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ABSTRACT

The research focuses on patriarchy and class, and the relationship between these two principles of social organisation. The two themes take the form of (a) a consideration of the position of women and men in the social division of labour and the impact of patriarchal ideology on the conceptualisations held by adolescents of women and men in the labour force and in domestic work, and (b) the construction of a model of the social division of labour which enables distinctions to be made between specific fractions of the middle class. To place the study in context, there is a critical review of some explanations for the sexual division of labour and its manifestations in industrialised society, and of the way in which the concept of patriarchy has been utilised in such explanations. The influence which prior theoretical application of the concept of patriarchy has had on its use in the current study is discussed. In principle the study is concerned with the ideological positioning of individuals in particular class locations, and the intersection of patriarchal ideology and practice with that of class. The derivation of the model of the social division of labour used to allocate the sample of adolescents in the study to class locations is described. The network of social relations is divided into three fields: those of production, of symbolic control, and the state. The relationship between the approach taken here and that of theorists who have dealt with the nature of class relations is discussed in the study. In the model the fields of production, symbolic control, and the state are subdivided into specific areas and mapped onto the occupational hierarchy, providing a grid onto which particular occupations can be placed. Fathers and mothers of the adolescents in the study are located in this social space.

The empirical research consists of an extensive questionnaire put to 950 twelve to thirteen and fifteen to sixteen year old girls and boys, drawn from State and public schools. The basic variables to which their responses are related are age, gender, social class and locations within social class. The questionnaire had five major sections dealing with: information about the adolescents' home and educational background; questions related to gender differentiation and the sexual division of labour in work, education and the home; questions dealing with aspects of the social division of labour exemplified by the occupational hierarchy; questions relating to education and to certain general political issues. Differences and similarities amongst the groups based on our variables were found and are discussed in terms of ideological positioning and hegemonic control. Future directions for research are indicated.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am much indebted to my supervisor Basil Bernstein for his enthusiasm, unflagging support, and for many hours of valuable discussion.

So many of my friends have provided endless moral encouragement and intellectual assistance that I cannot list them all. I would like to mention in particular Eileen Albury, Cristian Cox Donoso, Lesley Caldwell, Lynne Chisholm, Gunilla Dahlberg, Tupu Gordon, Peter Holland, Gerry Lander, Maureen McNeil, Vivienne Selzer, Betsy Stanko, and Gella Varnava-Skouras. I am especially grateful to Chris Knee for his constructive suggestions.

I owe too my thanks to the children who co-operated with me in the research and to Jo Foster who produced such a well ordered text.

Without the patience and love of Robert Albury I could never have completed this task.
For Rosa and Robert
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements
Table of Contents
List of Tables
List of Figures
List of Appendices

PART 1
INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY OF GENDER AND CLASS RELATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One
The sexual division of labour and the concept of patriarchy

1 Introduction
2 Sex or gender?
3 Patriarchy
   3.1 Patriarchy as the primary source of division in society
   3.2 Gender and class: patriarchy and capitalism
   3.3 Patriarchy as a monolithic concept
   3.4 The concept of patriarchy in this study
4 Women and class
   4.1 Traditional focus on the family as the source of women's class location
   4.2 Cross class families and proletarianisation
5 Institutional sites of the reproduction of gender relations
   5.1 Production and the family
   5.2 Education
6 Ideology and the reproduction of gender and class divisions

Notes
Chapter Two
The theoretical derivation of the model of class used in this study

1 Introduction
2 The concept of class
3 The middle class
   3.1 The professional managerial class
   3.2 The salaried middle class
   3.3 The new class
   3.4 Class groupings and closure
   3.5 Economic, political, and ideological determinants of class location and the boundary problem
   3.6 Descriptive models of the middle class and cleavage
4 Ideology
5 Ideological positioning
Notes

Chapter Three
Theory and description of the model of class used in the study to distinguish the substantive social groups

1 Introduction
2 Divisions within and between the fields of symbolic control and production
   2.1 Divisions between the field of production and symbolic control
   2.2 Divisions within the fields of production and symbolic control
   2.3 The model we have used
3 The hypotheses taken to the data
4 Empirical specification of the class and field location of the sample
  4.1 Description of the model of class used in this study
    4.1.1 Sectors within the field of production
    4.1.2 Functions within the field of symbolic control
    4.1.3 The core functions of the state
  4.2 The occupational hierarchy
5 Women and class
Notes

PART 2
THE EMPIRICAL STUDY OF ADOLESCENTS' CONCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL AND SEXUAL DIVISIONS

Chapter Four
The sample and method used in the study

1 Introduction
2 The sample
  2.1 Origins of the study and construction of the sample
  2.2 Obtaining a sample with the required attributes
    2.2.1 The middle class sample
    2.2.2 Brief descriptions of the schools from which the middle class sample was obtained
    2.2.3 The working class sample
    2.2.4 Brief descriptions of the schools from which the working class sample was obtained
  2.3 Description of the sample
    2.3.1 The working class subsamples
    2.3.2 The middle class subsamples
3 The methodology employed

3.1 Choice of procedure

3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of a questionnaire method

3.3 Mode of interpretation

3.4 The structure of the questionnaire
   3.4.1 Modelling
   3.4.2 Modelling of gender differentiation
   3.4.3 Modelling of the social division of labour and social relations
   3.4.4 Modelling of educational processes
   3.4.5 Further aspects of social and political modelling
   3.4.6 Questions requiring information

4 Administering the questionnaire

5 Coding the responses

5.1 Objectives and problems of coding
   5.1.1 Sources of the categories
   5.1.2 Allocation of responses to categories
     (a) Level of interpretation
     (b) Reliability of allocation to categories

5.2 The basic coding
   5.2.1 Topic area: 1. The social division of labour and its social relations and gender differentiation
     (a) Aspirations and expectations
     (b) Aspiration as a member of the opposite sex
   5.2.2 Topic area: 2. Gender differentiation
     (a) Gender differentiated education
     (b) Male and female work
   5.2.3 Topic area: 3. The social division of labour and its social relations
     (a) Income differentials
   5.2.4 Topic area: 4. Educational processes
     (a) The value of education for the individual
     (b) How to get on at school
5.2.5 Topic area: 5. Further aspects of social and political modelling
   (a) Who runs the country?
   (b) Political parties

5.3 Refocussing the basic coding for specific analyses

6 Methods of analysis

Notes

Chapter Five
Analyses and results: general measures

1 Introduction to the results
   1.1 Types of analysis
   1.2 Presentation of results

2 Discussion of initial indices and analyses
   2.1 Introduction
   2.2 Indices of support for or rejection of dominant societal values
   2.3 Results on the indices relating to dominant societal values
      2.3.1 Gender differences
      2.3.2 Class and intra class differences
   2.4 Factor analysis
   2.5 Intra-me differences on selected questions
      2.5.1 Refocussing of coding categories for the index of field orientation
      2.5.2 Results on the index of field orientation

3 Overview

Notes

Chapter Six
Introduction to the results on specific topic areas

1 Introduction

2 The concepts of classification and framing
Some data on the family derived from Wells' study

3.1 Positional and personal families

A test of the hypothesis relating positional and personal families to class and intra class location

4.1 Procedure

4.2 Results

4.2.1 Differences between means on positional score: sample located by father's occupation

4.2.2 Some comparisons based on both mother's and father's location

4.2.3 Gender differentiation in these families

Overview

Notes

Chapter Seven

The adolescents' modelling of gender differentiation

1 Introduction

2 The index of gender classification

2.1 Questions used, refocussing of the coding and examples of recoded responses

2.1.1 The questions and recoding

2.2 A note on strength and weakness of classification in the answers

3 Construction of the index of gender classification

4 Results on the index of gender classification

4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

4.2 Intra-mc comparison

4.2.1 Gender comparison within the mc groups

4.2.2 Comparison between the 'ideal typical' groups within the mc

4.2.3 Comparison between groups with both mother and father in the same field
4.3 Results on the index

4.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

4.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

4.3.3 Summary of the results on the index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour and background questions

5 When the unit is an item in the topic area

5.1 Why do people work?

5.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

5.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

5.2 What effect does work have on people's lives?

5.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

5.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

5.3 Trade unions, strikes and unemployment

5.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

5.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

5.4 How to earn more money

5.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

5.4.2 Intra-mc comparison

5.5 Summary of results on individual questions

6 Overview

6.1 The general picture

6.2 Dynamic patterns in the data

Notes
Chapter Ten
The working class re-examined

1 Introduction
2 Comparison of the wc children who have high educational aspirations with other wc and mc groups
   2.1 The adolescents' modelling of educational processes
      2.1.1 The classificatory relation between education and production
      2.1.2 The systemic relation between education and production
   2.2 The adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour
   2.3 The adolescents' modelling of gender relations
3 Overview

Notes

Chapter Eleven
Further aspects of social and political modelling

1 Introduction

2 Property
   2.1 Personal ownership
      2.1.1 General comments and comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.1.2 Intra-mc comparison
   2.2 Desire for ownership
      2.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.2.2 Intra-mc comparison
   2.3 What belongs to all?
      2.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.3.2 Intra-mc comparison
   2.4 Common ownership
      2.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.4.2 Intra-mc comparison
      2.4.3 Examples of responses

3 Order and change
   3.1 Who rules the individual?
      3.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      3.1.2 Intra-mc comparison
   3.2 Who rules the country?
      3.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      3.2.2 Intra-mc comparison
   3.3 Political parties
      3.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      3.3.2 Intra-mc comparison
   3.4 Change
      3.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      3.4.2 Intra-mc comparison
Chapter Twelve

Occupational aspirations and expectations amongst the adolescents

1 Introduction

2 Results from the questions on aspirations
   2.1 Aspirations and expectations
      2.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.1.2 Working class high aspirers
      2.1.3 Intra-mc comparison
   2.2 Occupational aspiration as a member of the opposite sex
      2.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups
      2.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

3 Overview

Notes

Conclusions

1 Introduction

2 The efficacy of the concepts, methodology and model employed
   2.1 The major conceptual tools
      2.1.1 'Dominant' ideology, ideological positioning and hegemony
      2.1.2 Classification
      2.1.3 Patriarchy
      2.1.4 The model of the social division of labour employed in the study
      2.1.5 The questionnaire
      2.1.6 Levels of meaning
## 3 Major findings

### 3.1 Education

### 3.2 Work and the social division of labour

### 3.3 Politics and other social issues

### 3.4 Gender

### 3.5 Class and gender

## 4 In conclusion

Notes

Bibliography

Appendices
**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 3.1
The model of the social division of labour 125

Table 3.2
Mothers' work for those in our sample with a precise field location (in percentage terms) 132

Table 4.1
The sample in manual/non-manual terms 146

Table 4.2
The sample in terms of an eight point breakdown 148

Table 4.3
Distribution of the sample into the model of the social division of labour 149

Table 4.4
The working class subsample 150

Table 4.5
The middle class subsample by field 152

Table 4.6
The 'ideal typical' middle class subsample 153

Table 4.7
Both mother and father in the same field for the middle class subsample 154

Table 4.8
Relationship between the field location of fathers and mothers in our sample 155
Table 5.1
Levels of significance of differences between boys and girls on three indices

Table 5.2
Levels of significance for differences between adolescents in the fields of production and symbolic control in giving answers predicted for those fields on a set of questions

Table 5.3
Percentage of selected groups within the sample giving 'Production' or 'Symbolic Control' types of response

Table 6.1
Outline of ideal types of positional and personal families

Table 6.2
Differences between means on positional score for social class groups

Table 6.3
Comparisons between groups based on mother's and father's occupations

Table 6.4
Differences between means for positionality on gender differentiation responses

Table 7.1
Types of responses generated by each question on gender differentiation

