political
orientation of each respondent. This proved a useful measure in light of the
finding that over 11% of those who would vote were voting tactically; a high
degree of inter-rater reliability was reached in coding overall political type.
The measure also proved useful as a means of separating actual commitment
to a political party and its policies, with intent to vote for a party. For
example, several subjects (mainly at the state school) said that they would
vote for a party, but only because a friend or parent did; apart from this
"commitment" they showed little or no support for the policies of that party.
The results of the political type measure showed that the majority of the private sample had a high degree of commitment to one of four political parties, accounting for 60 of the 67 pupils (89.6%). The state sample revealed a much lower level of commitment, accounting for only 18 of the 60 pupils (30%). The state sample's lower level of political commitment reflects their lower level of interest in politics reported earlier. These results are also significant in light of the finding of lower proportions of the state sample with an occupational identity commitment (discussed further in section 10.4 below).

Of those who did have a political commitment (using the overall political type measure), there were considerable differences between the two samples. The private sample were overwhelmingly committed to the Conservatives (49 of 60), the state sample mainly committed to Labour (8 of 18). This result reflects the generally right-wing views of the majority of the private sample, and also the more left-wing views of the state sample. The relationship between the political commitments of parents and pupils were also given in Chapter 8. It is of note that contrary to previous research findings (eg Acock and Bengtson, 1980), the pupils' perceptions of their parents political orientations were accurate (based on the interviews with private school parents). A greater level of commitment to a political party was found amongst the private than the state school parents, reflecting the results of political commitment for the pupils. It is also of note that similar proportions of private school mothers, fathers, and pupils had a political commitment (approximately 90% of each group). For the state sample, twice as many parents as pupils had a political commitment.
The political commitments of parents, however, differed in some respects from those of the pupils for both school samples. Whereas the private sample were overwhelmingly Conservative, their parents were both supporters of the Conservatives and the Liberal/SDP. Further, whereas the state sample were mainly undecided or anti-politics, their parents were supporters of the Conservatives, Labour, and the Liberal/SDP. This suggests that the stereotypical view of private school pupils being right-wing because of the right-wing commitments of their parents, cannot explain the majority Conservative support found amongst the private sample. An important finding was also that, although the majority of APS pupils' parents supported the Liberal/SDP or Labour Party, 18 of the 21 APS pupils had a Conservative Party political type. This suggests that despite having parents with quite different value backgrounds, the APS pupils demonstrated the majority orientation of the school. (Possible explanations for these findings are given in section 10.5).

10.4 The Process of Political Socialisation

The content results discussed in the previous section were one half of the investigation of the political socialisation of youth. The second set of results (presented in Chapter 9) used Eriksonian concepts of identity exploration and commitment to investigate the process of political socialisation. Adams (1985) comments on the lack of research using an identity focus to explore political identity development. The aim of the process research was to complement and extend the findings of the content of political socialisation reported above. The results are discussed below in three main sections, looking at the political commitment and category results (10.4.1), the grouping of the identity categories (10.4.2), and the relationship between (i) the process and content results and (ii) the political and occupational domains (10.4.3).
10.4.1 Political Identity Commitment and Category

The results for political identity commitment were found to be identical to the results for the measure of overall political type; this suggests that the measures were accurately tapping evidence of real commitment to a political stance. The results for political identity showed that, whereas over three-quarters of the private sample had a political identity commitment (a "clear and firm" commitment to a political ideology), less than a quarter of the state sample did. In this respect only the private sample show consistency with the literature, which indicates a movement into commitment during adolescence (Waterman, 1985; Kroger, 1988; Cote and Levine, 1989). This is despite the fact that a greater proportion of the state sample were in the older cohort.

The identity category results revealed further differences between the two samples. For those without a political commitment, the state sample were primarily in the diffusion category, not currently exploring among political alternatives, and showing no interest in doing so. It is possible that this is reflected in the lower level of interest in politics of this group and their less positive attitudes to the political process. The few subjects without a political commitment at the private school were mainly currently exploring among political alternatives (in the moratorium status) in an attempt to reach a commitment.

For those with a political commitment, the majority of the state sample had a commitment after exploration (achievement). The private sample, however, had equal numbers (30 pupils in each category) who had a commitment after exploration, and who had a commitment with no evidence of exploration of political alternatives (foreclosure). The large proportion of politically foreclosed individuals at the private school is also significant in light of the number of occupationally foreclosed pupils at the private school (see 10.1.2
earlier). According to Marcia (1966), identity foreclosed individuals are likely to have been brought up in a homogeneous environment with little exposure to competing viewpoints; Kroger (1985) suggests that the foreclosed individual is unable to loosen parental ties. Waterman (1982), in investigating what factors promote movement between statuses, suggests that foreclosure is most likely where there is identification with parents or a significant other, and where there is exposure to a narrow range of views. It is possible that the school experience may be a point of significant identification for the private sample. This possibility is returned to later in this Chapter.

The political identity results demonstrated two other findings consistent with the literature. First, there was evidence of some cohort (ie age) effects at both schools. The largest proportion of both samples with a political identity commitment were in the older cohort. This suggests some evidence of a movement towards commitment in adolescence (eg Stark and Traxler, 1974). Second, the use of case studies as recommended by many identity researchers (for example Josselson et al, 1977a) was shown to be very revealing about adolescent identity development. In particular, the four case studies showed the richness of detail contained in individual interviews with young people.

10.4.2 Grouping of Identity Categories

The results of using two different modes of grouping the four identity categories was given in Chapter 9. The first method uses outcome criteria, combining the achievement/foreclosure and moratorium/diffusion statuses, grouping according to commitment or lack of commitment (as used for example by La Voie, 1976; Adams and Shea, 1979). Implicit in this method (though rarely explicitly stated) is the belief that the two committed statuses are more ‘desirable’. An individual with a clear, firm, and integrated
commitment to a political ideology is viewed as in a more mature developmental stage than someone with no commitment.

The second method uses a process criteria, based on combining the statuses characterised by history of (or current involvement in) questioning of alternatives (moratorium and achievement) and those with no questioning (foreclosure and diffusion). This method (used for example by Marcia, 1976; Kroger, 1986, 1988) describes questioners as being in the 'high' statuses and non-questioners as being in the 'low' statuses. High and low in this sense refers to level of psychological health and mode of functioning. The majority of researchers use this method of grouping the categories, because they believe that a more complex identity requires a period of self-exploration and personal evaluation of alternatives (Fitch and Adams, 1983). Evidence of identity commitment alone is not sufficient.

These two methods revealed different results for the private and state samples. Using the outcome criteria, the results were the same as those presented earlier, ie the private sample with higher levels of politically committed pupils. Using the questioners and non-questioners groupings, however, at least half of both samples were in the questioners and non-questioners categories. Thus using process criteria to explore data within the process method reveals considerable similarity between the two samples.

The results also showed, however, differences in the individual categories within the questioners and non-questioners groups, ie the mode of reaching the current stage. These showed that those in the high statuses (ie the questioners) were mainly identity achieved at the private school, and both in the achievement and moratorium statuses at the state school; thus a greater proportion of the state sample were still questioning. For those in the low
statuses (the non-questioners) the private sample were almost all foreclosed, the state school almost all diffuse. Thus although both groups were non-questioners, the private sample were non-questioning but with a commitment, the state sample non-questioning and showing no interest in doing so.

These results suggest that whichever grouping method is used (ie grouping the categories by evidence of commitment or history of questioning), the private and state samples are different on the process of political socialisation. The private sample are more likely to have achieved a political commitment, with many foreclosed; the state sample show few pupils with a political commitment and are generally uninterested in developing a political commitment. Overall, the results of grouping the categories suggest that both methods can be used effectively to reveal different aspects of political socialisation process. As presented here the results show private and state school differences in both levels of commitment and questioning of political alternatives. Future research might usefully use both methods, dependent on the aim of the analysis.

10.4.3 Relationship of (i) the Process and Content Results and (ii) the Political and Occupational Domains

(i) The relationship of the process and content results
It was demonstrated earlier that the political type results were identical to those for identity commitment. Further exploration of these data revealed a relationship between type of political orientation and the process of developing a political identity. Those with a political commitment to either the Labour, the Liberal/SDP or Green Parties accounted for 25 pupils (both schools combined). Of this group 22 pupils were identity achieved, indicating a tendency for the supporters of these parties to explore the issues and alternatives before settling on a commitment to them. In particular, the
supporters of the Liberal/SDP and Green Parties might have explored issues prior to commitment, as in the few years before the interviews these Parties had very publicly explored both what they stood for and how best to organise themselves to achieve their aims. It is also of note that the three remaining supporters of these parties who were in the foreclosure category, were all at the private school.

Those with a Conservative Party political orientation showed a quite different pattern of history of exploration to those of the political parties above. Over half of those with a political orientation to the Conservatives were foreclosed in politics (both schools combined). They were therefore committed to the Conservative Party and its policies but showed no history of exploration of political alternatives. This applied primarily to pupils at the private school, where the majority of the Conservative supporters were. Of the 49 private school Conservatives, 27 were foreclosed.

The finding of a large number of foreclosed Conservatives at the private school may be explained by previous work by identity theorists. Donovan (1975) proposes that identity foreclosures are the ones to maintain a group or a community, and are not the ones to 'turn it in new directions'. The link between the philosophy of Conservatism and support for maintenance and stability is clear. Further, the content results showed that the private sample were more likely to reject political behaviour which threatened societal instability, for example by disagreeing with civil disobedience and rejecting an undemocratic overthrow of the government. Conservative principles and a tendency to foreclosure may therefore be closely related.

This finding begs the question of the role of different types of political ideology in affecting movement between identity statuses. For example,
supporters of the Labour, Liberal/SDP, and Green Parties may be more questioning and open to debate with regards to their political allegiances; cycles of identity achievement, moratorium, and achievement may therefore be common amongst this group. Early commitment to Conservatism, however, may reflect a need (or a desire) for stability and order that is revealed in a tendency to foreclosure, and an unwillingness to question early established political allegiances. However, whether the foreclosed individual has a tendency to Conservatism, or whether Conservatism itself promotes foreclosure cannot be answered with the data available. This would be an important area for future research.

An investigation of the identity literature revealed no work that has explored the link between political identity process and political content in this way; future work in this area may aid an understanding of political allegiance both in adolescence and adulthood. Pursuing this approach may show that not only are the influences of families, peers and schools important in identity development (ie the agents traditionally explored in political socialisation research), but the very nature of an individual's identity commitments may influence the process of identity development. Political content and identity development may therefore be much more closely related than many researchers have previously suggested.

(ii) The relationship between the political and occupational domains
Grotevant and Thorbecke (1982) describe adolescence as a time of "...spirals of exploration and commitment" (p 403). They suggest that exploration in one domain (and possible resolution and commitment), is followed by exploration and possible commitment in another. Similar findings have been reported by other authors (Waterman, 1985; Kroger, 1988), with most studies reporting young people in different statuses for the different domains, for example
achievement for occupation and moratorium for politics. One of the reasons for coding occupational identity as well as political identity in the current research, was to explore the relationship between the two domains.

Although the majority of both samples had an occupational identity commitment (confirming the work of Kroger, 1988, and others), a larger proportion of the private sample had an occupational commitment (see 10.2.2 earlier). Further, the use of the questioners and non-questioners mode of analysis showed a greater proportion of the state sample in the psychologically mature categories, having experienced real exploration of occupational alternatives. It was also suggested that the state pupils may be more psychologically advantaged as a result, with the private sample advantaged in terms of likelihood of success in pursuing a career.

The use of the questioners and non-questioners mode of analysis was particularly revealing when comparing both domains of politics and occupation, revealing fewer differences between the two samples. Those in the questioners categories for both the domains of occupation and politics accounted for 37% of the private sample and 45% of the state sample; similar proportions of the private (22%) and the state (13%) samples were non-questioners in both domains. Again, this shows that in-depth analysis of the results using process criteria shows fewer differences between the samples.

The examination of the relationship between the political and occupational results using the criteria of commitment showed patterns were occurring for the two domains. There was a generally higher level of identity commitment in both domains amongst the private sample; there was also a tendency to foreclosure in the private sample, with almost one-fifth of this sample in the foreclosure status for both domains. No private school pupil was without a
commitment in at least one domain. Amongst the state sample there was a

tendency for a lack of commitment in one domain, with almost half this group

revealing an occupational commitment but no political one. In addition, one

fifth of this group did not have a commitment in either of the domains.

These results suggest that there are similar trends in the patterns of

exploration and commitment for the occupational and political domains. The

results also suggest the existence of distinctive patterns of identity formation

amongst the two school types. The findings also appear to confirm the work

of theorists in the area that the political domain is addressed after the

occupational one (Waterman et al, 1974; Waterman, 1985). It also confirms

the view of the adolescent period as a "..spiral of cycles of exploration and

commitment" (Grotevant and Thorbecke, 1982, p 403). The results have also

shown the possible involvement of political content (ie type of political

commitment) in the identity formation process. As in Grotevant's (1987)

model, this therefore links the process of political identity development to the

wider issues and processes of youth socialisation.

In concluding this discussion of the process results, it is important to

remember that the assessment of identity status was made at one time-point

only. All the pupils are likely to have been in different identity statuses prior

to the interviews, and are likely to move on in the future into different

statuses. The results discussed here are essentially a "snapshot" of the current

stage of political identity development of this group. Longitudinal research is

clearly important in testing further the proposals made in this section; in

particular identity research over four or five years would be very revealing.

(Further recommendations for future research are made in section 10.6).
The following section aims to explain further the results discussed in this Chapter. It describes a method of modelling the role of the school as a socialising agent, isolates the characteristics of the private school which might help explain the findings reported, and broadens the discussion into a consideration of the development of social knowledge.

10.5 The Political Socialisation of Youth: Isolating the Role of the School Experience

Chapter 6 detailed the research aims of the study. The first two aims were to investigate the existence of (i) content and (ii) process differences in the political and socio-economic socialisation of young people in private and state schools. The third aim, if differences were found, was to isolate factors in the school experience which might lead to different socialisation outcomes and processes. This section addresses the third objective, with three areas used to help explain the results of the study. These are (10.5.1) frameworks modelling the role of the school as a socialising agent, (10.5.2) isolating the characteristics of the private school, and (10.5.3) applying psychological theories to the development of social knowledge.

10.5.1 Modelling the Role of the School as a Socialising Agent

It was suggested in Chapter 4 that the theoretical framework of Himmelweit and Swift (1969) may help in understanding the role of the school in youth socialisation. The theory proposes that schools are different types of "systems", each school with different potential for acting as a key socialising influence. Essentially, the model suggests that at any one time the child is subject to various pressures and socialising influences, including the family, the peer group, and the school. The influence of the school on the aspirations and value orientations of the child will depend on both the system type (described as 'strong' or 'weak'), the relative strength of the competing
socialising agents, and the individual values and orientations the individual brings to the school.

Himmelweit and Smith named five main factors which determine the strength of the school as a socialising agent. Three of these are particularly important in the current context: (i) the extent to which the school’s values are consistent and coherent, (ii) the extent to which the schools’ values are reinforced by (or conflict with) other values the young person is exposed to, and (iii) the kind of rewards the school can offer for acceptance of its values. These three criteria can clearly be seen in their application to the private sector of education, and the private school in the empirical study in particular. The private school demonstrated very clear goals and values, made explicit to the staff, pupils, and parents who pay for their children to experience these values; there is also often support for (and reinforcement of) these goals at the home. The interviews held with a number of private school parents suggested the involvement of the parents in supporting the school’s aims and values. Further, the school can offer considerable rewards for acceptance of its values in the form of later occupational and personal success.

Two additional factors were described by Himmelweit and Swift as characterising a school as a strong system. A strong school selects its pupils, whereas a weak school system accepts pupils not selected by others. Second, a strong school system has very explicit goals which are designed to shape its pupils futures in key ways. In addition to the three factors named above, these two factors also clearly apply to the private school. The private school may therefore be a strong school system, like the grammar school in Himmelweit and Swift’s original study. The role of a strong school system in the socialisation process is to confirm and reinforce the values and orientations of those pupils who arrive at the school already “appropriately” socialised, whilst
overriding the early socialisation experiences of those with vague and uncommitted views, or with views contrary to those of the school. Thus background factors are important where school structure is weak, and less so where school structure is strong.

This model is important in helping to explain the differences found in the content of political socialisation between the private and state educated samples. As a strong school system, the private school may help to both promote and perpetuate a right-wing political and economic philosophy and the political "correlates" that go with it; the link between a right-wing political ideology, the PWE and achievement motivation have already been suggested. In particular, the private school as a strong school system may help to explain the values of those on the APS. It was demonstrated that the APS pupils came from a variety of value backgrounds, yet expressed the majority political orientation of the school. These pupils may have arrived at the school "innappropriately" socialised, with the school experience overriding and amending their early socialisation experiences. It might be argued that the private and state samples' backgrounds were different in some ways which were not picked up in using parental occupation as the criteria for sample selection, and that these unmeasured variables explain the differences between the two variables. If so, this does still not explain the nature of the APS students political orientations. The possible socialising effect of private education on APS pupils is discussed from a policy perspective in the following section (10.6).

The Himmelweit and Swift model may also help to explain the differences found in the process of political socialisation of the two samples. The high incidence of political foreclosure amongst the private school pupils (ie political commitment without exploration) may be linked to the school's
dominant ideology. Eriksonian identity theory suggests that the origin of the foreclosed identity is identification with, and allegiance to, a significant other. Usually this is a parent. However, it is possible that in certain circumstances this could also be the school experience and the value system of the school. The school may therefore not only be a primary socialising agent for the content of political goals and values, but also in terms of process, affecting how issues are explored and whether political commitments are made and maintained (see also 10.5.2 below).

Viewing the private school as a strong socialising agent may therefore be central to explaining the results of the empirical study. Himmelweit and Swift use 'strong' to refer to the coercive and persuasive power that the school has over its pupils; this derives from both the school's objectives and the salience of these objectives for individuals within the system. In essence, the private school as a strong school system can reduce the influence of characteristics that pupils bring to the school and become the primary socialising agent. Himmelweit and Swift's model has much in common with the view of Merelman (1986). Despite making their proposals nearly twenty years apart, both believe that there are no formal "rules" for explaining the influence of different socialising agents; rather, these agents "compete" to be the primary socialising agent. It is suggested that the private school in the empirical study is a primary socialising agent for the majority of its pupils; for the state sample other agents (such as home or peers) may be more dominant in their socialisation process. (Section 10.6 discusses the implications of this proposal for theories of youth socialisation, and political socialisation in particular).

10.5.2 Isolating the Characteristics of the Private School

It was proposed above that the private school in the author's study is a strong school system, and thus a major socialising influence on its pupils. Implicit in
this is the suggestion that certain characteristics of the private school facilitate the promotion and development of a dominant ideology in the young people who attend the school. Four primary characteristics of the private school are described below. Each is viewed as a mechanism by which the private school as a particular social system may affect both the content and process of political socialisation.

1.) The first characteristic concerns the limited social backgrounds and experiences of most young people in the private school; this is considered important in helping to explain many of the results reported in this research. The content results demonstrated that very few of the private school pupils had any immediate experience (amongst their family or friends) of the unemployed or those on YTS. The academically selective nature of the school also meant that pupils have no contact with less academically able young people. The resulting social isolation of this group was further reflected in the comments of many pupils that most families could afford a private education for their children if they were prepared to make "a few sacrifices". There were also few pupils at the private school with parents from working-class and less materially well-off backgrounds; at the state school there was a wider range of family backgrounds. (This was demonstrated by the large numbers of pupils at the state school who were not interviewed, because they did not satisfy the selection criteria of having at least one parent in a professional or managerial occupation).

The private school pupils thus experience a social, political, and economic isolation during their educational lives that is rare amongst any group of young people in society. This situation was further accentuated by two factors. First, the majority of their work experience was conducted in professional settings organised by their parents and their parents' friends. Work
experience can often be an arena in which young people develop ideas about the lives of different groups of working people. Second, the pupils' friendship groups reflected their social isolation. The majority of the private sample were found to socialise outside of school hours with other pupils from the school; this was recognised by some of the pupils themselves who named a disadvantage of private education as 'not knowing people in their own area'. Therefore both out of school, as well as in school, the private school pupils were closely associated with each other.

The social, political, and economic isolation of the private sample may help perpetuate a collective representation of socio-economic and political reality. This possibility is made more likely by the finding that the small number of private school pupils with views contrary to the dominant ideology of the school (both centrist and left-wing) were closely involved with social and friendship groups outside the school environment. These were all either environmental, political or religious groups. In light of the above discussion of strong school systems, it is possible that these small number pupils have a primary socialising experience located outside of the private school.

2.) Associated with (1) above, is the ideological similarity of the pupils at the private school. The majority of the private school pupils revealed a clear and coherent right-wing political and economic ideology. The fact that there were few pupils not revealing this ideology meant that there was a very limited political environment at the school. This resulted in there being little incentive or encouragement for pupils to re-evaluate their views, and few opportunities for those with any doubts to experience either competing viewpoints or criticism of their values and attitudes. Consequently, pupils arriving at the school with a right-wing ideology are likely to have their views
confirmed, and those pupils with no commitment find only one "choice" of
political orientation from which to select.

This ideological cohesion may also explain the numbers of privately educated
pupils found to be in the foreclosure status in the identity process analyses.
Here, pupils have adopted or accepted an ideology early on in their lives, and
have not had any incentive since to re-evaluate or question it. High levels of
political commitment (both in the foreclosure and achievement statuses) is
likely in an environment where few political options are available. At the
state school there was clearly a much wider range of political and socio-
economic attitudes and values, and consequently a wider range of political
orientations were evident. (See also characteristic 4 below).

3.) The overtly academic emphasis of the school is considered an important
factor in explaining the results. The school had a stated aim of achieving
excellent academic results, enabling pupils to enter University and
professional careers. Pupils were clearly encouraged to have the highest
career aims, and there was an efficient and well-organised careers system to
promote this. Interviews held with parents of some private school parents
confirmed that the private school had an overtly academic emphasis and
reputation.

The academic emphasis of the school is seen as having two implications for
the development of political orientations. First, it is possible that anticipatory
socialisation is taking place in relation to both expected career path and
political standpoint. There was some evidence of this in the comments of
pupils, who appeared to be adopting the political orientations they associated
with success in professional and managerial careers:
"I'm not really totally happy with the Conservatives. I disagree with nuclear weapons... and I do think they could do more for the less well off. But I want to join the police more than anything else, and it's just logical that you support the Conservatives if you're in the police. So yes,...I support the Conservatives, mainly because I know I will in a couple of years time."

The second implication for political socialisation of the academic emphasis of the school lies in identity theory. It has already been demonstrated that exploration and commitment in a domain (such as occupation or politics) may be followed by exploration in another domain. The academic and career focus of the private school led to over 90% of the private sample having an occupational commitment. It is likely that as they have an occupational commitment, this group are free to move on to another domain, such as politics. The high numbers of private school pupils with a political commitment (both achievement and foreclosure) suggests that this is, in fact, happening.

4.) Finally, the organisational culture and ethos of the private school may be central to explaining the differences found. All schools have distinctive values and structures which comprise their culture. Metzger and Barr (1978) for example, describe school "atmosphere" and its importance in the development of young people's political attitudes. One clearly recognisable aspect of the private school ethos, was the early development of clear personal and vocational goals and the ability to coherently express a viewpoint. One aspect of the organisational culture of the school (as articulated by the careers staff) was thus a focus on individuals, individual ability, and individual articulation and confidence.