Table 7.2
Comparison between mc and wc groups on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification
Table 7.3
Comparison within the mc on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification: the field of production and the field of symbolic control 240

Table 7.4
Comparison between 'ideal typical' groups within the mc on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification 242

Table 7.5
Comparison within the mc on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification: those with both mother and father in the same field 243

Table 7.6
Percentage change with age on the index of gender classification: movement into weak classification 245

Table 7.7
Selected responses on domestic labour: comparison between mc and wc groups 248

Table 7.8
Selected responses on domestic labour: comparison within the mc 252

Table 7.9
Percentage change with age on selected questions on domestic labour 253

Table 7.10
Proportions of the mc and wc groups suggesting that the father has responsibility for looking after the home and family 256
Table 7.11
Selected responses on the most important thing in the adolescents' lives: comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 7.12
Selected responses on the most important thing in the adolescents' lives: comparison within the mc

Table 7.13
What is important in life? Percentage changes with age for selected responses

Table 7.14
Strength as a reason for the distribution of women and men in the labour force
(i) Proportion arguing that female and male differences in types of work are due to differences in physique or strength
(ii) Percentage change with age in those arguing that female and male differences in types of work are due to differences in physique or strength

Table 8.1
Are income differentials fair or unfair? Comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.2
Are income differentials fair or unfair? The intra-mc comparison

Table 8.3
Strength of classification of the income distribution in terms of high and low earners: comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.4
Strength of classification of the income distribution in terms of high and low earners: the intra-mc comparison
Table 8.5  
The index for classification of the social division of labour: comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.6  
The index for classification of the social division of labour: the intra-mc comparison

Table 8.7  
The largest proportion of each group falling into combined categories on questions on the social division of labour

Table 8.8  
Age movements between 12+ and 15+ on issues related to the social division of labour in terms of percentage point differences

Table 8.9  
Combined responses on reasons for work: comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.10  
Combined responses on reasons for work: the intra-mc comparison

Table 8.11  
The effects of work on life: comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.12  
The effects of work on life: the intra-mc comparison

Table 8.13  
What are trade unions for? Comparison between mc and wc groups
Table 8.14
Comparison between mc and wc groups on selected questions on employment

Table 8.15
Intra-mc comparison on selected questions on employment

Table 8.16
Major responses on what three occupation holders could do if they thought they should earn more money for their work
(i) Comparison between the mc and wc groups
(ii) Intra-mc comparison

Table 8.17
Age movements between 12+ and 15+ on selected questions on employment for both class and field groups

Table 9.1
Recognition of the classificatory relation between education and production by the mc and wc groups

Table 9.2
Recognition of the systemic relation between education and production by the mc and wc groups

Table 9.3
Recognition of the classificatory relation between education and production by the intra-mc groups

Table 9.4
Recognition of the systemic relation between education and production by the intra-mc groups

Table 9.5
Distribution of the mc and wc groups into basic focus of examinations to be taken
Table 9.6
Degree to which students saw themselves as involved in examination decisions

Table 9.7
Proportion of the class groups considering that what they do at school will be useful when they leave

Table 9.8
Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls? Comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 9.9
Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls? The intra-mc comparison

Table 9.10
Comparisons between class, field and gender groups on selected educational issues

Table 9.11
Age movements for selected issues on education, class and field groups

Table 10.1
Comparative characteristics of high educational aspirers

Table 10.2
Gender differences in examinations to be taken for working class high educational aspirers compared with the rest of the wc group
Table 10.3  
Comparison between wc high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of the classificatory relation between education and production

Table 10.4  
Comparison between wc high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of the systemic relation between education and production

Table 10.5  
Comparison between wc high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of classification of the social division of labour

Table 10.6  
Comparison between wc high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of classification of gender relations

Table 11.1  
Class, gender and age groups owning particular types of items

Table 11.2  
Within class, gender and age groups owning particular types of items

Table 11.3  
Selected responses on the property questions for the class comparison

Table 11.4  
Selected responses on the property questions for the comparison within the middle class
Table 11.5
Age movements for the class and field groups on property issues

Table 11.6
Selected responses on issues of order and change for the class comparison

Table 11.7
Selected responses on issues of order and change for the comparison within the middle class

Table 11.8
Age movements for the class and field groups on issues of order and change

Table 11.9
Comparisons between class, field and gender groups on issues of social and political modelling

Table 12.1
Aspirations and expectations: the class comparison

Table 12.2
Sources of inspiration for the adolescents' occupational aspirations: the class comparison

Table 12.3
Aspirations and expectations: the intra-mc comparison

Table 12.4
Sources of inspiration for the adolescents' occupational aspirations: the intra-mc comparison
| Table 12.5 | Work as opposite sex the same as the individual's own aspiration in percentage terms | 421 |
| Table 12.6 | Types of jobs suggested as opposite sex aspiration as a percentage of total responses | 422 |
| Table 12.7 | Percentage of subjects refusing to offer an opposite sex aspiration | 424 |
| Table 12.8 | Opposite sex work aspirations amongst those in the fields of production and symbolic control | 426 |
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1
Patriarchy and class 48

Figure 1.2
Hegemonic processes 63

Figure 3.1
Pedagogic capital and the fields of the model 118

Figure 3.2
Products of public and private sectors and agents of symbolic control 118

Figure 3.3
Interrelationships between the fields of the model 120

Figure 4.1
Class, patriarchy and positioning 160

Figure C.1
Hegemonic processes 436
LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1
A few examples of fathers' occupations falling into specific field locations 485

Appendix 2
Introduction to the research for the adolescents 487

Appendix 3
Factor analysis 488

Appendix 4
(a) Figures from which Table 5.1 was derived
(b) Figures from which Table 5.2 was derived 489

Appendix 5
The index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour; Figures for 'ideal type' groups and those with both mother and father in the same field 491

Appendix 6
Indices of the recognition of the classificatory and systemic relations between education and production: Figures for 'ideal type' groups and those with both mother and father in the same field 492

Appendix 7
The adolescents' modelling of the educational process:
A question by question approach 494

Appendix 8
Aspirations and expectations of all groups in terms of the top three levels of the Hall-Jones scale 495
INTRODUCTION

The object of this study is an investigation of the nature and mode of understanding which adolescents have of the principles on which the social division of labour and forms of social control are based. The major focus is on adolescent conceptions of the location of women in the social and sexual division of labour. We attempt to indicate the effect of patriarchy on the views held by adolescents of both social and sexual divisions, and the ways in which these views are mediated through their class location.

Considerable effort has been expended in the social sciences in the past to describe and understand the nature of society in terms of class relations. The concept of social class has proved invaluable, if sometimes confusing and ill-defined, in explaining inequalities in the distribution of power, of control, and of scarce material and symbolic resources. The social division of labour, encompassing both the technical division of labour and the associated social relations of production, has formed the basis for such analyses. Enmeshed with and entwined around this hierarchy of privilege and power based on class relations, another exists; the hierarchy of power relations based on gender, and the privileging of the male in most areas of social organisation and experience. The principle on which this parallel and interlocking hierarchy is based can be described as that of patriarchy. The concept of patriarchy has been used in the past in psychoanalysis, for example, to describe the power of the father, and in social anthropology to explain the power of men over younger men and women. Some theorists and commentators would prefer to limit its usage to these traditional types of definition. Others consider that the concept can be redefined and used to help to explain the all-pervasive sexual division of labour which penetrates every area of life. The development of the concept in this latter respect has a history far shorter than that of the concept of class, even if this history has often proved as confused and contradictory.

For social theorists who accept the existence of these parallel principles of social organisation, class, specifically its manifestations in capitalist society, and patriarchy, the question of the relationship between the two arises. Patriarchy, in the sense of male power and control over
women and the hierarchy of privilege based on gender, evidently predates capitalist society and the particular sets of class relations which develop in that setting. Capitalism can be seen as incorporating these pre-existing patriarchal or sexual divisions into the class divisions which were crucial to that system - and historical descriptions of the way in which this has been done, to the advantage of men in different class groups, have been attempted (for example by Hartmann, 1979, and Lown, 1983). The advantages to capitalism of the sexual division of labour have also been considered (for example by Beechey, 1977, and Bruegel, 1979). The possible interrelation is ignored, however, by some feminist writers, who see two parallel systems, one ruled by class divisions relating to the sphere of production and economic factors, and another ruled by patriarchy, relating to the sphere of reproduction and the relations between women and men (Firestone, 1970; Delphy, 1977). Whilst total separation might be a useful approach for theoretical and analytical purposes, it ultimately falls short as an explanation. The specific interrelation between these two principles has not been fully articulated, and is an area of major theoretical concern in the field of study of women in society (which cannot of course be separated from the field of study of men, since both exist in relation to each other).

The study reported here can be seen as reflecting the problems associated with theorising this interrelationship. The content of the study attempts to trace the ideological positioning of adolescents in terms of class and gender identities, in relation to both class and gender relations themselves, and is exploratory in nature.

Chapter 1 consists of a critical review of significant contributions to the study of patriarchy and gender. The purpose is twofold:

(1) to delineate the problematic within which this study is located, and
(2) to place the study within that context.

The chapter reviews the uses to which the concept of patriarchy has been put in the literature, describes the way in which it is used in the present study, and goes on to discuss briefly the institutional sites for the reproduction of gender relations. We examine the operation of the sexual division of labour inside and outside the domestic unit, and the reproduction of gender hierarchy, drawing attention to the part played in this process by the family, the state, education and ideology. The importance of both the material and
ideological construction of the sexual division of labour and the way in which it is embedded in the major institutions of society leads to the formulation of a model which attempts to describe the processes of hegemonic ideological control and the resistances to this control which are engendered in the counter-hegemonic field. The model forms both a condensed theoretical justification and a framework for the derivation of the experimental instrument used in the study. The adolescents' responses as described in the results section provide the flesh for this framework.

When considering the effect of class on the representations of society held by the adolescents we were particularly concerned with fractions of the middle class, specifically with the differentiation between the old middle class and the new middle class. Class analysis is a kaleidoscopic minefield for the uninitiated or unwary, and for most proponents a firm grip is provided not so much by a clear definition of what they mean by class, but by a particular perspective. A model of class relations was developed in this study which draws essentially on a marxist perspective in that the crucial defining characteristic of class is relationship to the means of production, and that the consciousness of the individual derives from that relation. The model is influenced by the work of recent theorists who have elaborated and advanced the conceptualisation of superstructural factors, frequently in the effort to define class boundaries.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the sources for the development of the model used in this study to allocate the adolescent sample to class positions. The representations of the adolescents which are uncovered in this investigation are regarded as indicators of their ideological positioning within the network of social relations, and the way in which this term is used and understood in the study is described in this chapter, with a brief review of theories of ideology which have been influential in generating this stance. Chapter 3 provides the theoretical justification and a detailed description of the model. This model of the social division of labour is based on the distinction between the old and the new middle class, using Bernstein's (1977, 1980) characterisation of these class fractions as the field of production and the field of symbolic control. The core functions of the state are included in the model and subdivisions within the three fields are specified. This categorisation is integrated with the occupational hierarchy in a form
influenced by the work of Goldthorpe and Hope (1974) so as to generate a grid representing social spaces into which specific occupations can be categorised. The adolescents' mothers and fathers are allocated to this social space on the basis of their work, and their children to a social class location on the basis of the father's occupation.