These aspects were considered as skills of importance for success in academic work, the labour market, and in interviews for higher education and later
employment. The small numbers of pupils in each class (often only four or five pupils) allowed a focus on individuals to facilitate this. It is likely that this may help to explain the clear and integrated political identities of the private school sample, and also the early development of these identities. (Notions of consistency of attitudes may also be important in explaining the clear ideology of the private sample; see Lalljee et al, 1982). Further, concepts from occupational psychology, in particular concepts of organisational culture and climate, are clearly applicable to school environments (see 10.6.3 below).

This section has identified characteristics in the school environment which may lead to the differences reported in political socialisation content and process. These aspects are linked to broader theories of the development of social knowledge, discussed below.

10.5.3 Psychological Theories of the Development of Social Knowledge
Chapter 2 detailed three main social-psychological theories likely to be of use in explaining and interpreting the results. Each focusses on whether (and if so how) different groups develop rules about human behaviour and acquire knowledge about society. The degree to which each - social representations, attribution theory, and social identity - may help explain the results found in the empirical study is discussed in this section.

Social representations theory may be mainly of use in helping to explain the results found of the content of political socialisation. In particular it may help explain the finding that the private sample revealed a group-based political and socio-economic representation, with only a few pupils not expressing this group ideology. The state sample revealed more disparate ideologies, and many showed no overall political commitment. Social representations theory, most frequently used to explain the different ideologies of different social
class groups, is therefore used here to help explain the different ideologies of educational groups. The social isolation of young people in private schools may lead to a group based and group reinforced framework that guides the development of the thoughts, attitudes, behaviours and aspirations of the pupils who attend it.

Social representations theory has been used to explain the ways in which different social class groups create and represent social reality (Emler and Dickinson, 1985; Dickinson, 1987; Emler et al, 1990). The notion of the creation of social reality has been proposed and investigated in only a few educational settings (Emler et al, 1987). The use of social representations in educational settings is based on the notion that a person's location in the social structure will influence their view of social reality (Feather, 1983), and that different educational structures have different cultures and values. This notion of a group based development of social knowledge is linked to notions of social identity (see below).

**Attribution theory** may help to explain the results found. Attributions are the attempt to give meaning and structure to personal behaviour and to the behaviour of others. It was shown in Chapter 8 that the private and state samples revealed distinctive attributional styles in relation to causality for both unemployment and for poverty. These findings were generally consistent with the literature, and were closely related to the different ideological orientations of the two groups. It is important to note that although differences were found according to the main ideological dimensions of the two school groups, these differences were in two groups already matched for socio-economic background. It is likely that the differing attributional styles of the two groups are linked to both the development of distinctive social representations (in the private school in particular), and also to their social
identities. Jaspars et al (1983) stress the importance of both the social context and group membership in attributions. The link of attributions and social identity is discussed further below.

Finally, social identity theory was proposed as a possible contributor to interpreting and understanding the results. Gaskell and Smith (1986) suggest that social identity theory contributes to a greater understanding of contemporary social issues. The theory is considered important in this context in terms of its application to the development of in-group pride and identification in social groups. Social identity is based on the notion of group membership and negative and positive comparisons between in-groups and out-groups (Tajfel, 1978). It is possible that the private sample can be described as a group in this context. Development of a group identity is a common defensive strategy, and it is possible that those attending private educational establishments develop not only group pride and identification but attitudinal uniformity also. This is a particularly likely reaction to the negative attitudes held by many individuals and groups towards the private sector. The Labour Party and its followers, for example, are generally against the continued existence of the private sector of education. Further, the British Social Attitudes Survey (see Goldstein, 1986) showed that 29% of their national sample wanted either a reduction or outright abolition of the private sector of education.

It is therefore possible that one reaction to negative views of the private sector has been the development of an (essentially defensive) group based and group reinforced social identity. This may help explain the development of the majority ideology at the school, with group members developing attitudinal and behavioural uniformity:
"[As] Individuals define themselves as members of [a] particular social category, they form, or learn, the stereotypic norms of that category and as category membership becomes salient so do they assign these norms to themselves." (Gaskell and Smith, 1986, p 69)

This notion of social identity applied to an educational setting is a useful one in explaining the attitudinal uniformity of the private school group. Hewstone et al (1982) suggest that their work on social identity in schools can best be explained using a combination of social representations and social identity. They add that insufficient work has been conducted on relating these two, or on developing a more social view of attributional style. (See also Robinson et al (1990) for the application of social identity to an educational setting, and a discussion of the link between a positive social identity and high levels of self-esteem).

The role of the school in socialisation as discussed in this section, is explored further below in terms of implications for both research and public policy.

10.6 Implications of the Results

The implications of the research are discussed in relation to three areas: political socialisation research (10.6.1), education and social policy (10.6.2), and recommendations for future research (10.6.3).

10.6.1 Political Socialisation Research

This section discusses the methodological implications of the results, and also assesses the contribution of the findings to a greater understanding of socialisation theory, socialising agents, political socialisation, and school effects.
Methodological implications

The rationale for the research design (comparing young females matched for socio-economic status, but attending different school types) is considered to have been an effective means of revealing the school effect in socialisation; many studies do not attempt to separate background and school effects. The actual choice of the two samples was also satisfactory, with the Headteachers of both schools commenting on the similarity of the family backgrounds of the two schools. The response rates, collection of data using questionnaires and interviews, and analyses of data were also considered to have been useful and effective.

In particular, the broad definition of politics utilised in designing the study, and the subsequent collection of data on a broad range of political and socio-economic areas was valuable. The use of a measure of overall political type based on interview transcripts was found to be a useful indicator of actual political stance, and a considerable improvement on the use of voting intent. Additionally, checking the students' views of their parents political orientations by interviewing a number of parents was particularly valuable.

Two main aspects are considered to have further strengthened the quality and utility of the research. First, the dual focus of exploring the content as well as the process of political socialisation was a primary strength of the research. Second, matching the samples for socio-economic background, gender, and age cohort, is considered to have effectively isolated school effects in the socialisation process.

The comments above concern the individual elements of research design, sample selection, and analysis and interpretation of data. An additional methodological outcome of the research concerns the way in which data is "used" in the exploration of political socialisation. The two different
approaches of the content and process analysis reveals clear differences in the relationship between "subjects" and "data". A diagrammatic presentation of how subjects and their political orientations are explored in these two methods is given below:

Relationship between individuals and treatment of data using a content and process analysis

1) Content Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Attitude to YTS</th>
<th>Perception of human nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Process method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political identity</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUPS

note: X = data collection point

In the above diagram, the first section (1) demonstrates the relationship between individuals, groups, and data in the content method of exploring political socialisation. This method focuses primarily on the individual variables, looking at the groups' views on individual political attitudes such as attitude to YTS or perception of human nature. In this way, both politics and individuals are "segmented", and broken up into separate and distinct parts. Individual responses are then combined to represent a group, in this case the school.
The process method (the second part of the diagram) treats individuals as entire entities, leaving both politics and individuals less segmented and more intact. This is particularly so as actual interview transcripts are used as the basic unit of data. The overall political type measure similarly reflects a focus on individuals as wholes. Having done this, individuals are then combined to represent groups such as school or sex. The use of the process method may therefore be a response to researchers who complain that much psychological research fragments individuals and also the study of ideology (for example Billig, 1984). It is not suggested, however, that one of the above methods of data collection is "better" than the other. However, it is considered important that more research address these types of issues, particularly as most socialisation research uses the content approach. The value of using a combination of these two methods in future research is thus demonstrated.

**Political socialisation and school experience**

Himmelweit (1983) described political socialisation as the way that different socialising experiences, group membership and the political-economic climate, affects the "cognitive maps" that people draw of their society. This is similar to Prewitt's (1978) definition of politics as the "...socially organised and institutionalised production of consent to the entire structure of social relations" (p 125), and Kavanagh’s (1972) view of political culture as the emotional and attitudinal environment in which political systems operate. Both these notions therefore root the study of political socialisation to governability, and the study of the way in which people develop both habits and beliefs that make them capable of being governed (Prewitt, 1978). The relationship of governability to systems persistance is of particular importance in a country where basic political structures have persisted for centuries.
In relation to socialisation theory, the importance of educational experience as a socialising agent has been highlighted by the results. In particular the results can be seen to support the views of Himmelweit and Swift (1969) and Merelman (1986) concerning youth socialisation. Merelman's view was that there are no formal "rules" in the socialisation process. Rather, different socialising agents compete to "reach" young people and impose their view of society and the nature of contemporary social relations. Thus there is no objective political model to be socialised "to", as implied by much early political socialisation research.

This notion of a "competition" theory of political socialisation is closely related to the model of Himmelweit and Swift (1969). In modelling the influence of educational experience on socialisation, their proposal of the existence of strong and weak socialising agents is valuable. It has clearly been useful in explaining the results of the empirical study reported here, and in the assessment of the private school as a strong school system. In establishing the utility of a competition theory, a great deal could be learnt from the application of this model to other socialising agents. The ways in which some families, for example, are 'strong' or 'weak' socialising agents, and how they compete with (or override) the effects of other agents such as the school or the peer group, would be a logical next step. It might then be possible to further model the role of primary socialising agents for different groups of children and young people.

Elements of Himmelweit and Swift's model can also be seen in relation to more recent work from other areas of psychology. Lau, Quadrel and Hartman (1990) for example propose a model of the relative influence of parents and peers (in the development of health related beliefs), based on notions of "windows of vulnerability". This model suggests that parental influence on
their children is likely to persist throughout life unless the child is exposed to new or different social models during a period of vulnerability: one such period is adolescence. The link with the critical periods of Eriksonian theory is clear. Lau et al propose that during adolescence individuals are susceptible to influence outside of parents. The model predicts

"...enduring parental influence unless the child is exposed during a vulnerable period to important social agents whose beliefs and behaviours differ from those of the parents" (p 255).

In accepting what can be described as a "competition" model of socialisation it is also necessary to accept that there is no single, objective view of society to be socialised "to". Rather, a competition model of youth socialisation accepts that different groups of young people will develop different models and representations of the world around them. This has particular implications for the developmental perspective taken in political socialisation research. The cognitive-developmental approach was earlier described as useful in understanding political socialisation. Implicit in most cognitive-developmental notions of child and adolescent development, however, is the view of political development as the re-structuring of cognitive representations, and the movement towards a particular view of social reality. Although the cognitive-developmental framework is viewed as useful in exploring political development, therefore, it is important to stress that the development of social knowledge is not solely an individual experience, but in fact the development of different representations of social reality by different groups of children and young people (see Dickinson, 1986a; Emler et al, 1990). This psychological framework is clearly related to the proposals of political scientists described earlier.

It is of note in this light that concepts from the cognitive-developmental approach are similar to those used in the process analysis as used in the
research. The process approach used in the empirical study can be seen to bear a close resemblance in particular to Piagetian notions of both assimilation and accommodation. The identity statuses of foreclosure (and to a lesser extent diffusion) represent individuals for whom political questioning and re-structuring is not currently taking place. Further investigation of how tendency to explore within domains is related to cognitive re-structuring is likely to be revealing. The further investigation of cognitive development and political development may also be useful in relation to social representations theory. If, as proposed earlier, the private school generates and perpetuates a single representation of social and political reality, then questioning and re-structuring is less likely to take place. The results for political identity commitment and category for the private sample suggests that this is, in fact, happening.

One additional implication of the results is that they demonstrate the relevance of psychology and the use of social-psychological theories in political socialisation research. Many political scientists and sociologists have suggested that models of political behaviour have implicit psychological and socialisation theories built into them (Merelman, 1986). The use of psychological theories and methods are therefore vital in further understanding youth political socialisation. The use of theories of identity development in the process analysis has been useful in contributing to knowledge of exploration and commitment in political development. In particular it has allowed a focus on individuals that is lacking in much socialisation research. Additionally, the three social-psychological theories used (social representations, attribution theory, and social identity) were each shown to contribute to understanding the development of different political orientations by the two samples. The need to see a close relationship between these theories was also a proposal of the research.
One of the main areas of contention identified in the literature review was the importance of early political development for later political orientations. The cross-sectional design of the study means that it cannot contribute directly to this debate. However, it is also likely that even longitudinal research (generally conducted over only six or twelve months in much research and in most doctoral research in particular) would also not contribute greatly to this debate. It is of note, however, that in the model of political development presented in Chapter 4, Dawson et al (1977) propose that adolescence is the time when relatively enduring orientations to politics are developed. A questionnaire based follow-up study of the private sample was undertaken two years after the initial contact with this group, and a preliminary examination of the results suggests consistency of political orientation over this time period. (Details of this follow-up study are not included in this thesis; details are available from the author).