The class location of women has traditionally been bound to their position in the family, of origin or marriage, with scant attention paid to their own work in production. This positioning of women within the family is a major ideological message in support of the sexual division of labour, and as such has been both incorporated into the discourse of the social sciences, and developed and elaborated in theories emanating from this field, as part of the work of the construction of ideology and of hegemonic control. The class location of women is the linchpin of the relationship between class and patriarchy; at the level of grand theory, its insertion would require a total realignment of the theoretical constructs associated with class and patriarchy, an epic venture. Whilst this thesis is not a contribution at the level of grand theory, we are concerned to understand the relationship between class and patriarchy. We discuss the issue and the class location of women in the theoretical introduction to the work (Chapters 1 and 3) and pursue it in our empirical study. The mothers in our sample are allocated to a class position on the basis of their own relation to production, and in some analyses the position of both mother and father are taken into consideration.

Chapters 4 - 12 present the empirical study. The empirical work is based on a large sample of 950 adolescents. It is exceptional in a study of this type for such a large sample to be used, and it means that when we break the sample down into subcategories, as we do for many of our analyses, there are still respectable numbers in the relevant cells. The derivation and generation of the sample is described in Chapter 4, as are the ways in which it has been redefined for specific analyses which were undertaken. The sample is allocated to the model of the social division of labour reported in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 deals with methodological aspects of the study and includes a description of the questionnaire which was used.

The questionnaire consisted largely of open ended questions, and an extensive and elaborated set of coding frames, or networks, was derived to
deal with the answers. An outline and some examples of this basic coding system is given in Chapter 4.¹ This basic coding was redefined and refocussed in some of the analyses, and specific details of the refocussing of the original coding, which forms a crucial part of the exploration of the concepts used in the analyses performed on this data, are presented at the point in the thesis where the specific analyses and results are presented.

The description of these specific analyses and the results obtained from them provide the main empirical part of the thesis and appear in Chapters 5 - 12. A number of general analyses were undertaken in an attempt to encapsulate the broad sweep of the data and provide a framework into which the more specific analyses could be placed and these are presented in Chapter 5. The questionnaire was divided into topic areas which focussed on particular aspects of social organisation, and these topic areas are each considered in a separate chapter in turn. In Chapter 6 a general introduction to the results in the specific topic areas is accompanied by a report on an analysis by the current author of some data provided from a study by Gordon Wells of children and language. By using these data we have been able to indicate a link between particular family types and the fields of the social division of labour which we have identified in our model, those of production and of symbolic control. The topic areas covered in the following three chapters are gender differentiation (in Chapter 7), the social division of labour (in Chapter 8), and the educational process (in Chapter 9). For these three topic areas we tried to capture the adolescents' modelling of this particular aspect of social organisation by using a concept developed by Bernstein (1977) which offers a link between specific practices within institutions and the structure and organisation of power in society - the concept of classification. The way in which this concept has been used for each topic area is described in detail, and the results of its application to the data given for each part of the questionnaire in turn. In some instances the responses on individual questions or items are discussed separately, since it was not possible to incorporate them into the analysis based on the concept of classification and the details and results on these questions appear at the end of each chapter dealing with the topic areas of the questionnaire. After the initial introduction in Chapter 6, which provides a general description of the concept of classification and the reasons for its use in the study, the format is the same for each chapter. In each instance the specific use of the concept of classification is presented.
where relevant, followed by the particular questions included in the index
developed for that topic area and the refocussing of the original coding which
was required. This is followed by a description of the construction of the
index used, the results comparing adolescent groups based on the variables of
class, gender, age and location within the middle class, first on the index and
then on any individual questions which could not be incorporated into the
index. Finally there is a discussion of the results, which attempts to pull
together the similarities and differences between our groups on the issues
raised in each topic area.

In Chapter 10 we examine more closely a particular group of working
class children, those with high educational aspirations, and compare them with
other groups in the sample. Chapter 11 deals with further aspects of social
and political modelling not covered in the above topic areas, which are
reported on a question by question basis without the application of the
concept of classification.

Chapter 12 consists of a separate section which appeared on the
questionnaire, dealing with the adolescents' responses to a series of questions
on occupational aspirations and expectations. The results are related to the
literature on occupational choice, and some of the deficiencies of the work in
this area are noted. The findings are also related to our major concerns, class
and gender inequalities. We draw together the most important of our findings
and discuss their implications in the conclusion to the study.

We begin then in Chapter 1 with a review of the relevant contributions
to the study of patriarchy and gender divisions.

Footnote

1 The entire set of coding frames/networks constitutes a coding manual,
which is available from the author, but too extensive to include in this
report of the work.
CHAPTER 1

THE SEXUAL DIVISION OF LABOUR AND THE CONCEPT OF PATRIARCHY

1 Introduction

The adolescents in this study express certain views about the social and sexual division of labour, class and gender relations. These adolescents are constructing their own place in gender and class hierarchies through a process involving experience of material conditions, social relations and interactional practices, and ideological messages in the institutions of the society in which they live. We regard the views which they express as indicating at some level elements of the ideological positioning which has and is taking place for them. In Chapter 2 we discuss at a general level theories of class which have influenced this study. In this chapter we will briefly touch on some of the research and theorisation on women which has contributed to the position taken here.

In order to describe the principle upon which gender hierarchy is based, we have adopted the concept of patriarchy, using it to refer to the power and control which is exerted over women by men, and we trace the derivation of this concept in the literature, in order to define our usage.

Areas of investigation which are particularly relevant to this study, and which have produced both empirical material and new theorisations of women's position have focussed on women's work and labour market experience, domestic labour, the class location of women, education, and the role of ideology in maintaining sexual divisions. In the expansion of the study of women which has taken place over the last decade or so, in some instances existing theories from the 'male-stream' (O'Brien, 1981: 6), notably those of Freud and Marx, have been appropriated; in others these theories have been explicitly attacked and replaced by alternative formulations. Feminist objections to Freud's psychoanalytic theory for example have argued that it provides ideological reinforcement for women's oppression by describing the characteristics of femininity in terms of immutable structures of the psyche. It is suggested that the theory itself is the product of a particular cultural
and historical situation, incorporating historically and socially specific notions of male superiority whilst claiming to be an ahistorical and universalistic theory of psychic development (Burniston et al, 1978). Mitchell (1974), however, argues that the social nature of sexual definition is inherent in Freud's theoretical formulations, and uses his concepts for an analysis of the functioning of the ideologies of sex and gender. Her work has been the starting point for a line of study incorporating psychoanalytic theory into the understanding of women's subordination.¹

Socialist feminists see the root of female oppression in the working of the capitalist system, and use Marx's theory as a starting point for an explanation. Within this overall theoretical orientation there are many different stances. The limiting positions in the range are (1) a primary concern with Marxist analysis and the application of this analysis to women without questioning the categories and concepts employed, and (2) a recognition of fundamental problems with Marxist theoretical formulations and their unconsidered application to women. Those who take the latter position argue that Marx's theory is in need of radical modification if it is to articulate the interaction between class and gender - they frequently use the concept of patriarchy in developing such a reformulation. Studies of women's position in society have focussed on gender hierarchy and the subordination and devaluation of women.

2 Sex or gender?

The term 'sexual division of labour' is used at the most general level to describe the division of male and female activities into those which take place in the public arena, associated with production and the social, and those which take place in the private arena, concerned with reproduction and the individual, but it can also apply to the separation of the spheres of activity of men and women in both the home and the market place.² Weight is placed on the distinction between sex, seen as a biological category, and gender as a socially constructed category by some authors (for example Oakley, 1972: 16;³ Brake, 1976: 174). This avoids the pitfalls of biological reductionism, the snare of the immutable in the 'nature' of men and women. For others, however, the distinction is unnecessary since for them the social and the
biological are inextricably entwined. Rubin (1975: 159), for example, argues that "the sex/gender system is the set of arrangements by which society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied". MacKinnon (1983: 635), similarly emphasising sexuality, argues that

"Since I believe sexuality is fundamental to gender and fundamentally social, and that biology is its social meaning in the system of sex inequality, which is a social and political system that does not rest independently on biological differences in any respect, the sex/gender distinction looks like a nature/culture distinction. I use sex and gender relatively interchangeably."

Mackintosh (1981: 2) concludes that in her discussion of the activities and relations of men and women, which she terms the sexual division of labour, she will use the concepts of 'gender' and 'gender relations', but that this "does not assume that any of the divisions studied can be deduced from differences between the biological sexes". This study will follow Mackintosh in the use of the terms 'sexual divisions' and 'gender'.

3 Patriarchy

The concept of patriarchy itself is one which has emerged in its most recent form in feminist studies on the position of women, and is the subject of considerable controversy within this field of study. The two positions which form the boundary of the range available are (1) that patriarchy is an unnecessary, loosely and very variously defined concept with biologistic and universalistic overtones, which is of little or no value in attempting to come to grips with the problems associated with analysing and explaining the position and experience of women in society (Adlam, 1979: 98; Barrett, 1980: 10 ff; Rowbotham, 1979: 970); and (2) that patriarchy is a crucial and essential concept in the task of understanding women's subordination, potentially having the force which the concept of class has in the marxist explanation of social relations, although further theoretical work may be necessary and appropriate to develop this critical concept (Eisenstein, 1979; Alexander and Taylor, 1980: 161; Lown, 1983: 33).
In the following section we will give some examples of usage of the concept of patriarchy which will also serve to illustrate the basic positions in feminist analysis of women's subordination, radical, revolutionary and socialist feminist, and the similarities and differences which exist within these positions. At the broadest level the socialist feminist critique of radical and revolutionary feminist analyses of women's subordination is that it is essentialist, focussing on one set of relations, those between men and women with no account taken of other social differences and divisions; and the radical and revolutionary feminist critique of socialist feminist analysis is that it is itself subordinated to a male constructed conception of class as the major motor of history. Within these overall positions, however, there are wide variations, as will be shown below.

3.1 Patriarchy as the primary source of division in society

Millet (1970) introduced the concept of patriarchy into feminist discourse, using it to refer to male domination over women and the power relations which sustain women's subordination to men. Millett defines patriarchy as follows:

"Our society, like all other historical civilisations, is a patriarchy. The fact is evident at once if one recalls that the military, industry, technology, universities, science, political office, and finance - in short every avenue of power within the society, including the coercive force of the police, is entirely in male hands" (p. 25).

From this radical feminist perspective sexual division and hierarchy becomes the fundamental division in society, a position taken in opposition to the marxist analysis which postulates class as the primary division. For Millett the rule of women by men is "sturdier than any form of segregation, more rigorous than class stratification, more uniform, certainly more enduring" (p. 25) and "whatever the class of her birth and education, the female has fewer permanent class associations than does the male. Economic dependency renders her affiliations with any class a tangential, vicarious and temporary matter" (1971: 38).
The family is seen as crucial in socialising children into gender specific roles, temperaments and statuses, and radical feminists emphasise particular aspects of women's oppression in the area of reproduction - for example childbirth, abortion, and motherhood. Revolutionary feminism takes this emphasis on biological reproduction one stage further and, following Firestone (1970) develops a theory of patriarchy and sex-class based on male ownership of and control over women's reproductive capacities. In this argument there are two systems of social class, one the economic class system based on relations of production, and the other the sex class system, based on relations of reproduction. Patriarchy refers to this second system where women are subordinated to male control over their reproductive power (Jeffreys, 1977: 10) and it is the constancy of this power which provides the unchanging basis of patriarchy. The latter position, rooting female subordination in biology and emphasising the universal nature of gender hierarchy, has been criticised for undermining the usefulness of the concept of patriarchy by the universalistic claims, leaving no way of explaining the different manifestations of gender hierarchy and patriarchy in different cultures, and at different historical junctures. 

A more important criticism is that of biological reductionism and the concomitant dangers of the immutability of the 'natural' (Beechey 1979: 70, Barrett 1980: 12). Further criticisms from socialist feminists refer to the inadequacy of the definition of reproduction in radical and revolutionary feminism, which they see as too narrowly focussed on biological reproduction, and to the fact that two autonomous systems of class are postulated to exist in parallel, with no discussion of the relationship between them.