One implication of the results may therefore be for the nature of the debate and the direction of future research on the persistence of early acquired attitudes and values. It is proposed that work on the persistence of political content (i.e. values and attitudes) needs to be supplemented by work on political "style", i.e. on the investigation of process and how young people explore political options. In relation to the current research, for example, future work may investigate the onset of real political questioning and exploration in the private sample, and the development of political commitment in the state school group.

10.6.2 Education and Social Policy

The previous section highlighted the implications of the empirical study for the methodological debate within political socialisation research, and for largely theoretical aspects of socialisation and political socialisation. This
section explores the implications of the results for youth research, gender issues, political education, and issues of educational structure and private education.

Youth research
It was demonstrated in the literature chapters that the majority of youth research has been concerned with those most affected by the labour market changes of the 1980s, and on those attending YTS courses and the young unemployed in particular. The effect of this has resulted in a paucity of research on the academically able and those who stay on in education at the ages of 16 and 18. The impact of the labour market changes of the 1980s have been less dramatic for this group, and indeed they have been shown to have fared well throughout this period (Roberts, 1987a).

Little is known therefore about the academically able and their lives in the 1980s and 1990s. The results of the current research and other research within the 16-19 Initiative (for example Quicke, 1991) has redressed this balance somewhat. Information on the academically able is clearly not solely of academic interest. Those pursuing A Levels and a University education are most likely to be those entering professions and careers in professional and managerial occupations; they are thus the policy-makers of the future. Understanding the development of their political and socio-economic frameworks is consequently of great importance.

The focus of the research on differences between two groups of academically able young people is considered to have implications for an understanding of societal structure. If the academically able are the educational "elites" of the country, then the privately educated might legitimately be seen as the "elites' elite". Researchers who propose a hegemonic view of society see private
education as providing its pupils with their place in the occupational, social and political hierarchy. These schools therefore provide private school pupils with high status occupations in the "cultural mainstream" (Fitz et al, 1986), preparing young people for positions of dominance in society (Eglin, 1984; see also Tapper and Salter, 1984). The finding of differing socialisation processes and outcomes amongst private and state educated young people has clear implications for this debate.

Gender issues

The research focussed on the private education of young females. In doing so, it is considered to have provided new information in relation to a variety of gender related issues. Much early socialisation research concerned the experiences of boys only (McQuail et al, 1968; Himmelweit and Swift, 1969; Furnham, 1982b). Despite more recent work focussing on females only (Griffin, 1985; Frazer, 1988), the balance between research on males and females is still unequal (see also Murray, Maguire and Ashton, 1988).

The research focussed on academically able females, with a small sub-sample of privately educated males. It is of note that the comparisons of the private school males and females showed no noticeable differences between these groups on either the content or the process of political socialisation. In relation to the process results this finding confirms the view of many researchers in the area that males and females are "...fully comparable..." (Waterman, 1985, p22). Indeed, the main differences found were between the different educational types (ie private and state) rather than between males and females. It is possible that, where gender differences in political socialisation are reported by researchers, they are most common amongst less academically able groups of young males and females.
The high occupational aims found amongst both groups of females challenges the view that occupational aims are not the primary concern of adolescent girls (as proposed for example by Marcia, 1980). This suggests that where gender differences are found in youth research (in particular in the area of career planning), they may also be more prominent amongst the less academically able. In the current context, the high levels of political support and interest in the private sample may also be linked to a general sense of efficacy and confidence amongst these young women. This has long been identified as a primary characteristic of single sex girls schools (see Warnock, quoted in TES, 1/3/1991), with the research having implications for this debate also.

**Political education**

Political education is the deliberate attempt to inculcate certain forms of political orientation or mode of political thinking through the school experience. Political education has long been proposed as a result of research claiming low levels of political knowledge and awareness amongst young people (Stradling, 1977; Furnham and Gunter, 1987). The introduction of political education has been proposed by many researchers (Dunn, 1984; Palonsky, 1987), as has education for economic understanding (Furnham and Cleare, 1988), and for unemployment (Fleming and Lavercombe, 1982; Stirling, 1982).

The implications of the results for political education are open to debate. Although the level of political knowledge and awareness was highest amongst the private sample, it is unlikely that the lesser levels of political interest and knowledge amongst the state sample would be considered particularly low. Traditional political education, providing young people with information about politics and the democratic process, may not be appropriate for all
groups of young people. It is of note, however, that a majority of both of the samples were themselves in favour of increased political education in schools.

The impact of the results on the issue of political education in schools may, in fact, lie in identity theory. The content results showed varying levels of political knowledge, interest and activity amongst the groups. The process results, however, showed young people with varying levels of political "questioning" and different histories of exploration and commitment. Researchers using an identity focus have recently begun to call for programmes of intervention in adolescent identity, encouraging young people to move into statuses characterised by real political exploration (see in particular Archer, 1989b, 1989c). The need for a distinction between (i) political education, and (ii) discussion of political options and mode of political exploration, is a clear proposal based on the results of the research. In particular, the social isolation and single representation at the private school may make intervention with this group an important consideration.

**Educational structure and private education**

The results of the study have important implications for our understanding about young people in private schools, and for the politics of the Assisted Places Scheme in particular. It was suggested early in this thesis that there is relatively little known about how different educational structures affect development. Many researchers have commented on the need for a better understanding of the influence of school experience not only on tangible outcomes (such as careers) but on the development of attitudes, values, and aspirations (for example Tapper and Salter, 1978; Palonsky, 1987).

Although much of the early sociological work investigated educational impact on child and adolescent development (Hargreaves, 1967; Bowles and Gintis,
1976), the impact of psychology on this area has not been as noticeable. This is despite the long history of work proposing a link between education, individual and group values, and life chances (Meyer, 1977; Anyon, 1979; Robins, 1988). The results of the research reported here have suggested not only the impact of private education on political and socio-economic socialisation, but have also helped to model the role of the school in the process of socialisation.

An additional contribution of the research has been the focus on the private sector of education, a group generally excluded from youth research. The results have particular implications for the political debate about the private sector of education, offering a contribution beyond the "traditional" focus on occupational outcomes and academic achievement of this group. The claims of the politically left-wing concerning private education have, in many ways, been confirmed by the research. The private school sample were shown to be socially isolated and largely unaware about the lives of most other groups in society; they also revealed a right-wing and individualistic, social, economic, and political orientation that is traditionally (and stereotypically) associated with private schools. The finding that characteristics within the private school itself may promote and perpetuate this ideology is an important contribution to this debate.

There are clear implications for the policy of the APS in the results presented. The APS pupils in the sample were clearly not from the working-class and disadvantaged backgrounds envisaged by the government (DES, 1985). Although most of the APS pupils were mainly from single-parent families, their parents were still employed mainly in professional and managerial occupations; this agrees with the findings of other research on the APS (Edwards et al, 1989). It is possible that findings such as these are why the
Scheme is not now being extended as was originally planned (TES, March, 1991).

The APS pupils were found to be distinctive, however, in one other respect, in addition to their family backgrounds. The political orientations of the APS parents were more diverse than the rest of the private school sample, with parents who were mainly left-wing or centrist. The political and socio-economic orientations of the APS pupils, however, reflected the dominant right-wing ideology of the school. This suggests that the private school system may not only provide "able children with a wider range of educational opportunity" (DES, 1985) and a better academic education, but it may also affect the political orientations of APS pupils. It is open to speculation whether this was the government's intention when the APS was first established.

10.6.3 Recommendations for Future Research

The research described in this thesis has offered new information about the political socialisation of youth and the role of educational structures in this. This Chapter has already highlighted a number of areas that future work should pursue in order to expand this knowledge. Further recommendations for future research are given here.

The first recommendation concerns the basic rationales and designs used in youth socialisation research. It was proposed previously that, if there are no strict "rules" governing the socialisation process, then different groups of young people will experience differing primary socialising agents. This "competition" model of youth socialisation suggests that more work needs to be conducted that isolates the socialisation experiences of young people in different types of educational structure. Research may therefore usefully
address the experiences of young people in different types of private schools, in particular less academic ones. Work aiming to control for the effects of family background, as here, are also clearly important.

It was stressed earlier that political development takes place across the life-span. Theorists disagree, however, about the importance of developments in adolescence for the political orientations of adulthood. A recommendation for future research is therefore the longitudinal analysis of political content, and also the longitudinal investigation of political process and identity. Research should explore both the nature of political attitudes and values in the period following adolescence, and also the nature of political exploration and commitment. The identity literature suggests that experiences in new contexts (work, higher education) may encourage movement towards exploration and commitment: future research needs to address this.

Understanding the deeper psychological processes involved in political socialisation may require the use of more recently developed psychological approaches. Two areas are considered particularly important. First, having established the role of school experience in political socialisation, more work needs to be conducted that explores the nature of the value structures of schools themselves. Concepts from occupational psychology, in particular the investigation of organisational culture and ethos, have already been proposed in helping to explain the results of the study. These concepts have so far been applied mainly to large commercial and public organisations, and rarely to educational settings and individual schools. Some work, however, has recently begun to address these issues. Murray and Thompson (1985) for example, refer to the importance of school climate, and describe a School Climate Index based on four different indices (see also Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp, 1991).
The second recently developed area of psychology which future work may address is the exploration of the language of the political arena (see for example Potter and Wetherall, 1987). The different use and interpretation of individual terms and concepts is rarely addressed within research which uses primarily standardised items and measures, and that assumes agreement about the individual meaning of words and terminology. In the current research for example, a questionnaire item referring to "extreme" political views meant quite different things to the two samples. In focussing on individual language in this way, future research may provide a greater understanding of the way individual political realities and concepts are constructed. The use of discourse analysis may be helpful in developing this work further.

The ways in which individuals articulate their views, both in terms of language and sophistication of political articulation, is an important area for future research. It is of note that the two additional coders who undertook the identity process analysis were able to distinguish the transcripts of the private and state school pupils. Individuals from the two schools were identified by differences in expression, use of political terms and concepts, and strength of articulation of views. Despite the fact that the transcripts were anonymous and represented by numbers, the two coders were still able to accurately assess the school type of the subjects.

A central recommendation for future research is therefore a renewed emphasis on language and on how individual’s articulate political views. In particular attention needs to be given to the role of such things as styles of arguing and the role of consistency in expressing opinions. Recent work has already contributed to this area (for example Billig, 1991). An important focus in light of the current results concerns the nature of attitudes and their
relation to consistency of opinions. Lalljee et al (1984) propose that attitudes serve as a way of asserting social identity; they add that the requirement of consistency of attitudes is a central feature of culture rarely addressed in research. Both these aspects in particular are considered worthy of further attention.

It is considered that these areas, if addressed, would further develop knowledge about the role of educational structures in the political socialisation of youth.
CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 1 of this thesis proposed that the investigation of political socialisation is central to explaining the organisation of human life into society, and in explaining how governability (and hence the persistence of the political system) is achieved. One fundamental issue underlying the research is that there is no innate biological rule that forces people to live together in societies governed by laws (Prewitt, 1978). In its broadest context therefore, research into political socialisation explores a phenomenon deeply embedded in everyday life: the way in which people learn to live by rules and laws, and how they develop ideas and thoughts about the nature of human relationships within a society. The focus was therefore on the development of social knowledge in children and young people. Investigation in this area is considered as important as investigating development within other areas of child and adolescent psychology, though rarely is it given equivalent status or attention.