Delphy (1977) has developed a materialist feminist analysis locating the source of women's subordination in marriage and the family. She argues that there are two modes of production in contemporary capitalist society, (1) the industrial mode of production defined by capitalist property relations and capitalist exploitation; and (2) the family mode of production which is defined by patriarchal relations of production and the exploitation of women by men. Delphy has a broad general definition of patriarchy as sexual division (Delphy, 1977), but the focus for her conception of patriarchy is more specifically located in the family, which is for her the site of the economic exploitation of women where both their productive and reproductive labour is appropriated by men. As a result of their common position in the patriarchal domestic mode of production, women form a distinct class irrespective of the class position.
of their husband, which is derived from his relation to the industrial mode of production. Delphy's work has been criticised, again largely from a socialist feminist perspective, for the separation of two types of class, women as a class, and class for men derived from economic activity, and a lack of consideration, as with other radical and revolutionary feminists, of the relation between class and patriarchy.

3.2 Gender and class: patriarchy and capitalism

Socialist feminists who have found the categories of marxist theory inadequate to deal with the problem of the subordination of women have argued that what is required is an understanding of the articulation of the interaction between class and gender through the economic, political and ideological levels of the social formation. The concept of patriarchy is frequently adopted as a basis for the analysis of this interaction, and, in common with revolutionary and radical feminists, it is argued that the principle of patriarchy predated capitalism, and that the divisions of capitalism were meshed with or grafted onto the already existing sexual divisions (Beechey, 1979; Hartmann, 1976). In some instances the emphasis is on the material basis for women's oppression, and realisations of patriarchal power in material practices and institutions of society. Others draw attention to patriarchy as ideology, and in the latter case psychoanalytic theory is frequently incorporated into the theoretical formulation (Mitchell, 1974).

Hartmann (1976), taking a materialist position, provides an historical analysis of the interaction of the principle of patriarchy and the processes of capitalism, placing emphasis on the role of the male worker in restricting women's participation in the labour market, with examples from both the UK and USA. The argument here is that the principle of patriarchy, operating through men in the interests of men, could either be in conflict or could coincide with the interests of the capitalist class. Hartmann reaches towards a definition of patriarchy as "a set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men and enable them to dominate women" (1981: 197), arguing that the material base for patriarchy is male control over female labour power and sexuality.
A further line of socialist feminist analysis with a materialist approach has directed attention towards the social relations of reproduction as the locus of patriarchy. Edholm et al (1977) have provided conceptual refinement of the notion of reproduction, which helped to clarify the area for later writers. They suggest that three elements should be distinguished in the concept of reproduction: (1) social reproduction of relations and forces of production - what has to be reproduced for the social formation to continue, (2) reproduction of the labour force both in terms of day to day maintenance and the allocation of agents to positions in the labour process over time, and (3) human or biological reproduction.

Work on the relations of reproduction and the family can be found in articles in *Women Take Issue* (CCCS, 1978), by Hartmann (1976 and 1979), Eisenstein (1979) and McDonough and Harrison (1978). The difficulties encountered in this approach can be illustrated with reference to the latter authors. McDonough and Harrison attempt to show that an analysis of patriarchy in its symbolic aspects and an orthodox marxist analysis are equally one-sided and argue that "an adequate marxist feminist analysis must attempt to relate the form of organisation of the sexual division of labour in the home and in production to the historically specific form of organisation of procreation and sexuality" (p. 39). Mitchell (1974, discussed below) is taken as an example of the first approach to patriarchy in its symbolic aspects and they look at her use of Freud's analysis of the operation of ideology and the laws of human order, both of which are for Freud patriarchal, based on the law of the father. In their view Mitchell's attempt to specify a set of general abstract formal propositions about the nature of the unconscious and ideology is "theoretically incompatible with a concrete understanding of the forms and conditions and effectivity under which ideology operates and of their relation to other structures within the wider social totality" (McDonough and Harrison, 1978: 24). They conclude that the unconscious must be analysed in its historical specificity, in concrete kinship structures and class ideologies. The authors suggest that what they see as the orthodox marxist definition of patriarchy as a form of organisation of labour in the household (p. 25) is equally inadequate, and for them the development of the concept of patriarchy "must lie in the interrelation between the relations of production on the one hand and ... the relations of human reproduction on the other" (p.
Patriarchy must be seen as a dual concept relating first to the control of women's sexuality and fertility in monogamous marriage and secondly to the economic subordination of women through the sexual division of labour and property. The impact of these forms of patriarchal control over women will differ for women from different social classes (or more specifically in their analysis for women married to men in different social classes). It seems, however, that despite their insistence on the importance of the concept of patriarchy, it is class which has the ultimately determining force, and essentially a separation between the relations of production and of reproduction is maintained. Their analysis, as Adlam (1979: 94) suggests, is a kind of sophisticated economistic functionalism, where "these patriarchal structures of economic dependence in marriage (which are specific to women but different for each class) function ultimately in the interests of the male capitalist, of his need for legitimate heirs and for fresh labour power" (McDonough and Harrison, p. 36).

Mitchell's (1974) attempt to retrieve psychoanalysis for feminist discourse and to locate the concept of patriarchy in ideology has been extremely influential in some branches of feminist analysis, especially the former aspect which has led to feminist formulations of female sexuality incorporating psychoanalytic concepts. Mitchell, following Freud, and a Lacanian rereading of Freud, sees the defining characteristic of patriarchal culture as the power of the father over young men and women, which is attained symbolically at the inauguration of human culture. The crucial event for any individual is the entry into culture (and for Lacan into language) through the resolution of the Oedipus complex, the point at which the unconscious is constituted. The external equivalent of this internal structuring of the unconscious within the structures of patriarchal law is the material organisation of the kinship structure, and in particular the exchange of women. Following Levi-Strauss (1968), Mitchell argues that the rules of kinship are the society, and the act of exchange holds a society together. The basic law regulating marriage relationships is the prohibition on incest, leading to exogamy where a family must give up one of its members to another family, and it is this structural relationship between families which distinguishes human society from primate groups and is the constitution of society and culture. Historically it is always men who exchange women and this necessity lies in the universality of the basic law prohibiting incest.
Mitchell says of the Oedipus complex that "it reflects the original exogamous incest taboo, the role of the father, the exchange of women and the consequent difference between the sexes" (p. 377). The Oedipus myth is a patriarchal myth, because it is a man's world into which a woman enters, "It is against the symbolic mark of the dead father that boys and girls find their cultural place within the instance of the Oedipus complex" (p. 403). The place of women in patriarchal culture is the sphere of reproduction, "her task is to see that mankind reproduces itself" (p. 405), whilst the male is the heir to the law of culture. Mitchell states this in a generalised form, "men enter into the class-dominated structures of history whilst women (as women, whatever their actual work in production) remain defined by the kinship patterns of organisation" (p. 406). Having seemingly argued herself into a corner where the very construction of the social, embedded in the subconscious of all individuals in the human race is based on the rule of the father, patriarchy, Mitchell now looks to the notion of ideology as a route for change and escape from this cultural and historical necessity. "Patriarchy describes the universal culture - however, each specific economic mode of production must express this in different ideological forms" (p. 409). In capitalism a fundamental contradiction exists, the complexity of capitalist society makes archaic and redundant the kinship structures and incest taboos and yet it preserves them, focussing them on the "supposedly natural nuclear family". The tensions inherent in this situation are themselves focussed on women and their role as reproducers within the nuclear family. Using the notion of the relative autonomy of the economic and ideological instants in society, Mitchell argues that a cultural revolution operating at the level of the ideological is necessary to overcome patriarchy.9

Whilst Mitchell provides a fascinating and provocative account of the nature and resilience of patriarchy, there are some problems associated with her position. The fundamental problem is that of dualism, stemming from the contradiction inherent in having, as Mitchell does, a universalist conception of the construction of the gendered subject derived from Freud and Levi-Strauss, seen as saturated in patriarchy and the law of the father, and a historical materialist conception of modes of production (Beechey, 1979: 73). Although Mitchell argues for the relative autonomy of the ideological instant from the economic, her own position demands the total autonomy, and a focus on the ideological realisation of patriarchy as a means of change, thereby ignoring
the material aspects of women's subordination (Beechey, 1979: 74; Barrett, 1980: 54, 60; Burniston et al 1978: 123; McDonough and Harrison, 1978: 24).

In outlining some of the ways in which the concept of patriarchy has been used to explain the subordination of women, we have also indicated some of the major criticisms which have been made of these usages and definitions. The most important criticisms relate to a tendency to develop an ahistorical and universalistic concept of patriarchy, limiting its use by an extension of the power and meaning attached to the concept; the problem of dualism which has bedevilled a range of different approaches to class and patriarchy; and imprecision in the definition and use of the term.

3.3 Patriarchy as a monolithic concept

Posing the problem at a more general level, Rowbotham (1979: 970) and Adlam (1979: 96, 98) attack the desire to develop a monolithic theoretical construct which will explain women's subordination in its entirety. For Rowbotham this inadequate general concept which will place a parsimonious and logically constructed theoretical grid over buzzing, blooming reality is patriarchy. She argues for specific historical and temporal analyses of the processes of gender relations which she suggests are not always relations of subordination. Adlam's rejection of monolithic theorisation as an attempt to "render intelligible according to a limited number of basic causes the teeming heterogeneity of the immediate" (1979: 98) is concerned with the notion of capitalist patriarchy. She sees theories of patriarchy and marxist analysis as radically incompatible and incommensurate, being located in two separate theoretical discourses, and having at their root two different 'material bases' and different conceptions of determination. 10

Critics of the concept of patriarchy have not all been as trenchantly dismissive as Adlam ("Socialist feminism can do without a theory of capitalist patriarchy" (Adlam, 1979: 101)), but have suggested various ways of retrieving or retaining the concept by limiting and clarifying its definition. Barrett (1980: 250) favours retaining the concept for use in contexts where male domination is expressed through the power of the father over women and other men, and in general the anthropological school of feminist research and
analysis appears to favour this limitation (see for example Edholm et al, 1977). Beechey (1979: 80) speaks for many when she suggests that a satisfactory theory of patriarchy should be historically specific, and should concern itself with the manifestations of forms of patriarchy as they emerge in the practice of particular social institutions. In contrast to these proposed reconstructions of the concept of patriarchy, which frequently have an implicit message about a general analysis of social reality into which these more specific incursions can be made - marxism or class analysis - Alexander and Taylor (1980: 161) defend its use as we have outlined above in theories developed by radical and revolutionary feminists. They argue for a general theory of patriarchy which may indeed have to be kept separate from a marxist analysis, in order that the particular nature of women's oppression can be theorised.

Three other authors demonstrate the usefulness of the concept of patriarchy when specifically defined to analyse a particular context or event. Lown (1983: 29) in fact favours a general concept of patriarchy, as "unequal power relations of gender and age forming a central axis of historical and social change". She sees patriarchal relations as a pivotal organising principle of society, not just as a facet of one particular society - "power relationships between men and women cut across every aspect of social existence, and being located historically, are subject to change" (pp. 29, 30). In the actual application of the concept to a particular study of the setting up of the Halstead silk mill by Samuel Courtauld in 1825, she demonstrates the usefulness of the concept for analysing the social and economic transformations of productive and reproductive arrangements of emergent capitalist societies. Lown wants to characterise patriarchal power in terms of organising and rationalising social relations based on male superiority and female inferiority, which take both an economic and a familial form (p. 33) and which pervade the major institutions and belief systems of the society. She uses her case study to demonstrate that patriarchal interests were at the centre of the struggles reshaping the class and gender hierarchies which occurred around the setting up and running of the Halstead silk mill. She concludes that "with paternalism acting as a major vehicle for such reconfigurations, adult men, whether as capitalists or workers, emerged from mechanisation and factory organisation with authority and control in varying degrees and types over female kin and non-kin and young males" (p. 43). The
factory became the embodiment of family ideals entailing the subordination and control of women, and for men the maintenance of their status and power as patriarchs was crucial to the effort to secure a livelihood. What happened in the Courtauld's case, Lown argues, was that there was negotiation of a gender and occupational hierarchy which marginalised women's economic status, and placed them ideologically in the realm of the domestic.