The narrow approach to political socialisation of researchers from a range of academic disciplines was highlighted throughout the thesis. In viewing "politics" as analogous to "party politics", much political socialisation research has inevitably focussed almost exclusively on the investigation of young people's views of political parties and topical issues. It has been demonstrated that attitudes to political parties and individual policies falls a long way short of an effective investigation of, and development of an understanding of, the concept of governability and of how people come to live together in societies governed by rules.

The broadening of both the definition of politics and the remit of political socialisation research, leads to a broadening of the debate about methodology in this area. Research into political socialisation (in common will all other
areas of psychological, political and educational research) requires more
detailed attention to each stage of a research plan. Thus attention and
consideration must be given to the development of theoretical frameworks,
research designs and the development of measures, and to analysis and
interpretation of results. The investigation of the role of differing educational
structures in political socialisation reported in this thesis addressed the
interrelationship of theory, method, analysis, and interpretation of results.
The use of a dual focus (a process method in conjunction with a content
method) is a clear example of this interrelationship. The practical and policy
implications of research in this area is also considered important, and these
issues were addressed extensively in the research.

The practical implications of the research were shown to be particularly
pertinent for educational and youth policy. Millions of children experience
"education" each day in this country. Despite the many different structures of
education and types of schools in Britain, relatively little is known about how
the type of school a child attends affects his or her development. The success
of books such as 15,000 Hours (Rutter et al, 1979), which aimed to investigate
these wider aspects of education, makes it even more surprising that more
research has not addressed such issues since. The issues inherent in the
debate, however, are implicit in the statements and proposals of politicians
and educationalists. The involvement of psychologists and the application of
psychological theories and methods are likely to be particularly valuable in
this respect. The difficulty involved in untangling the effects of individual
characteristics, family background and school experience should not make
researchers any less enthusiastic for the task. Education is an important
political, social, and economic phenomena, and as such more attention needs
to be given to both its processes and outcomes. It is hoped that the research
reported in this thesis may encourage further attempts to untangle the
relationship. The areas recommended for future research to address (detailed at the end of Chapter 10) are likely to be particularly valuable in providing further knowledge and understanding.

Ultimately, the impact of the research described here will vary according to the values, attitudes, and beliefs of different readers. The research demonstrated that different educational structures affect not only the prospects and achievements of young people, but also their values, attitudes, and mode of thinking. An individual's own view of the issues explored in the research - concerning for example equality, opportunity, and social organisation - will determine their reaction to the results. In concluding this thesis, it is hoped that the research will at least provoke both further debate and further research.
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APPENDIX 1: 16-19 INITIATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire pages are reproduced as follows:

Page 338: Front cover
Pages 339-342: Younger cohort only pages
Pages 343-346: Older cohort only pages
Pages 347-359: Core pages for both cohorts

Question numbers written in red on the questionnaire refer to those questions utilised in the study. These are referred to in Chapter 8 as follows:

Q6Y = Questionnaire question 2: younger cohort only
Q6L = Questionnaire question 6: older cohort only
Q13 = Questionnaire question 13: both cohorts

Multi-item scales: (as detailed in Chapter 7) comprised the following items:

1. Employment Commitment: Q9c,e,g.
2. Work Commitment: Q9a,v.
3. Belief in Work: Q9a,c,e,g,v.
4. Attitude to Training: Q9d,f,h.
5. Opposition to Authority: Q12b,c,e,f,g,j,i.
6. Anti-police: Q12c,e,k.
7. Anti-politics (political alienation): Q12a,d,h.
UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

WHAT DO YOU THINK ........... ?

A SURVEY OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN SHEFFIELD

(PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL)
A. YOUR EDUCATION

1. Please tell us which exams, if any, you plan to take this year. Write in the name of the subject and tick whether you are taking a CSE, GCE O Level or something else in it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS (Write in names)</th>
<th>CSE (Tick)</th>
<th>GCE O Level (Tick)</th>
<th>OTHER EXAM (Write in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How good would you say you were at school work? (Tick one)

- Better than most
- Above average
- About average
- Below average
- Worse than most

3. At what age do you think you are most likely to leave full-time education? (Tick one)

- 16
- 17
- 18 or over
- Uncertain
- Already left

4. a) Have you played truant this year at school?

   Number of times (write in): 

   Never (tick here) 

5. a) Have you ever had a part-time job? (Tick one)

   - Yes, have one now
   - Yes, in the past
   - No

   If Yes now or in the past

b) What kind of work do/did you mainly do? (Write in)

   
   
   
   
   
   

1
A. YOUR EDUCATION

6. a) Do you think any of the following groups treated unfairly in your school? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Doesn't Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Pupils in 'bottom' groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Pupils in 'top' groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Black pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) White pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Many schools now teach about the world of work and unemployment including such subjects as careers, education, guidance, life skills, education for leisure, trades unions. Please indicate with a tick for each of the subjects below how much you have been taught in the fifth year.

![Table of subjects taught](image)

8. What do you like most about being at school? (Write in)

9. What do you dislike most about being at school? (Write in)

10. On the whole how satisfied would you say you were with the education you have received? (Tick one)

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

11. How much value has your education been to you? (Tick one)

- Very valuable
- Fairly valuable
- Not very valuable
### YOUR EDUCATION

12. If you are planning to stay on in education (at school or college) next year, could you please tell us your main reasons for doing this.

(Write in) ........................................................................................................................................

13. If you are planning to leave this year could you please tell us your main reasons for doing this.

(Write in) ........................................................................................................................................

14. Some people say they ‘muck about’ at school. In fifth year lessons have you ‘mucked about’... (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. During this term have you drawn or written anything on any part of the school building (not including desks)? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to ten times</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten times</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Here is a question about teachers. How many are easy to talk to? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most of them</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly any of them</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How often do you have small group discussions in lessons? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Often</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If you have had small group discussions, do you think they have been successful? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. YOUR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

1a. What do you expect to be doing in a year's time?
   (Tick the one which you are most likely to be doing)
   - Out of work
   - On YTS
   - At school
   - At sixth-form college
   - Full-time at college of further education
   - In a full-time job (over 30 hours a week)
   - In a part-time job
   - Something else

   I expect to be
   \[\text{Out of work} \quad \text{On YTS} \quad \text{At school} \quad \text{At sixth-form college} \quad \text{Full-time at college of further education} \quad \text{In a full-time job (over 30 hours a week)} \quad \text{In a part-time job} \quad \text{Something else}\]

   I expect to be
   \[\text{Out of work} \quad \text{On YTS} \quad \text{At school} \quad \text{At sixth-form college} \quad \text{Full-time at college of further education} \quad \text{In a full-time job (over 30 hours a week)} \quad \text{In a part-time job} \quad \text{Something else}\]

b. Do you plan to take any GCE A Levels? (Tick one)
   - Yes
   - No

   \[\text{Yes} \quad \text{No}\]

2. At what age would you like to get married, if at all?
   Age (write in) \[\text{years}\]
   Would not marry (tick here)
   Already married (tick here)

   \[\text{Age (write in) years} \quad \text{Would not marry (tick here)} \quad \text{Already married (tick here)}\]

3. If you could have exactly the number of children you wanted, how many would you like altogether, if any? (Please write in)
   Number of children (write in)
   Would not want any (tick here)
   Already have a child (tick here)

   \[\text{Number of children (write in)} \quad \text{Would not want any (tick here)} \quad \text{Already have a child (tick here)}\]

C. YOUR MONEY

1. How much per week are you currently receiving from the following sources?
   (Write in the amount to the nearest £).
   a. From parents or other members of your family
   b. Part-time job
   c. Any other source (please write in the source)

   \[\text{From parents or other members of your family} \quad \text{Part-time job} \quad \text{Any other source (please write in the source)}\]

D. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT JOBS AND MONEY

1. In general, how difficult is it for people like yourself to get jobs around here?
   (Tick one)
   - Extremely difficult
   - Very difficult
   - Quite difficult
   - Not too difficult
   - Not at all difficult

   \[\text{Extremely difficult} \quad \text{Very difficult} \quad \text{Quite difficult} \quad \text{Not too difficult} \quad \text{Not at all difficult}\]

2. How likely are you to want to move out of this area to get a job in the future?
   (Tick one)
   - Very likely
   - Quite likely
   - Not very likely
   - Not at all

   \[\text{Very likely} \quad \text{Quite likely} \quad \text{Not very likely} \quad \text{Not at all}\]
**A. YOUR LIFE OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS**

1a. We should like to know what you have been doing over the past couple of years since the summer of 1985.

Please tick one box for every three months to let us know roughly what you were doing at each time. For each period pick the thing you were doing for all, or for most of, the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Out of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. On YTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. At School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. At sixth-form college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Full-time at college of further education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. In a full-time job (over 30 hrs a week)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. In a part-time job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Something else, please say what.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. Can you tell us a bit more about what you are doing now?

If you are in a job,

- What is the job called?

- What do you do?

- Where do you work?

- What do they make or do?

If you are in full-time education what subjects are you studying and for which exams?

If you are in a training scheme,

- What kind of scheme is it?

- What kind of work do you do?

If you are out of work how do you mainly spend your time?

1c. On the whole how satisfied would you say you are with what you are doing now? (Tick one)

Very satisfied [ ] Fairly satisfied [ ] Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied [ ]

Fairly dissatisfied [ ] Very dissatisfied [ ]
A. YOUR LIFE OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS

2a. Please tell us which exams, if any, you have taken and what results you got, if you know them. We would like to know about all of them, however well or badly you did. Please write in the name of each subject, tick whether it was CSE, O Level or something else and circle the result you got. Finally, if you have passed the exam, write down the age at which you passed it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS (Write in names)</th>
<th>CSE (Tick)</th>
<th>EXAMS (Tick)</th>
<th>Other (Write in)</th>
<th>YOUR RESULTS (U = unclassified)</th>
<th>Age at which you passed the exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>41-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>47-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>53-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>59-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>65-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>71-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>77-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>81-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>87-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 U</td>
<td>A B C D E U</td>
<td>97-101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. YOUR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

1a. What do you expect to be doing in a year’s time? (Tick the one which you are most likely to be doing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I expect to be</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On YTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At sixth-form college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time at college of further-education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a full-time job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(over 30 hours a week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a part-time job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something else, please say what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. Do you plan to take any GCE A Levels at any time? (tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At around what age would you like to get married, if at all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (write in)</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Would not marry (tick here)</th>
<th>Already married (tick here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you could have exactly the number of children you wanted, how many would you like altogether, if any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children (write in)</th>
<th>Would not want any (tick here)</th>
<th>Already have a child (tick here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26-28
### B. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you play truant in your fifth year at school?</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times (write in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never (tick here)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. During your fifth year at school what did you like most about being at school? (Write in)</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. During your fifth year at school what did you like least about being at school? (Write in)</td>
<td>12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We would like to know what you think about Youth Training Schemes (YTS). Do you think that these schemes:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help unemployed people to find a job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are a useful way to get a training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are a good preparation for adult life in general</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is YTS, in your opinion ... (tick one)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly of value to employers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of equal value to employers and young people</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly of value to young people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is YTS, in your opinion ... (tick one)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly necessary to give unemployed young people something to do</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly necessary to provide a highly trained workforce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a combination of the above two things</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has your experience of the past two years made you ... (tick one)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more critical of the Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more appreciative of the Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>made no difference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. YOUR MONEY

1. How much each week do you currently receive from the following sources (write in the amount to the nearest £). If you do not get the money each week, how much do you get and for what period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Main job (please give the amount, that is, after tax and national insurance deductions, but include any overtime or bonuses that you normally earn)</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>29-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Any other job or jobs</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>22-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) YTS allowance (including any travel allowance)</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>35-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Social Security benefits, e.g. unemployment or supplementary benefit</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Education grant or bursary</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>41-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) From parents or other members of your family</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>44-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Any other source (please write in the source)</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>47-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a. Do you pay anything for your board?  
Yes __________  No __________