Middleton (1983) similarly undertakes a specific historical study of the period of primitive capital accumulation and the emergence of a class of capitalist entrepreneurs in England. The definition of patriarchy used here is exploitation by male family heads of women's labour within the household. Middleton concludes from a review of the historical evidence that women were unable to resist the strategies of closure which were used against their independent economic activity by the capitalist employers as a result of the rising male bourgeoisie's success in concentrating capital in its own hands, and that this patriarchal victory was only possible because of the initial appropriation of household labour during the period of primitive capital accumulation.

In an analysis of women's experience of unemployment in the British labour market in comparison with other EEC countries, Walby (1983) uses a definition of patriarchy as gender inequality which is systematic and analytically autonomous from other structures such as capitalism. Walby argues that the patterns in women's unemployment are not reducible to capital or the family, but that labour market structures are themselves patriarchal and influence these patterns. Using comparative data from the EEC countries, Walby suggests that it is because women have very poor employment conditions, and are attractive as a result to employers in the UK, that, although their unemployment rate is high compared with that of men, it is less so than in the other EEC countries. The major patriarchal structure that Walby points to which influences the position of women is the division between part time and full time work. Other patriarchal labour market structures delineated are sex segregation in occupations, and the existence of systematic practices which result in women being first to be dismissed when redundancies are necessary. These practices include the 'last in first out' rule, dismissal of part timers before full timers, and even dismissing married women first. Trade union practices of excluding women, for example from
apprenticeships, and from skilled work during and after the First World War, are pointed to as specific patriarchal practices which have contributed to the patriarchal structure of the labour market. Walby concludes that the structures and sets of practices which she had discussed in connection with the British labour market can be described as patriarchal, since they are patriarchal in their effects, that is they systematically produce gender inequalities.

Middleton and Walby stress the importance both of avoiding a monolithic conceptualisation of patriarchy and of identifying and defining this concept in ways specific to the historical and institutional context. Lown, whilst arguing for a broader conceptualisation of patriarchy, effectively uses it in a similar specific fashion. We would argue that the usefulness of the concept of patriarchy can be retained in these less ambitious applications in terms of specific historical conjunctures or sets of practices embedded in particular institutional arrangements.

3.4 The concept of patriarchy in this study

What we are suggesting is that the concept of patriarchy as sexual hierarchy the unequal distribution of power between men and women, with men in control, can usefully be seen as a principle which underlies the organisation of social relations, both historically and in different cultures at the present time. There is a considerable amount of empirical data on the sexual division of labour which supports this contention. The specific historical and institutional studies of the power relations between men and women in terms of patriarchy become then a specification of the working of the principle of patriarchy in these particular settings. Similar respecifications of the nature of class relations in a changing and developing capitalism in both Western industrialised countries and the Third World has taken place, within the broad framework of a class analysis based on antagonistic groupings derived from relation to the means of production. Whilst class relations and patriarchal relations as theoretical constructs appear to give some purchase on an understanding of the social world, the specific interrelations between the two must be the focus for particular empirical studies.
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Figure 1.1 suggests the form of relationship which exists at a general level between these principles of social organisation, with the arrows indicating the direction of influence. Class is defined as deriving from the ownership or control of physical and discursive resources, or the exclusion from such ownership or control. Patriarchy refers to the power and control over women exerted by men, which produces gender hierarchy.

The current study looks at the impact of the principle of patriarchy and its supportive ideological messages on adolescents by examining the way in which they conceptualise both women and their own position in the labour market, in education and in the home.

4 Women and class

4.1 Traditional focus on the family as the source of women's class location

The traditional approach in social investigation has been to allocate women to a particular social class on the basis of the occupation of a man, their father or husband. In the functionalist version, the family is the basic unit of analysis and the woman's major role as wife/mother is located firmly in the family and crucially involved in socialisation. The aspects of this female role which were identified were ideological, nurturant, affective, psychological and cultural. The woman's relation to production, if any, was marginal to this basic positioning in the family.

Stratification theorists, as Gurnsey (1982: 425, 426) has pointed out, whilst they are concerned with institutionalised inequalities in access to and control over valued resources by individuals and groups in society, and the relations between groups with differential access to such resources, take two positions on the inequalities which exist between men and women: (1) they are concerned with neither the causes nor the effects of these inequalities; (2) the analysis of some of the effects is relevant, but not the causes. Parkin (1972: 14) has said for example that "inequalities associated with sex differences are not usefully thought of as components of stratification". Giddens, whilst recognising the impact of women's positions on the occupational structure, argues that "Given that women still have to await
their liberation from the family it remains the case in the capitalist societies that female workers are largely peripheral to the class system" (Giddens, 1973: 288).

We could categorise the contributions which have sought to remedy the inadequacies in the above approaches to women and class in the following ways:

(1) Those which have looked more closely at the woman's role in the family, with the particular focus of stressing the importance of domestic labour for an understanding of the functioning of the capitalist system and class relations. Examples here are Harrison (1973), Middleton (1974), Gardiner (1976), Bland et al (1978) and Molyneux (1979).

(2) Those which postulate an entirely separate class system based on gender relations which runs parallel to the system of social classes based on economic activity in the sphere of production. The concept of patriarchy is frequently seen as the principle on which this parallel system is based. Examples here are Firestone (1970), Millet (1970), Scarlet Women Collective (1977) and Delphy (1977, 1981).

(3) Those which stress the importance of women's own work and relation to production in terms of:

(a) their own consciousness or class awareness (Ritter and Hargens, 1973; Porter, 1978);

(b) its function for capital (Beechey, 1977, 1978);

(c) its importance in the structuring of the division of labour, using notions of proletarianisation and feminisation of certain sectors of the occupational hierarchy (West, 1978);

(d) its relation to their husbands work and the existence of cross class families (McRae, 1982; Britten and Heath, 1983).

4.2 Cross class families and proletarianisation

The discussion in this chapter so far has touched on the problems associated with the corrective approaches to the issue of women and class
which we have categorised here. We will briefly consider three further studies which constitute different ways of approaching the phenomenon of change in the occupational structure through the expansion of the tertiary sector, which has produced an expansion of work in the lower non-manual reaches of the occupational hierarchy in office and clerical work. These positions have largely been filled by women, many of whom came from a manual working class family of origin. Payne et al (1983) discuss the social mobility of women, giving empirical support from Scotland for the above statement; Llewellyn (1981) provides a different approach, with a small scale interview study giving information on women's experience of mobility in a bank. The authors we turn to first are not dismissive of stratification or sociological theories of class, but try to show that it is possible to include women in a stratification model. Britten and Heath (1983) identify 'cross-class families', those with a husband engaged in manual work and a wife in non-manual work, as the only substantial complication to be added to the usual class schema; for the rest, most marriages are between men and women on the same side of the manual/non manual division, although women are typically in lower level occupations with less prestige than men when in the same class or occupational category. Britten and Heath look at income level, education and voting patterns for their cross-class families. They find a relationship between educational qualification amongst the manual worker husbands, and 'assortative mating' with 'white-blouse' wives, and they suggest that these families may provide distinctly different learning environments for children. In voting behaviour they found that the higher the level of the wife's white collar occupation, the more likely a manual worker husband was to vote conservative. Britten and Heath conclude that the members of this cross-class category "display characteristics and behaviour which are by no means identical to those of the homogeneous manual families to which they are normally assimilated" (1983: 60).

McRae (1982) examined specific cross-class families where the wives were in higher level professional and semi-professional occupations, and the husbands were blue-collar workers, as a way of testing the idea that white-collar work, especially that performed by women, has been proletarianized. McRae argued (p. 16) that if women in markedly different occupational positions to their blue-collar husbands had little or no impact on the class position of the family or processes of class formation, then it was
unlikely that lower level white-collar wives of manual workers would have any impact. She found, however, that these higher level white-collar wives did have a strong impact on their families causing them to resemble middle class rather than working class families. The incomes of these wives provided greater material comfort and financial security; and in terms of voting patterns and union activity, the conservative tendency noted by Britten and Heath was also found. These studies draw attention to the significance of a wife's occupational position to family practices and behaviour in cases where the family would have been classified as working class on the basis of the father's occupation alone.

West (1978) argues that an adequate formulation of women's class position must be based on their relation to production - their work and position in the occupational structure. Contrary to the above authors, she considers that women in lower level white-collar work are becoming proletarianised. She reviews the contributions of Giddens (1973), Braverman (1974) and Poulantzas (1975) to this issue. West accepts that there has been a process of deskilling of white-collar work, but considers that Braverman's (1974) analysis leads him to an oversimplified conception of a homogeneous, mass working class; she rejects Poulantzas' view that the relatively deskilled and routinised white-collar workers in bureaucracies constitute a new petit bourgeoisie. For her they are largely women, and they are proletarianised.

Whilst providing an interesting critique of Giddens, Poulantzas and Braverman, and drawing attention to women's position in production as crucial to an understanding of their class location, West provides no solution to what she identifies, with so many other writers in this area, as the crucial problem. That is the relationship between the sexual division of labour and the division of labour in production. The issue of consciousness, which should have been critical to her discussion, is marginalised, and her conviction that white-collar women workers are proletarian falters at the end:

"If there is no doubt that women manual workers are part of the working class in their own right by virtue of the labour they perform, there is today much less doubt that most women non-manual workers also are - objectively speaking - part of the proletariat. This said, such women workers may still, as Poulantzas maintains, have to be won for the working class in terms of class struggle..." (p. 250).
The empirical findings of Britten and Heath and McRae which we discussed above appear to conflict with the theoretical position held by West on the proletarianisation of low level white-collar work. In support of West's position, however, Carter and Carter (1981) suggest that in recent years in the USA a split has developed in professional work between prestige jobs with good pay, autonomy, opportunities for growth and development, and a "new class of more routinized, poorly paid jobs with little autonomy and which are unconnected by ladders of promotion to prestige jobs in the profession" (p. 478). They produce some evidence for this deskilling in the areas of college and university teaching, medicine and the law, showing that the upper tiers in these professions remain male, and the growing lower, routinised tiers are female.

We could approach the issue from a different direction, and ask what is the class identification of women from working class families of origin who hold the low level non-manual jobs which we are discussing. In the current study the adolescents were asked what their work aspiration was, and what it would be if they were a member of the opposite sex. Of the 224 working class girls in the study, 66% expressed aspirations which could be described as female stereotyped white-collar work. When asked for their aspiration as a member of the opposite sex, 48% of these girls gave typical male manual work. Twenty-two percent of the girls gave typical male non-manual work. Could we infer from these figures that almost half of the working class girls in our sample actually identified with the working class, whilst 22% seemed to indicate a desire for upward mobility reflected in their projected aspirations as a member of the opposite sex? A study comparing the class identifications and their impact on family processes of women in lower level white-collar work would be a useful complement to McRae's study of higher level white-collar wives. It seems that not only occupation but social level of family of origin might affect these women's consciousness. In terms of the model of the social division of labour used in this study, the field location of the occupation might also have an effect on the class consciousness and identification of the worker.

It is clear that the class location of women is an unresolved issue. With the exception of those who postulate a separate class system based on gender
and governed by the principle of patriarchy, most of the work which deals with this issue focusses on the importance of theorising the interrelation between class and gender hierarchy. The current study may throw some light on this issue, since it is concerned with precisely this area. We argue at the most general level that it is the interaction of the principles of class and patriarchy which maintain women in a subordinated position both inside the home and outside in the sphere of production. The content of the interaction in any specific historical context is a matter for empirical investigation, and we have discussed some examples of studies which concern themselves with these specificities above (for example Lown, 1983; Middleton, 1983; Walby, 1983). In the next section we will look briefly at the ways in which other agencies, institutions and practices in society operate to reinforce and reproduce hierarchical gender divisions.

5 Institutional sites of the reproduction of gender relations

The position taken in the current study is that the institutions and practices of the family, education, production and the state, and the operation of ideology in current British society, and in Western cultures generally, reproduce and reinforce a hierarchical ordering based on gender with men in the dominant position. Much of the work which has focussed on women in the past decade has provided support for this contention. This is not to argue, however, for a monolithic construction or overdetermination of women's subordinate position, for there are contradictions and conflicts in all of these areas which leave spaces for the emergence of both alternative patterns of interrelationship between men and women, and counter-hegemonic ideologies.

5.1 Production and the family

A cursory examination of the statistics of labour market participation reveals that the proportion of women in production has been increasing in recent decades but that they work in a labour market which is severely segregated, both horizontally and vertically, by sex. Women are concentrated in a limited number of industries and occupations, and are found low in the
occupational hierarchy in the areas in which they do work (Britten and Heath, 1983). This segregation is supported by a range of ideological messages, the most fundamental of which is that of the sexual division of labour: work and production are seen as the sphere of men; home, childcare and domestic labour as the sphere of women. Within production, certain types of work are identified as suitable for women, and others for men, again severely limiting the range of occupations open to women, both in terms of their own aspirations and expectations and the willingness of employers to employ them (Hunt, 1975). Other materialist explanations of these divisions between home and production, and within production have been suggested. Beechey (1977), for example, sees certain categories of women as a reserve army of labour, functional for capital in both flexibility in being drawn into or excluded from the labour market, and in this way depressing the overall value of labour power and enabling men to be paid at a lower rate. Whilst there are problems with this approach (see Anthias, 1980: 55; Milkman, 1976: 78, 79, 92), Bruegel (1979) has found some support for the argument in the experience of part time women workers in manufacturing industry in the UK. Delphy (1977), as we have seen above, argues that the economic subordination of women within the family is functional for men.

The domestic labour debate was an attempt to make the link between the sexual division of labour in reproduction and production which led to an extensive effort to apply marxist categories and concepts to an analysis of women's work in the home and family. Much of the debate was concerned with (a) the appropriateness of adopting marxist categories of political economy, developed to deal with production in a capitalist society, for use in an analysis of domestic labour, which is performed outside the relations of production, and (b) the adequacy of the definitions of the particular concepts used. Despite the economistic tendencies within the debate, the focus on the work which women do in the home as work, and on the question of the interrelation between domestic labour and the labour market drew attention to the fundamental contradictions in women's position, and to the importance of an analysis of that position which takes account not only of its material basis in exploitation at work and in the home, but also the ideological processes which help to create and maintain that position.
Certain policies and practices of the welfare state have tended to reinforce the position of women as the economic dependant of a man in a domestic unit (whether married to him or not). Land and Parker (1978) provide evidence of a range of prescriptions in state family policies which support a specific dependant/breadwinner form of marriage, whether or not there are dependant children. They argue that

"At the same time as preserving an unequal marriage relationship social policies which impinge on the family have not been allowed to interfere with work incentives for men. Indeed, we would argue that by assuming an unequal economic relationship between men and women, the man's duty to participate in the labour market is reinforced and, although the wife may take paid employment too, her first duty is in caring for her husband, children and sick or elderly relatives." 21

The cohabitation rule, which applies to the unmarried, makes explicit the fact that a woman living with a man is expected by the state to be economically dependant on him. 22 Brophy and Smart (1981) argue convincingly that the changes in family law have increasingly been based on the concept of the rights of children, or parents' obligations towards them, and serve to stabilise and support a particular family form, reproducing dependancy and inequality between husband and wife. They consider that, whilst becoming more 'liberal' in its regulation of divorce and other family matters, the state has increasingly adopted considerable powers of surveillance over the family. 23

In an examination of the history of family law since the nineteenth century and of contemporary developments, Brophy and Smart drew out aspects of the complex and contradictory relationship between the law, women and the family. They point to the state's growing concern over children and their needs for maternal care as a factor in the changes made in terms of women's rights over custody of their children, and argue that this maternal role began to eclipse the rights of fathers. Family law and welfare law have moved closer together, with the former adopting interventionist strategies more common to the latter, for example the courts have increasing powers to investigate incomes, deduct money at source, and investigate families through welfare agencies. 24 The major aim of these changes is to attach the responsibility for the maintenance of wives and children ever more securely to individual men, to reduce the costs of the family unit to the
state, and to contain dependency within individual, economically viable family units.

5.2 Education

From its inception, mass compulsory education incorporated the ideology of the sexual division of labour, and this has governed educational provision for girls. There have been changes in the explicitness with which the requirements of sexual differentiation have been met in the educational system with changing historical circumstances, and when conflicting ideologies of equality of educational opportunity emerged. Wolpe (1976) charts the progress of this ideology of sexual division through three official government reports: the Norwood Report (1943), the Crowther Report (1959), and the Newsom Report (1963). The authors of the latter report suggested that girls who were unenthusiastic about housework "may need all the more the education a good school course can give in the wider aspects of homemaking and in the skills that will reduce the element of domestic drudgery" (reported in Sharpe, 1976: 20). Sharpe points out that the question of domestic training for girls, especially working class girls, has been considered at every stage in the development of state education.

Most critical social research on education in the 1960s focussed on social class, pointing up the inefficiency of the educational system in tapping the pool of talent latent in the working class by indicating the close relationship between social class background and level of education attained, where the working class were clearly disadvantaged. These critics were also concerned with factual inequality of opportunity for different class groups to reach particular levels of education in a period when the ostensible aim, the rhetoric and the ideology relating to education were couched in terms of equality of opportunity and meritocratic achievement and reward. A recent study (Halsey et al, 1980), based unfortunately on an all male sample of 10,000, has suggested that the educational expansion of the past three decades has not benefitted members of the working class but those of the middle class. They point out that these groups may have reached saturation level in take up of educational opportunities and that in any future expansion more benefit might accrue to the working class.
As children and young adults progress through the educational system, within social class groups girls fall behind boys in taking up higher levels of education. King (1971: 171), discussing the different educational experiences of four types of pupils (middle class boys, middle class girls, working class boys and working class girls) observes that

"At each level of education the sex-gap is bigger for the working than the middle class, and the class-gap is bigger for girls than for boys. As the level of education rises the sex-gap widens for both classes, but widens more for the working class. The class-gap also widens for both sexes but more for girls than for boys."

The differences in the educational experience of different class groups were seen as an indication of failure to provide the equality of opportunity which educational reforms were meant to achieve. Another strand of criticism of education, however, was based on the notion that the schools and the educational system were rather successful in their major function. The function identified was reproduction, and in particular the reproduction of the class relations of capitalism. Althusser pointed to the need for capitalism to reproduce labour power and the relations of production of that system in order to maintain itself as the dominant mode. The part which education plays, in concert with other 'ideological state apparatuses', is in providing the labour force with the necessary technical know how to perform the various categories of work required by the division of labour, and crucially in the 'reproduction of submission to the rules of the established order'. Bowles and Gintis (1976) argue that this work of reproduction by the educational system is achieved through a correspondence between the organisation and practices of the school and the organisation and practices of the sphere of production. The school, through its practices, generates different types of personalities and capacities in those who pass through it, suiting them for particular locations in the social division of labour. Bourdieu and Bernstein point specifically to the relationship between the family and the school in the reproduction of power relations, and of the cultural hegemony of dominant class groups. Once again there is a correspondence, but this time between the family processes and practices of the dominant class groups and the practices of the school, which reproduce the cultural capital of that class, excluding other classes,28 and enabling the dominant class to take up dominant positions in the relations of production, and in symbolic markets. Bourdieu and
Boltanski (1978: 197, 198) discuss the ways in which the dominant class fraction of the bourgeoisie which formerly relied on the direct transfer of physical capital for their class reproduction, have come to use the educational system and the production and transfer of cultural capital as the major means of class reproduction. They make the interesting point that this is statistical reproduction, in the sense that it benefits the class (or class fractions) as a whole but may not work as efficiently at the level of the individual family within the class, in that members may not be successful in obtaining the necessary certification or other forms of cultural capital, in order to take a place in the class.

For Bernstein the pedagogic practice of the primary school, whether traditional or liberal, is based on the pedagogic practice of the middle class mother, there is a correspondence and continuity between the experience which the middle class child has in the home, and in the school, whereas the working class child experiences no such continuity, and is consequently disadvantaged. This disadvantage is cumulative and the process is supported by an individualistic, meritocratic ideology which locates blame for failure in individual incapacity. In this way the class groups and the relations of production are reproduced.

Whilst the above theorists are primarily concerned with the function of education in reproducing class relations, recent work has begun to focus on the reproduction of gender relations, and has thrown a new light on the processes and practices of education. We have noted that the official position on the education of girls has been that their place and work in the home should be emphasised in the curricular provisions, particularly for working class girls, thus reproducing the form of the sexual division of labour. Wolpe (1977) argues that schools both produce and reproduce ideology in general and ideology related to women's position and the sexual division of labour in particular, and that this is accomplished through the school organisation, through teachers as agents and through the curriculum. Delamont (1980: 3), from a different perspective and employing a different vocabulary, reviews studies on practice in secondary schools, supplemented by her own investigations, and argues that schools "develop and reinforce sex segregation, stereotypes and even discriminations which exaggerate the negative aspects of sex roles in the outside world when they could be trying to alleviate them".
Here she is arguing that the processes of gender differentiation and stereotyping, even in single sex schools, are more extreme than those prevalent in the world outside the school. This is in line with an argument put forward by MacDonald (1981) suggesting, in contradistinction to the cultural reproduction theorists discussed briefly above, that the school's major contribution to reproduction is in the reinforcement of gender identity, and that the school operates primarily to reproduce gender differentiation.

David (1980) draws attention to the role of the state in the processes of reproduction in the educational system, arguing that the state uses the family-education couple in order to sustain and reproduce the status quo, and specifically to maintain the existing relations within the family, and the social relations within the economy - the sexual and social division of labour. David charts the role of the state in regulating family activities with regard to children and their schooling, including parental rights and obligations, through a study of the laws passed by successive governments and their official reports and explanatory documents. For David, this state regulation extends to the ways in which children within school learn about parenting, not only explicitly in the curriculum but also through the "implicit processes of schooling and the ways in which education is organised" (1980: 4).

As with the welfare and family law provisions of the state which we have considered, there are contradictions and conflicting principles operating in state policies with respect to education at any time. Wolpe draws attention to the conflicting ideologies which operate within the educational sphere, whilst arguing that there is relative autonomy of the educational system. She suggests that there is a contradiction between the ideology of achievement and of the sexual division of labour - "Social ambivalence is derived from calling on the girl, particularly the middle class girl, to achieve and do well at school, while at the same time she is subjected to those pressures where 'all arrows direct the girl to marriage'" (p. 304). Sharpe (1976: 22) points to the contradictions felt again particularly by middle class girls who have absorbed the high aspirations of their class and the ideology of equality, when they find that, despite higher levels of education and raised expectations, the actual position of women in the labour market and their opportunities are by no means equal with those of men. One of the girls in the current investigation, answering a question calling for her work aspiration as a
member of the opposite sex and giving (as 53% of the middle class girls do) the same aspiration that she gave for herself as a woman, and not a stereotyped woman's job, has yet to recognise this contradiction: "Whatever career I decide to pursue I am sure my sex will not affect it in any way."