2b. If yes, how much do you pay each week?  
(write in amount to the nearest £) __________

D. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT JOBS AND TRAINING

1. In general, how difficult is it for people like yourself to get jobs around here? (Tick one)

   - Extremely difficult
   - Very difficult
   - Quite difficult
   - Not too difficult
   - Not at all difficult

2. How likely are you to want to move out of this area to get a job in the future? (Tick one)

   - Definitely
   - Very likely
   - Quite likely
   - Not very likely
   - Not at all
D. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT JOBS AND TRAINING

3. People have very different opinions about many things. Here is a list of opinions. You will agree with some of them and disagree with others. Sometimes you will agree strongly and at other times you will disagree strongly. Now and then you may be uncertain whether you agree or disagree. Read each opinion and put a tick in the box which is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A person must have a job to feel a full member of society.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is much better to get some kind of training than to go straight into a paid job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Having almost any job is better than being unemployed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Youth training schemes are just slave labour.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Once you've got a job it's important to hang on to it even if you don't really like it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Youth Training Schemes are better than the dole.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. If I didn't like a job I'd pack it in, even if there was no other job to go to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Going on YTS is the best way now for 16 and 17-year olds to eventually get a job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I think a technical training will help me in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. It is not worth the effort to learn about new technology.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT JOBS AND TRAINING

3. What do you think of as new technology? (write in)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. I don’t think I need to learn more about how to use computers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. I would like to have a job involving new technology.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Getting a job depends on your ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Getting a job today is just a matter of chance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. It depends upon where you live as to whether you get a job or not.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. People who are poor usually have themselves to blame.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. It’s bad luck that causes people to be poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Poor people have the system to blame for their poverty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. People who are successful in their work usually deserve it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Being successful at work is just a matter of luck.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Getting a job at work really depends on other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. A person can get satisfaction out of life without having a job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. YOUR SPARE TIME

1. Do you know any of the following kinds of people? That is, do you know their names and know them to chat to? (Tick Yes or No for each one)

- a. A shopkeeper
- b. A carpenter or joiner
- c. A dentist
- d. A solicitor or lawyer
- e. A plumber
- f. A policeman
- g. A vicar or priest or minister
- h. Someone who works on a newspaper
- i. A member of the local council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. When you have got free time, who do you mostly spend it with? (Tick one)

- (i) Parents
- (ii) Brothers and/or Sisters
- (iii) Boyfriend or girlfriend or partner
- (iv) A particular close friend
- (v) Group of friends of both sexes
- (vi) Group of friends of the same sex as me
- (vii) I spend my free time on my own

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which of the following do you have the use of at home if you want? (Tick Yes or No for each one).

- a. Telephone
- b. Motor bike or moped
- c. Bicycle
- d. Car
- e. Video
- f. Record or cassette or compact disc player
- g. Room of your own
- h. Use of space to invite your friends to stay the night.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. We would like to know who your favourite personalities are. For each of the types of people listed below write the name of your favourite. If you do not have a favourite put a cross (X) in the line.

- Pop singer or group
- Politician
- Film star
- Sportsman or Sportswoman
- Radio Personality
- T.V. Personality

Favourite (write in)

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. YOUR SPARE TIME

5. Please indicate how often you have done or gone to each of the following things in the last year by ticking one of the boxes for each activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>1 time a month</th>
<th>3 to 6 times a month</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Youth club or group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A religious meeting or church service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A youth organisation like scouts or guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Meetings of a political group or party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Meetings of a special hobby club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Meetings of a sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Pubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Dances or discos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Theatre or concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Cinemas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Amusement arcades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Watching T.V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Watching football matches or other sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Smoking cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Drinking alcoholic drinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Playing a musical instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. People have different opinions about many things. Here is a list of opinions. You will agree with some of them and disagree with others. Sometimes you will agree strongly and at other times you will disagree strongly. Now and then you may be uncertain whether you agree or disagree. Read each opinion and put a tick in the box which is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>If I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>I give up easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>I seem to be capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>I find it easy to make new friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>I do not know how to handle social gatherings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>I am concerned about the sort of impression I make on others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>I am more concerned about how I feel about myself than about how other people think about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I am mainly interested in how my friends and family see me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### F. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT YOURSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>I feel unsure of most things in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>I find it easy to adapt to new rules and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>I do not decide how good I am at things by comparing myself with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>If I could, I would be a very different person from the one I am now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to know what is going on in the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>I am happy to be the person I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>I sometimes cannot help but wonder if anything is worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>I have no trouble deciding on the right rules to live my life by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>When I succeed at something, it is usually because I have broken the rules slightly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>I am often troubled by emptiness in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>I feel that I am as worthwhile as anybody else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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F. YOUR VIEWS ABOUT YOURSELF

2. How have you been feeling over the past few weeks? Please answer these questions by placing a tick in the box under the answer which you think most nearly applies to you. Remember that we want to know how you are feeling nowadays, not how you were in the past. You should compare yourself recently with how you have usually felt in the past few years.

Have you recently?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing?</td>
<td>Better than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lost much sleep over worry?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Felt capable of making decisions about things?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Felt constantly under strain?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Felt that you couldn’t overcome your difficulties?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Been able to face up to your problems?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Been feeling unhappy and depressed?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Been losing confidence in yourself?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>No more than usual</td>
<td>Rather more than usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Been feeling reasonably happy all things considered?</td>
<td>More than usual</td>
<td>Same as usual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. YOUR ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS

1. Do you buy or read any newspapers regularly? (write in newspapers or tick 'none')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>None (tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If there were a General Election tomorrow and you were able to vote, which political party do you think you would be most likely to support?

a) Name of party (Write in) ____________________________________________

b) If you would not vote for any party tick here

3a. If you left full-time education, are you a member of a Trade Union? (tick one)

- Yes
- No

3b. If No, do you intend to join in the future? (tick one)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

4. Some people describe themselves as middle class. Others say that they are working class. What social class do you think you and your family belong to? (tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper middle class</th>
<th>Some other class (give name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Have you ever done any of the following? (Tick Yes or No for each activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Attended a public meeting or rally or gone on a march or demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Discussed politics with your parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Written to an MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Watched a party political broadcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Handed out leaflets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Helped to organise any public meeting or event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Discussed politics with your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How interested are you in politics? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How much do you think each of the following politicians care about the interests of young people? (Tick one box for each politician).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Kinnock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Steel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Owen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. YOUR ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS

People have different opinions about many things. Here is a list of opinions. You will agree with some of them and disagree with others. Sometimes you will agree strongly and at other times you will disagree strongly. Now and then you may be uncertain whether you agree or disagree. Read each opinion and put a tick in the box which is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Politicians are mainly in politics for their own benefit and not for the benefit of the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>It can be okay to do something which is against the law if it is to help a friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The police are often unnecessarily brutal to people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>It does not really make much difference which political party is in power in Britain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>If I saw someone make a break-in I would tell the police about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>People in authority, like teachers, always pick on me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Most of the rules in places like schools are stupid and petty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>None of the political parties would do anything to benefit me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>School has been a waste of time for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Defying people in authority is all right if you can get away with it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Most police officers are honest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Men and women should do the same jobs around the house.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Trade unions are too powerful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Men and women should all have the chance to do the same kind of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G. YOUR ACTIVITIES AND VIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Teachers should never go on strike.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>I think democracy is working in Britain today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>It is alright to have sex with someone if you have been going out with them for a few weeks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>There is nothing wrong with homosexual relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>If a young girl gets pregnant she should be able to have an abortion if she wants to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>If you live with your parents they can tell you what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>The Church is the best authority to decide on matters of right or wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Life is so short that having a good time is more important than anything else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Very few adults really understand young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>No more foreigners wanting to live in this country should be allowed in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>People should realise that their greatest loyalty is to their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>It is better to live here than in any other part of the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Because of AIDS people should stick with one sexual partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>People living in the North are friendlier than those living in the South of England.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>If I could vote in a general election tomorrow I would vote the same way as my parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>People living in the South of England are usually more successful than those living in the North.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. YOU AND YOUR FAMILY

1. So that we can compare your answers with those of other young people, we need to know a few facts about you and your family. Please tick all the boxes that apply for each person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Lives there (please tick)</th>
<th>b. Work</th>
<th>Something else (write in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works full-time</td>
<td>Works part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1c. Please give the ages of all your brothers and sisters, (write in ages).

Age of Brothers:

Age of Sisters:

2. We want to know about your parents' (or step-parents') jobs, or the last one, if they do not have jobs at present.

a) Father's job (write in)  b) Mother's job (write in)

What is the job called?

What does he/she do?

Where does he/she work?

What do they make or do?

3. Is the house or flat you live in at the moment... (tick one)

- Rented from the Council
- Rented privately
- Owned by you or your family
- Something else (please write in)

4. Do you have a disability or handicap which would affect the types of work you could do? (Tick one)

- Yes
- No

5. Which of these ethnic groups do you belong to?

- African origin
- Caribbean origin
- Chinese or Hong Kong origin
- Bangladeshi origin
- East African Asian origin
- Indian origin
- Pakistani origin
- Scottish origin
- English origin
- Northern Irish origin
- Welsh origin
- Eire origin
- Other European origin
- Some other origin (please say what)
- I prefer not to say
Thank you for completing the questionnaire. If there is anything else you would like to tell us please write it in below. We shall be most interested to read what you have to say.
If you want us to send you information on results of this study please tick the box below:

Please tick here: ☐

Please write in your name and full address below:

Name: ____________________________  (first name)  (last name)

Address: ........................................

Address: ........................................

Address: ........................................

Tel. No: ........................................

In case we should have difficulty getting post to you if you move, please PRINT the name and address of someone (with a different address from your own) who will know where to reach you (such as an uncle or aunt, older brother or sister or a close friend).

Mr

Miss

Ms: ____________________________  (first names)  (last name)

Address: ........................................

Address: ........................................

Address: ........................................

Tel. No: ........................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP:

Now please post this back to us in the envelope provided. It does not need a stamp.

We look forward to hearing from you.
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND CODING FRAME

All questions were asked of both school groups unless otherwise indicated. Interview questions are referred to in Chapter 8 with an "I" prefix.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND CODING FRAME

(Case number ____)

1. Can you tell me how old you are? ___ years ___ months.

(For state sample careers group only/ three people) Check what doing now, and career plans. Note below:

2. How long have you been at this school for? ___ years.

(Private only) How long have you been in private education for altogether? ___ years.

3. Can we just about your plans for the future? What do you plan to do after:

(older only) Your A Levels?

1. University/ Polytechnic
2. Look for work
3. Training or College course
4. Year off/ then University/ Polytechnic
5. Don't know/ undecided

(younger only) Your GCSEs?

1. A Levels
2. Look for work
3. FE course
4. Don't know/ undecided

(younger cohort planning to do A Levels) After A Levels?

1. University/ Polytechnic
2. Look for work
3. Training or College course
4. Year off/ then University/ Polytechnic
5. Don't know/ undecided

4. What type of work do you hope to do eventually?

1. Professional (1): medicine, accountancy, law, or veterinary science*
2. Professional (2): eg physiotherapy, personnel management
3. Skilled: eg chef
4. Unskilled: eg shop assistant
5. Undecided/ don't know

* note: coded separately to distinguish the most prestigious professional careers and those with restricted entry.
5. Why do you want to do ---- [this work]?

1. It's interesting work
2. Good prospects/ opportunities for career development
3. Good pay
4. It's a high status/ prestigious occupation
5. It's a "service" job/ it helps people
6. Other reason
7. No particular reason/ not sure

6. How long ago did you decide you wanted to do this work?

    months
    99. Don't know/ can't say

7. Was there anything in particular that first got you interested in doing this work?

    1. Family member
    2. Friend
    3. Teacher
    4. Careers fair/ staff
    5. Media
    6. Work experience
    7. Other
    8. Nothing in particular

(Did you want to do a different career before this one? Explore for history of occupational exploration)

(not coded: used for occupational transcripts only)

8. Can I ask you about religion?

(a) Would you say that you have a religious faith?