A considerable number of studies on girls and education have substantiated the claim that girls and boys receive a different education in the same educational system and that the sexual division of labour is reinforced in that system. (See for example Byrne, 1978; Deem, 1978, 1980; Delamont, 1980, 1983a; David, 1980; Spender and Sarah, 1980; Sutherland, 1981; Reid and Wormald, 1982.) Following Wolpe (1977) we suggest that the ideology and actuality of the sexual division of labour is conveyed in schools through the organisation of the schools and the educational system, through teachers as agents and through the curriculum. We have provided some evidence from the work of others to support this contention (see also Holland, 1981).

6 Ideology and the reproduction of gender and class divisions

In Chapter 3 we detail the aspects of the development of the concept of ideology which have been relevant and contributory to the notion of ideology used in this study, and the way in which it is used here. Briefly, we regard individuals as being ideologically positioned, or positioned in ideology, through their experience of the social relations and practices of the institutions of the society in which they are located. Ideological positioning refers outwards to a set of representations of social relations and forms and principles of social organisation which is held by an individual, and to the relationship between the individual and other agents in these complexes of social relations. It also refers inwards to concepts of self.

A multiplicity of ideologies operates in society, within the context of an overall dominant ideology which legitimises inequalities based on gender and class. Ideology is both false and true - false in the sense that the purpose of the dominant ideology and its specific subvariants is to legitimise or disguise power relations, often converting arbitrary or power based distinctions or differences into 'natural' or 'innate' ones - for example in
aspects of the ideology of the sexual division of labour. True in the sense that it becomes incorporated into the individual's self identity, generated by their lived experience of practices and institutions into which these ideological distinctions are incorporated - for example the individual's experience of their own gender identity. The dominant ideologies of class and patriarchy are not monolithically successful; consent must be won for them and counter ideologies can grow in the gaps and contradictions which they express. Some of the more explicit contradictions between ideologies and between ideology and experience were touched on above - for example the conflict for middle class girls between the ideology of achievement (in the educational context) and the reality of opportunities for women in the sphere of production. Specific ideologies can be not merely reinforced or reproduced through the various institutions which the individual experiences or in which s/he has a place, including cultural texts and all aspects of the media, but constructed, reconstructed and negotiated. Many agents of symbolic control work in the area of reproducing, reinforcing, negotiating and constructing ideologies. The model below attempts to give a very general schema for the operation of ideology.

The dominant ideology is not a single, monolithic entity, but an assembly of ideological messages, realisations of particular general ideologies (in the sense of world views or conceptualisations of particular aspects of social life - for example the construction or meaning of masculinity or femininity) which are embedded in the practices and processes of a range of institutions in society, through which, and through differing mechanisms, they reach individual consciousness. The model indicates some of the more general ideological messages which support and legitimise inequalities based on the principles of patriarchy (gender hierarchy) and class. Even at this general level, conflict and contradiction can be seen between these ideologies: in the case of gender/patriarchal ideology, the division between men in production and women in the domestic sphere contradicts the actuality of women in production. This is dealt with by the separation between women’s work and men's work in production, and the ideological reinforcement of this division.

One attempt at ideological reinforcement of the division between production (for men) and the domestic sphere (for women) is the argument, common in social science literature, that the work that women do in
Figure 1.2: HEGEMONIC PROCESSES
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1. PATRIARCHAL IDEOLOGIES
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     - Counter-cultural images and texts
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   - Individualism
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   - Equality of opportunity
production is an extension of what they do in the private sphere. To some extent this could be said to be true - women manual workers are largely in cleaning and catering for which their domestic labour no doubt prepares them. Production line assembly work and packaging, another area of women's work, requires a different stereotype, however, to justify the prevalence of women; dexterous little fingers. These skilled appendages fit women for boring, repetitive assembling work, but not for example to be surgeons, where their nimble fingers and sewing skills might have been thought to be relevant, and their eye for the boring detail might have enabled them to reassemble the patient neatly, minus any extraneous objects.  

When we move to non-manual work, the clerical and secretarial work which women largely do can only be seen as similar to their work in the home in the very general sense that it to a great extent involves servicing men, as a result of women's low level positions in these areas of work.

In the case of class ideologies noted above there is contradiction between the ideologies of inherited capacities, and meritocratic achievement, which is dealt with in ideological terms by the notions of inherited intelligence and of equal opportunity. There are also contradictory images, stereotypes and representations within the ideologies - for example within that of femininity. Perkins (1979: 150) has pointed to problems for the socialisation of dominated groups, who must incorporate and assimilate dominant cultural values which define some attributes as more valuable than others. These are, however, attributes to which the dominated groups cannot, indeed should not, aspire.

The major institutions of the society are the location for the realisation, construction, reconstruction, dissemination, and negotiation of features of ideological messages, images, representations and stereotypes. Through the individual's participation in the practices of these institutions, these ideological messages become part of their lived experience and 'commonsense knowledge' in Gramsci's (1971: 419-425) terms. They also become incorporated in the individual's sense of self. Within these institutions a wide variety of ideologies coexist, and they relate to the major dominant ideological principles with differing degrees of cohesion or agreement. The institutional sites for hegemonic control are also sites of
conflict and for the negotiation of ideological representations. Gramsci indicated in his historical studies of certain European countries that hegemonic control was not the rule, that disequilibrium between the ideas of the dominant groups and their acceptance by the masses was more characteristic of the history of these societies, but with the development of the modern industrial state, the means for gaining hegemonic control became more powerful and pervasive. Gramsci cites Germany and Italy in certain periods as examples exhibiting relatively fragile hegemony (Gramsci, 1971: 188, 44 ff), and the USA as the best example of a society in which the ruling classes had historically established almost complete ideological hegemony (Gramsci, 1971: 285). In the context of this study we attempt to find differences and similarities in ideological positioning which emerge in relation to the family or home experience of individuals whose parents are located in particular positions in the division of labour in the workplace, those in the fields we define as production and of symbolic control.

Through the operation of ideology in the institutional sites, the dominant groups in society (from the perspective of this study dominant class and gender groups) are able to create and/or maintain hegemony, the crucial characteristic of which is the consent, or acceptance, engendered in the dominated groups. Gramsci uses the term counter-hegemony to describe a situation where a party or class group is in a position to develop an alternative world view or system of values, with the associated practices and social relations, which can form the starting point for the overthrow of the dominant group.37 This is an extensive and extended process - for Gramsci the ideological erosion of the existing order must take place at all levels; economic, political, cultural, social, and precede any direct frontal assault on the state. It is a multidimensional process involving for him the continuous and organic but not necessarily unilinear and progressive development of the dominated or oppressed class, in response to specific influences and events. We have used the term counter-hegemonic sites to indicate potential sources for the development of alternative world views, value systems, and ideological messages. The range of ideologies produced in these sites, and experienced in the practices and processes of the organisations or groups which engender them, can vary in coherence and in degree of opposition to dominant ideological messages. They may be in conflict with the positions and ideologies of other dissident or potentially disaffected groups. It is clear from
the description of the processes of negotiation and construction of hegemony in the hegemonic sites that these counter-hegemonic ideologies and practices are also realised within the major institutions of the society. 38

Counter-hegemonic elements may take the form of a rejection of the dominant ideological representations, rather than a developed alternative system; 39 they may take the form of a rejection of the dominant ideology and hegemony which fails, ultimately achieving the aims of the hegemonic dominant order. An example here would be Willis' (1977) 'lads' who in rejecting the values of the school and the educational system, in fact socialise themselves into their position in the manual labour market, selling their labour power. McRobbie's (1978) working class girls, who she sees as taking on femininity (the role of wife, marriage, romance) as an expression of opposition to school and male culture, a form of resistance to the unrewarding demands of the school and the sexist attitudes of working class boys, are a further example. As with Willis' 'lads', this form of resistance is a real contribution to the reproduction of the working class wife's dependence on her husband. Anyon (1983) takes Genovese's (1972) model of the reaction of slaves in the USA to their enslavement, which he sees as a process of accommodation and resistance, and applies it to the socialisation experience of women. She argues forcefully for the resistance side of the equation as a real historical and current fact of women's experience, but concludes

"... the ideology of femininity reinforces a paternalistic dependency on men. The accommodation and resistance to that, by individual females, is often a defensive action (no matter how creative) that is aimed not at transforming patriarchal or other social structures, but at gaining a measure of protection within these." (p. 34)

At a more general level, Bourdieu (1977a) suggests that within any field there are both orthodox and heterodox positions, ideas or theories. We could argue in terms of the division within the middle class which we investigate in this study, for example, that those in the field of production would be more likely to espouse orthodox positions from within the hegemonic field, and those in the field of symbolic control, heterodox positions. (Aggleton and Whitty's (1984) youthful agents of symbolic control would seem to exemplify heterodox positions within the hegemonic field.) Some potentially counter-hegemonic positions could perhaps in this way be incorporated into
the ruling hegemonic heterodoxy. One can imagine elements of the feminist position and ideology being selectively recontextualised into the hegemonic heterodoxy, associated with extant elements involving 'equal opportunities'. So potentially counter-hegemonic positions can be incorporated through processes emanating from both sides, the ruling hegemony and resisting individuals.

In the light of these considerations we can see that feminism may or may not prove to be able to provide a real counter-hegemonic locus. What we have seen in the material in this chapter defines the difficulty of this task.

From the evidence discussed in this chapter we could argue that, in addition to the material aspects of women's subordination and indeed contributing to and reinforcing that situation, there is what amounts to an 'ideological bombardment' (MacDonald, 1981: 171) with respect to the sexual division of labour, which, with all its contradictory and conflicting elements, operates in all of the institutions of the society. It is hardly surprising that we find therefore largely hegemonic acceptance of gender differentiation and divisions (as we do of class divisions) in the responses of most of the adolescents in our study. What is surprising are the elements of counter-hegemonic representations which emerge, particularly in the case of middle class girls in the field of symbolic control, and in some instances, working class girls.

We have reviewed a number of theoretical approaches to the explanation for women's subordination, and described very briefly what that subordinate position consists of in contemporary British society, in relation to certain basic institutions. This has provided an elaboration of the concepts employed and a setting within which the current study of adolescents' conceptions of aspects of the social and sexual division of labour can be contextualised.

Our exploration of the theories which have been developed to explain, or at times to describe, women's position in the sexual and social division of labour has led us to our conceptualisation of patriarchy, and its usefulness as a concept for the analysis of women's position. It has also led to the notion of ideological positioning in the context of hegemonic control as an important
element in the reproduction, or otherwise, of women's subordinate position in society. The next chapter, which discusses the theoretical derivation of the model of class which we used in the study, looks in more detail at the notion of ideological positioning.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1 The journal m/f (London) is a forum for feminist work arguing for the compatibility of psychoanalysis and materialism, and contains general theoretical discussions of capitalism and patriarchal psychic structures, studies on the application of psychoanalysis to cultural analysis, and reworking of Freud's cases. Mitchell's work is discussed in more detail below in connection with the concept of patriarchy.

2 Bourdieu (1977a: 89) makes a distinction between (a) the division of sexual labour (women bear children) and (b) the sexual division of labour, men and women are responsible for a different set of tasks, economic and domestic. See Gamarnikow (1983a) for a selection of papers which question in different ways the public/private division, suggesting that this is itself an ideological construct which contributes to women's subordination. Many of the theorists we discuss in this section take the position that the public saturates the private (for example Donzelot (1979) writing on the family, David (1980) on education, and Wilson (1977) on the welfare state.