    1. Yes
    2. No

(If yes) (b) Which religious faith is that?

    1. Christian
    2. Jewish
    3. Hindu
    4. Buddhist

9. Can we talk a bit about your parents? Which political party do they generally support?

(If yes, code for mother and father)

    1. Conservative
    2. Labour
    3. Liberal/SDP
    4. Green
    5. Undecided
    6. Anti-politics/ would not vote
    7. Don't know
10. Do you know anyone who is involved with a group such as a political party or a trade union?

1. Yes: parent/sibling
2. Yes: other relative
3. Yes: friend
4. No

We talked earlier about the sort of schools you've been to. Can we talk a bit more about education?

(PRIVATE ONLY BELOW, UNTIL INDICATED)

11. Why do you think your parents decided to send you to a private school?

(List up to three reasons):

1. Prestige and status/"snobbish reasons"
2. Was awarded an APS place
3. Better academic education/qualifications
4. Better overall education
5. Local state school was poor
6. Better discipline and behaviour
7. Parents had been educated privately
8. A "better type of person" attends private schools

12. What do you think are the benefits of a private education?

(List up to three benefits)

1. Prestige and status/"connections"
2. Better academic results/education
3. Better overall education
4. Better discipline
5. Better facilities
6. Better group of people
7. Other benefit

13. Do you think there are any disadvantages to private education? If so, what are they?

(List up to two disadvantages)

1. Narrow mix of people
2. Too academic/few practical subjects offered
3. Teased/called a "snob" by pupils at other schools
4. Don't know young people in own area
5. Very hard work/"pushed" a lot
6. No disadvantages

14. Did either of your parents go to a private school?

First, your mother?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Not applicable
Second, your father?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Not applicable

15. Some people say that it is not fair that private schools exist. (a) Overall, do you think it's fair?

1. Fair
2. Unfair
3. Don't know/ no opinion

(If fair or unfair) (b) Why is that?

1. Unfair but that's just the way it is/ life is unfair
2. Fair because of the Assisted Places Scheme
3. Fair because everyone has a choice of what to do with their money/ freedom of choice important
4. Fair because fees are not particularly high/ most parents can actually afford it
5. Don't know/ can't say

16. Can you tell me whether you're on the APS?

1. Yes now
2. Yes in the past
3. No

(STATE ONLY BELOW, UNTIL INDICATED)

17. Have you ever been to a private school?

1. Yes
2. No

(If yes) For how many years? ___ years

18(a). Do you think that private schools are any different to state schools?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ no opinion

(If yes) (b) What do you think are the main differences?

(list up to two differences)

1. Pupils get better exam results/ better education
2. Better teaching and/or smaller classes
3. Attended only by rich people
4. Private education "sheltered"/ narrow mix of people
19. **Do you think private education should be allowed?**

1. Should be allowed  
2. Should be abolished / banned  
3. Don't know / no opinion  

**(BOTH GROUPS FROM HERE)**

20. **How important would you say education and qualifications are to you?**

(a) **first, to get on in life?**

1. Very  
2. Fairly  
3. Not very  
4. Not at all  
5. Don't know

(b) **second, to you personally?**

1. Very  
2. Fairly  
3. Not very  
4. Not at all  
5. Don't know

21. **Can we talk a bit more about working in the future?**  
**What for you is the main reason for working in life?**

(list one main reason only)

1. To earn money to live / need an income  
2. Everyone works / it's expected  
3. To get job and career satisfaction  
4. To earn a lot of money  
5. To have something to do / would be bored if didn't  
6. Other reason

22. **If you had to rate the importance of working in the future on a scale of one to ten, what would you give it? Use 10 as of the highest importance, and 1 as not at all important.**

1-10 __

23. **Would you consider giving up work later on in your life if for example, you inherited a lot of money?**

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don't know  
(and note any reasons given)
24. Some people say that every adult is entitled to a job. Do you agree with this for:

(a) everyone?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

(b) those with good educational qualifications?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

25. I'd like to ask you a few questions about the Youth Training Scheme.

(a) Do you know anyone amongst your family or friends who have been on a YTS?
1. Yes
2. No

(b) How much do you think a YTS allowance is per week at the moment?
1. a week
2. Don't know

(c) How much do you think YTS allowances should be?
1. a week
2. Don't know

(d) The government is currently changing benefit rules for young people, so that if they are not in education or work, they have to go on a YTS. Do you agree with this?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

(e) Why do you agree/ disagree?
1. Agree: it gives good quality training/ job skills
2. Agree: it stops lazy young people signing on
3. Disagree: young people should have choice about what they do
4. Disagree: YTS "slave labour"/ government using it to reduce the unemployment figures

26. Can we talk a bit about unemployment?

(a) Do you know anyone amongst your family or friends who is, or who has been, unemployed?
1. Yes
2. No
(b) **What do you think are the main causes of unemployment?**

(list up to two causes)

1. Many of the unemployed are lazy/ don't look for work/ sign on whilst working
2. Many of the unemployed lack skills/ qualifications
3. No actual cause: it's a "fact of economics" that there are not enough jobs for everyone
4. Government policies causing unemployment (via interest rates/ lack of investment)
5. World recession/ unemployed caused/affected by the world economic situation
6. Other reason (eg new technology/ more women looking for work)
7. Don't know

(c) **Which groups of young people do you think find it most difficult to get jobs in Sheffield?**

1. Those who are poorly educated, with poor literacy skills, and with few qualifications
2. Those looking for unskilled work and those with no work experience
3. All groups who are disadvantaged: the long-term unemployed, the disabled, young people from ethnic minorities
4. Don't know

(d) **What do you think the current level of unemployment benefit is?**

1. a week
2. Don't know

(e) **Do you think that unemployment benefit levels are about right, should go up, or should go down?**

1. Should go up
2. Should go down
3. It's about right

I'd like to talk a bit more about politics now.

27. **How interested are you in politics and current affairs?**

1. Very interested
2. Quite interested
3. Not very interested
4. Not at all interested

28. **How often would you say you discuss politics and current affairs with**

(a) **Your parents?**

1. Never
2. Rarely/ once every few weeks
3. Once or twice a week
4. Three or more times a week
(b) Your friends?

1. Never
2. Rarely/ once every few weeks
3. Once or twice a week
4. Three or more times a week

29 (a). Do you ever read a newspaper?

1. Yes
2. No

(If yes) (b). How often do you read one?

1. Every day
2. A few times a week
3. Once a week
4. Never

(c). Do you watch a TV news programme

1. Most days
2. Once a week or less
3. Never?

30. If there was an election and you were able to vote, would you vote?

1. Yes
2. No

31. (For those who would vote) (a) Which party would you vote for?

1. Conservative
2. Labour
3. Liberal/SDP
4. Green
5. Undecided/ don't know

31 (b). (For those who would not vote and those who were undecided) Do you feel closer to one party than the others?

1. No
2. Yes:
   a. Conservative
   b. Labour
   c. Liberal/SDP
   d. Green

32. Would this be a tactical vote?

1. Yes
2. No
33. (If yes) Which political party do you actually support?
   1. Conservative
   2. Labour
   3. Liberal/ SDP
   4. Green

34. How long have you supported this party for?
   ___ months

35. Have you ever supported a different party? (explore for history of party support)
   (not coded: use for transcripts only)

36. How do you feel about the present government? Would you say you generally support or do not support them?
   1. Generally support
   2. Generally not support
   3. Not sure/ no opinion

37. Overall, how do you feel about the government's
   a. Economic policies. Do you?
      1. Support all aspects
      2. Support most aspects
      3. Not support
      4. Don't know
      
   b. Social policies. Do you?
      1. Support all aspects
      2. Support most aspects
      3. Not support
      4. Don't know

38. What do you think the other two main parties would be doing if they were in power?
   a. First of all, the Labour Party, what would they be doing?
      1. Doing "everything" different
      2. Doing nothing different
      3. Close private sector schools
      4. Abandon nuclear weapons
      5. Raise rates of taxation for the better off
      6. Give more power to the trade unions/ repeal government legislation on the unions
      7. Spend more money on public services (health, education)
      8. Other (eg do more for women, the environment)
      9. Don't know
b. How about the Liberal/SDP. What would they be doing?

1. Doing "everything" different
2. Doing nothing different
3. Close private sector schools
4. Abandon nuclear weapons
5. Raise rates of taxation for the better off
6. Give more power to the trade unions/ repeal government legislation on the unions
7. Spend more money on public services (health, education)
8. Other (eg do more for women, the environment)
9. Don't know

39. We have a 'first-past-the-post' electoral system in this country, where the party with the most MPs forms the government. Do you generally think this is a good system or not?

1. Good system
2. Bad system
3. Don't know

(Those replying good or bad) Why do you think that?

1. Good because it's a simple system/ easy to understand
2. Good because it gives one strong party in government
3. Bad system because it doesn't represent all views/ votes aren't proportionate to seats
4. Bad system because it causes swings from one party to another

40. Do you think we should have a system such as Proportional Representation here?

1. In favour
2. Against
3. Don't know/ not sure what it is

41. Do you have much political education at your school, where you have lessons to learn about and talk about politics and current affairs?

(state sample older cohort leavers group use past tense)

1. A great deal
2. Some/ a little
3. None

42. Do you think there should be more political education in schools?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
43. I'd like to know how you feel about the Local Council. How well do you think they run Sheffield?

1. Very well
2. Reasonably well
3. Not very well
4. Not at all well
5. Don't know/ no opinion

44. (a) Do you know the name of your local Member of Parliament?

1. Yes
2. No

(b) Do you know which political party they belong to?

1. Yes
2. No

(check 44a and 44b after interview if respondent is uncertain)

45. Can I ask you two questions about taxation?

(a) First, do you think taxation should be raised for the well-off, so that the government has more to spend in general?

1. No: because lower rates of taxation act as an incentive in business
2. No: because the better off have earned their money, they should be able to keep it
3. Yes
4. Don't know/ no opinion

(b) Second, are you generally in favour of the introduction of the community charge, or poll tax?

1. Support it
2. Against it
3. Unsure

46. I'd like to know how you feel about trade unions.

(a) First, overall, do you think trade unions play an important role in society?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ no opinion

(b) Second, do you think that trade unions have too much power, too little, or about the right amount of power?

1. Too much power
2. Too little power
3. About right
4. Don't know/ no opinion
(c) There's some debate at the moment about whether people in all occupations should have the right to strike. Do you think that people in all occupations should be able to go on strike?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ no opinion

47. I'd like to ask you about some different campaign and pressure groups.

(a) Can you say whether you know what the aim of each of them is?

(Circle number of each one knows aim of)

1. CND
2. Amnesty International
3. National Front
4. Women's Movement
5. Anti-Apartheid
6. Animal Liberation Front
7. Greenpeace

(b) Do you support the aims of the following groups?

(ask about those knows aim of above; circle the number of each one supports)

1. CND
2. Amnesty International
3. National Front
4. Women's Movement
5. Anti-Apartheid
6. Animal Liberation Front
7. Greenpeace

48. Are you a member of any of the groups that we've mentioned?

(ring those members of)

1. CND
2. Amnesty International
3. National Front
4. Women's Movement
5. Anti-apartheid
6. Animal Liberation Front
7. Greenpeace

49. Do you think that you are likely to join a pressure group or a political party in the future?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
50. Can you imagine that the government passed a law which you thought was really wrong. Can you tell me whether you would definitely, would consider, or would not do any of the following four acts?

a. Write a letter to your MP?
   1. Definitely
   2. Possibly
   3. No
   4. Don't know

b. Sign a petition?
   1. Definitely
   2. Possibly
   3. No
   4. Don't know

c. Take part in a march/demonstration?
   1. Definitely
   2. Possibly
   3. No
   4. Don't know

d. Break the law?
   1. Definitely
   2. Possibly
   3. No
   4. Don't know

51 (a) Do you think there will ever be an undemocratic or a violent overthrow of the government in this country?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don't know

(b) If there was ever such an overthrow, would you not support it, support it in certain circumstances, or support it?
   1. Not support
   2. Support it in certain circumstances
   3. Support it
   4. Don't know

52. (a) People often talk about social class. Which social class, if any, do you think you are in?
   1. Upper class
   2. Middle class
   3. Working class
   4. Don't know/no class
(b) What do you think is the main difference between people in different social classes?

1. Income/wealth
2. Educational level
3. Area/ house lived in
4. Type of school attended
5. Accent/ clothes/ appearance
6. Occupation
7. Don't know

53. There are people in society who are poor. What would you say is the main reason for poverty?

1. Many/ some of the poor themselves are to blame (for example lazy, workshy, careless with money, waste money on such things as drink and cigarettes)
2. No one is to blame for poverty, it is "just the way it is"; it's inevitable.
3. The government and its policies cause poverty: eg low levels of benefits, low wages
4. Don't know

54. Some people say there is a north-south divide in the country. Do you think this is true?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ can't say

(If yes) What do you think are the main differences?

(List up to two differences)

1. House prices
2. Wages
3. Unemployment
4. General standard of living

55. How about Sheffield, do you think the city is divided?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ can't say

56 (a) Do you think there are differences in how men and women are treated in society?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ can't say
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(If yes) (b) **What do you think are the main differences?**

(List up to two)

1. Types of work they do
2. Promotion/ career chances
3. Child care responsibilities
4. Income
5. Household tasks
6. Sexist language and comments

The rest of these questions are quite difficult, but please try to answer them as best you can.

57. I'd like to know how you would describe three different terms. What do you think of as:

A. Politics?

1. Making laws/ the government running the country
2. Different political parties trying to get into power
3. The relationship between individuals and the law/ what people can and can't do in society
4. Different ways of organising whole countries or societies/ different types of political systems
5. Don't know/ can't say

B. Capitalism?

1. People buying and selling
2. People working to try and get ahead in terms of salaries, status and material possessions
3. A way of organising society that produces elites based on class and privilege
4. Don't know/ can't say

C. Socialism?

1. The policies and philosophy of the Labour Party
2. The society/ type of politics in communist countries
3. A way of running a society where profit comes second to social policies and helping people
4. Don't know/ can't say

58. Can you imagine what life would be like if, for some reason, there was no government or laws. Do you think that people would mainly look after themselves, mainly look after other people, or try to balance both?

1. Mainly look after themselves
2. Mainly help the less well off
3. Try to balance both
4. Unsure
59. Sometimes people talk about human nature, what people basically are. Do you think people are basically peaceful and cooperative, selfish and greedy, or a bit of both?

1. Selfish and greedy
2. Peaceful and cooperative
3. Both in everyone
4. Not sure/ can't say

60. (For those with a religious commitment)
You said earlier on that you had a religious belief. Can you tell me whether you think that that affects your attitudes and things you do on a daily basis?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't say/ don't know

61 (a). Would you say that you live your life according to a set of rules, things that help you decide what is right or wrong?

1. Yes
2. No

(If yes) (b) Where do you think these rules have mainly come from?

1. Parents and/or family
2. Religion
3. Developed own rules
4. Taken society's rules
5. Don't know/ can't say

THAT'S ALL THE QUESTIONS I WANTED TO ASK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME. IS THERE ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ASK ME ABOUT WHAT WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT?
APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE LETTER TO SUBJECTS

Appendix 3 contains a sample letter of approach to the private school sample. Minor amendments were made to this letter to make it appropriate for the state school sample and the careers sample.


Dear Student,

As part of my doctoral studies in the Department of Psychology at the University of Sheffield, I am working on a project, called the '16-19 Initiative', which aims to look at young people's attitudes to work, education and politics.

My plan is to interview those students currently in the fifth form at School, as well as some members of the sixth form. Interviews would take place some time in the first half of this year, lasting for about an hour and a half, and they could be arranged for early evening, or at weekends, whichever is most convenient. Since I hope to speak to all of the fifth form and some of the sixth form, many of your friends will also be involved.

It should be stressed that the interviews will be treated in the strictest confidence, and will be used for research purposes only. At no point will information from a student be personally identified. Enclosed is a letter for you to give to your parents, similarly describing the research; perhaps you would like to discuss it further with them.

I do hope you will agree to take part. If so, please complete the enclosed questionnaire; fill it in on your own, and return it as soon as possible in the envelope provided, remembering to add your name, address and telephone number. I will then contact you to arrange an interview. If you would rather not take part, or would like to find out any more details, please write to me at the address above, or ring Sheffield 756600, ext. 269, weekdays.

I look forward to speaking to you.

Yours sincerely,

Debra Roker
APPENDIX 4: PARENTS OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

Professional/Managerial Occupations

Accountant
Barrister
Solicitor
University lecturer
Electrical engineer
General Practitioner
Vet
Company director
Radiologist
FE Lecturer
Polytechnic lecturer
Owner and manager of a shop
Manager of engineering company
Translator
Secondary school teacher
Police inspector
Writer
Pharmacist
Dentist
Occupational therapist
Senior personnel manager
Headteacher
Owner of a travel agents
Engineer
Paediatrician
Journalist
Surgeon
University professor

Non-Professional or Managerial Occupations

Shop assistant
Porter
Postman
Flower deliverer
Park keeper
Steelworker
Typesetter
Wages clerk
Cleaner
Waitress
Secretary
HGV driver
Cook
Tester
Library assistant
Laboratory technician
Milkman
School dinner worker
APPENDIX 5: POLITICAL IDENTITY TRANSCRIPT

(Note: D = interviewer/ R = respondent)

Case number 312
Female/ 18 years old/ seventh year

D. How interested are you in politics and current affairs?
R. Oh yes I'm really interested, I always have been. I really like news and documentary programmes, like Panorama.

D. If there was an election tomorrow, do you know who you would vote for?
R. Well yes, as you've probably guessed from what I've said so far, I'd vote Conservative.
D. Would that be a tactical vote, where-
R. Oh no no. I support the Conservatives completely.
D. Can you say why you would vote that way?
R. Well I just believe that they have the most realistic policies and a good philosophy. The economy is becoming really efficient and strong, and they've brought the trade unions into line. I'm very much in favour of nuclear weapons and they've reduced the absurdly high taxes which the rich had to pay, which was long overdue. Basically, I just agree with all their policies.
D. Can you say when you first began to support that party?
R. Umm... well, I suppose since I was about... well the fifth year I suppose. That's two years now I suppose. I was about thirteen when I really first began to discuss issues with my parents and people here at school. I supported the Liberals for a year or so...I liked David Steel very much and thought their policies were sensible, but eventually I went off them. They didn't seem certain or agreed about anything, and they would never have got elected. The Conservatives just seemed to make more and more sense, and now I'm a really strong supporter.

D. So overall do you generally support the government?
R. Oh yes definitely. They're doing an excellent job. And I really do admire Mrs Thatcher a lot, I think she's superb.
Case Number 401  
Female/ 17 years old/ seventh year

D. So, what do you plan to do after your A Levels?  
R. Well, I've got a place at Bristol University from this October to do  
Accountancy with Marketing. They want two B's and a C and I think I'll be  
OK to get that.  
D. Right, so, do you know what sort of work you want to do eventually?  
R. Yes, I want to be a chartered accountant.

D. So how long have you wanted to be a chartered accountant for, have-  
R. Well, only since I've been in the sixth form really, so about eighteen  
months now. Before that I really like maths and science and was planning to  
become an engineer. But then I sort of lost interest in the sciences, but still  
liked maths. A couple of people here mentioned business or accountancy and  
it just looked really good so I decided on that. I'm really please with that  
decision.

D. What is it about accountancy that makes you want to do-  
R. Well, I just like maths and figures, and the sort of work accountants do, so I  
knew it would be interesting. More than anything it has to be interesting.  
You can also earn a lot of money in accountancy and I do want to earn a good  
salary.
APPENDIX 7: IDENTITY CODING INSTRUCTIONS AND SAMPLE SCORE SHEET

CODING SHEET

Adolescent Identity

The coding you will be doing involves short extracts from interview transcripts. The interviews were conducted with 135 young people, all aged between 15 and 18. Almost all of them were at school, in either the 5th or 7th years, and most were female. They were asked a wide range of questions in the interviews, relating to their future plans and aspirations, and their views on political and social issues.

One of the things we are interested in is the notion of identity, and the existence (or not) of clear and firm commitments in key areas of a person's life. The two areas you will be coding concern occupational identity and political identity.

For each person, two separate transcripts will be presented:

1. The "occupational" one: this gives questions and answers relating to current situation, plans for the next 2/3 years, and the sort of work/career aimed for. It also includes questions on the length of time the person has wanted to do this, and what/who influenced them in career planning.

2. The "political" one: this gives selected questions and answers relating to voting, political party support, interest in politics and attitudes to the present government.

For each person you have two tasks to complete:

TASK 1

Your first job is to read through the two transcripts for each person. Then decide for each area (i.e. occupational and political) whether the person shows, or does not show, evidence of having identity commitments in this area. By this we mean evidence of clear and firm commitments to a particular career plan or political ideology.

You should consider the transcript in total before making a decision. Your choice of whether or not a person shows an identity commitment should be made on the basis of the overall information. Hence a person may have a strong commitment to voting for and supporting one political party, and give clear and consistent reasons for doing so. However, they may also say they are not very interested in politics. This person would still be coded as 'having' a political identity. If you do not feel able to tick Yes or No, tick "Not enough information"; though you should try not to use this very often.
TASK 2

Deciding whether a subject 'has' or 'does not have' an occupational and political identity commitment is the first thing for you to do. We would then like you to code the two areas (for each person) in relation to their identity category - i.e. how the person thinks about occupational and political issues now, and how they thought about them in the past.

There are four of these categories, which are described below. Again, take the overall information and code the category that best represents that person's thinking. If you cannot do this code "Not enough information" on the answer sheet. The four categories are:

Category 1: this person has gone through a period where they have explored various options. They have now emerged with firm commitments in the area.

Category 2: this person is very uncertain about their views in the area. They are actively looking at all the alternatives in an attempt to arrive at a choice; they are often trying to acquire information to enable them to make a decision.

Category 3: this person has never experienced a period of uncertainty. However, they still show a clear identity and set of commitments in the area.

Category 4: this person does not have any firm commitments, and is not trying to form any. They may never have had a period of uncertainty, or they may have had one but been unable to resolve it. They show no clear identity commitments in the area.

For example, someone may say they have considered pursuing many different careers. Now, however, they are pursuing one chosen career aim. They would therefore be coded as Category 1. Someone else, for example might say that they have no political commitments, are totally uninterested in politics, and never have been interested. They would be coded Category 4.

---------

The coding sheet to use is attached.

Please ask me if you have any questions about this, or are unsure what to do.
### CODING SHEET: ADOLESCENT IDENTIFY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Identity Domain</th>
<th>TASK 1</th>
<th>TASK 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity Commitment</td>
<td>Identity Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8: POLITICAL TYPE MEASURE CODING INSTRUCTIONS

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

Included with these instructions are 30 of the transcripts which were used in the identity coding. I would now like you to code what I have called the "overall political type" of each of these subjects, using the transcripts. This is a general commitment to a particular political party and its policies.

There are seven possible coding categories. Four of these are for four different political orientations: Conservative, Labour, Liberal/SDP, and Green (categories 1-4). Two other categories are for those who do not have an overall commitment to any one of these four political types: those who do intend to vote but who are currently undecided about their commitment (the "undecided" category 5), and those who are anti-politics and probably would not vote (the "anti-politics" category 6). A "none of these" category (7) is also available if you feel that a respondent does not fit into any of the first six categories.

CODING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Lib/S</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Anti-pol</td>
<td>None of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>