3 Oakley's definition of the distinction is "'Sex' is a word that refers to the biological differences between male and female: the visible difference in genitalia, the related difference in procreative function. 'Gender' however is a matter of culture: it refers to the social classification into 'masculine' and 'feminine'."

4 Mathieu (1979) argues radically for the social nature of maternity. She considers, using examples from anthropological studies, that the biological level of explanation is applied only to women, women are seen as mediators between the natural and the social by virtue of physical reproduction - and the social or cultural level of explanation is applied to men. See also Edholm (1982: 168, 169) for some examples of the social definition of the biological.

5 Ehrenreich in a seminar at the Institute of Education London (26/10/79) argued that women in the USA were in danger of becoming the new poor, women were forming an underclass through divorce, separation, and low pay. (See Ehrenreich, 1983: 172.) Delphy (see below) takes a similar position to Millett on the class location of women.

6 Herskovits (1965), especially Chapter 7, and Caplow (1964) provide discussions of both the universality and variety of the division of labour by sex. It would be interesting to look at which occupations become considered appropriate for women apart from the obvious ones associated with the female nurturant and domestic roles, and what historical and other factors are relevant in the process. Why is it, for example, that a very high proportion of the USSR's field permafrost scientists are women - an occupation presenting the most extreme physical hardship to its practitioners, and not one which spontaneously falls into the image of female stereotyped work (Mandel, 1971)? Benet (1972) suggests that women were trained as typists when the typewriter appeared because it was considered that as they could play the piano it would naturally follow that they could type. On the issue of the content of the stereotype in our culture, a study by Cecil (1973) found that different variables are used to evaluate male and female job
applicants. The instructions given to the subjects in Cecil's study specified that all applicants were being interviewed for the same job, which was described as 'white collar'. From the differential evaluative variables chosen as important for male and female applicants it was clear that the respondents had projected male and female stereotypes onto this vague description and perceived the male as a potential administrative management employee and the female as a clerical employee.

7 A recent trend in marxist theoretical work has emphasised "the materiality of ideology", following Althusser's (1971) observation that ideology exists in material apparatuses (institutions) and their practices, and reflecting a desire to transcend a narrow economistic conception of determination in the social formation. The position has been criticised as a misreading of Althusser in order to be able to use the "magical qualifier 'materialist'" (Hall, 1978: 116), and even as "reckless hyperbole" (Johnson, 1979: 59). It is not necessary, however, to deny the material effectivity of ideology, and its location in material practices, in wishing to maintain the distinction between ideology and material practices (Barrett, 1980: 89).

8 The labour aristocracy sought the 'family wage' in order to be able to support a wife who did not work outside the home, but who worked for the husband inside it. See Foreman (1977: 119, 120) for a male trade unionist statement on the role of the working class wife, and Barrett and McIntosh (1980) for an exposure of the myth of the family wage. Walby (1983: 153) suggests that simultaneous resistance by organised labour to both deskillling and the entry of women into certain areas of work, is a far from uncommon historical event, indicating that examples can be sought in the work of Andrews (1918), Braybon (1981) and Cockburn (1981). See also Humphries (1977) on the family wage and the working class family.

9 Mitchell, who attempts to retrieve psychoanalytic theory for an analysis of female sexuality, sees the gendered construction of the individual as saturated in patriarchy as we have seen. Adlam (1979: 93) argues that the psychoanalytic concept of sexual difference entails no necessary implication of domination/subordination, particularly the subordination of women to men. This distinction between difference and division is essential to the effort to retain psychoanalytic theory in the analysis of women's position, since if it is not retained "either patriarchy is inevitable or else the unconscious is simply the result of sophisticated forms of cultural conditioning" (Adlam, 1979: 93). This type of argument has a hollow ring given the phallocentrism of psychoanalytic theory in Freud and later rereading of his work such as that by Lacan. It is reminiscent of arguments about the sex-blind nature of marxist categories of economic analysis and the social division of labour. In both instances the question to be asked of the theory (psychoanalysis, or marxism) is whether sexual division has been helplessly incorporated through hidden (and not so hidden) assumptions, rather than to assert that sexual division is logically unnecessary to the theory. Adlam (Red Rag, 1978, p. 8), interestingly enough, takes this argument to the analysis of patriarchal theory, suggesting in a critique of Delphy (1977) that theories of patriarchy have to assume sexual division in order to explain it, and (1979: 98) that "the argument is tautologous - signs of patriarchy can only be read for what they are if it is already known
that that is what they will be." See also Chodorow (1978, Ch. 9) for a discussion of 'difference' in Freud's work, which she sees as equated with relations of superiority and inferiority (see especially p. 145). To return for a moment to the issue of phallocentrism in Freud's work, he himself provides the following interesting comment on this aspect of his world view:

"It seems that women have made few contributions to the discoveries and inventions in the history of civilization; there is, however, one technique which they may have invented - that of plaiting and weaving. If that is so, we should be tempted to guess the unconscious motive for the achievement. Nature herself would seem to have given the model which this achievement imitates by causing the growth at maturity of the pubic hair that conceals the genitals. The step that remained to be taken lay in making the threads adhere to one another, while on the body they stick into the skin and are only matted together. If you reject this idea as fantastic and regard my belief in the influence of lack of a penis on the configuration of femininity as an idée fixe, I am of course defenceless."

(Freud (1964: 596))

This is also the case for Adlam of psychoanalytic conceptualisations of the symbolic, saturated with sexual difference, and a marxist theory of ideology based on illusion/reality or falsity/truth. See her critique of Kuhn's (1978) attempt to combine psychoanalysis, marxism and patriarchy (Adlam, 1979: 91 ff.). "Whereas for psychoanalysis sexual difference is a central object of the whole theoretical discourse, for marxism that object is logically unnecessary" (Adlam, 1979: 91). It seems that Adlam wants to keep the monolithic theories of social explanation toward which she leans in different theoretical discourses, a solution adopted by writers in the journal m/f. These authors have developed through this journal a form of discourse theory and argue that the social construction of women must be analysed in relation to the discourses within which it is constituted, with the implication that no theoretical discourse has primacy over another. As Barrett (1980: 88) points out, "this is certainly a stylish way of dealing with the problem ... (but) ... to the critic of discursive imperialism it may seem a nominal rather than a conceptual gain".

This is a usage which accords with our own.

See the Introduction to Holland (1983b) for a review of a large number of studies on women in all major areas of the world from which the dominant overall picture is one of women's subordination to men in all areas of social, political and economic activity, recognised within the context of each particular culture. We recognise the dangers in applying a model or theory developed in one context intertemperately to another (Bujra (1978: 18, 19), Dube (1980: 30) and Coward (1983: 276) make this point in differing ways from differing perspectives) but specification in the particular context can draw attention to differences in that context compared with another.

I hesitate to add the rather unconsidered comment of MacRae (1972: 209): "Let me, in a higgledy piggledy way, list some obvious points."
Women are ambiguous: they may do more than men to sustain the ideology of class, and yet it is clear that they are, even when 'gainfully employed', less central to social classes than are men." Lenski (1966) suggests that there is a 'class system' based on sex, but offers no analysis of this system in his multidimensional stratification model. Acker (1973) argues that sex could be included in stratification models in two ways, as a dimension which cuts across class lines producing two interrelated hierarchies of positions and persons, and as a basis for evaluation for placing individuals in particular hierarchies. She discusses the position of a non employed wife and the basis on which she could be hierarchically placed - a combination of the ranking of housewife, conferred status, and premarriage deference entitlements belonging to the woman herself. In this connection see Nilson (1976, 1978) for empirical investigations of the social standing of married women and of housewives. The latter study, based on a survey of 479 adults in Milwaukee, assigns the job 'housewife' an average prestige score of 70, comparable to a newspaper reporter, radio announcer, tenant farmer or insurance agent. One last comment on stratification theory can be left to Middleton (1974: 185): "Such 'theory' is in fact merely a systematic framework into which empirical observations and ad hoc explanations may be slotted".

14 Payne et al (1983: 66) charted the degree of recruitment of women from manual worker families of origin (based on father's class location) into white-collar work for the period 1930-1970, showing the parallel with the general expansion of non-manual work. The proportion of upwardly mobile women - that is the proportion of those entering non-manual occupations who were from a manual background - peaked at 45% in the early 1960s and was at its lowest at 18% in the early 1930s.

15 Some cross-class families had wives in manual and husbands in non-manual work in their sample, but these were few. This paper has led to an extensive discussion of the class location of women and whether or not it is necessary to adjust current class schemas to take account of women's work in allocating a family to a class position. See Goldthorpe (1983: 1984), Stanworth (1984), Heath and Britten (1984), and Erikson (1984). Goldthorpe retains a determined rejection of such a necessity in the face of the rest of these authors' determined espousal of this need. They write from differing perspectives and suggest different modes for the incorporation of women's work into class schemas.

16 A characteristic which differentiated a group of working class children with high educational aspirations from the rest of the working class group in our sample was a mother in non-manual work. See also the report on Well's work in Chapter 6 for material on the impact of the mother's occupational location on interactional practices in the family.

17 McRae used the seven point break down of the Goldthorpe and Hope scale (see Goldthorpe, 1980: 39-42). Wives were in classes I and II of this scale; husbands in classes V, VI, and VII.

18 This statement is also true of Eastern industrialised countries. See Holland (1983b: 97-130) for an annotated bibliography on studies relating to the position of women in Eastern Europe. See for example
Heitlinger (1979) and Atkinson et al (1978) on the Soviet Union, Ferge (1976) on Hungary, Heitlinger (1979) and Scott (1976) on Czechoslovakia. Most of these authors point to the family and women's responsibilities within it as the major institution preventing full realisation of equality between men and women in socialist countries, and reproducing gender hierarchy, but their discussions also cover other institutional supports for this situation.

19 Hegemonic ideologies can be based on class or gender interest, and the concept of male hegemony (Rowbotham, 1973: 38-39) and masculine hegemony (CCCS, 1978: 74, 153) have been used, partly to draw attention to the notion of 'consent' to domination by the subordinate group. For a brief discussion of Gramsci's concept of hegemony see Chapter 2, p. 98.

20 See Pollert (1983: 101) for some examples of uncritical acceptance by working class men of this ideology. Pollert's article is interesting for its discussion of the interaction between the material and ideological processes involved in the sexual division of labour inside and outside the family, in the context of a study of a particular factory. See Porter (1982: 119) for a discussion of working class wives who totally accept their part in the sexual division of labour, seeing their task as the maintenance, servicing, and responsibility for the care of their homes, husbands and children. In Porter's view their acceptance of the ideology of the sexual division of labour causes them to enter the labour market as "migrants from the domestic domain", whether they have husbands or children or not, and this differentiates their experience of work from that of men (p. 118). Hunt (1980) provides more evidence for the salience of this ideology for working class families.

21 We see the extent to which this type of relationship within the family is accepted by our adolescents in the results section, Chapter 7 below.

22 Smart (1976: 16) points out in a discussion of female criminality that women are likely to be involved in social security offences, especially where cohabitation is involved: "In this case their involvement in crime is related mainly to the state's reinforcement of their economically dependent position in society and to their role of provider for children and the home."

23 This theme of state regulation of the family recurs in Donzelot (1979), Lasch (1977), Wilson (1977), and David (1980).

24 The family and marriage are no longer coterminous in family law, and its prescriptions extend to non married parent/children groupings. Brophy and Smart (1981: 32 footnote 44) describe the new concept of 'child of the family' whereby a man can find himself permanently responsible for the maintenance of children of another man by virtue of supporting them during a period of cohabitation or marriage.

25 The Board of Education Annual Report 1904/5 for example stated: "A common curriculum for both boys and girls will not as a rule be approved, though in schools containing both boys and girls some part of the teaching may be common to both. The curriculum for girls will as a rule be expected to include a practical training for home duties which is applicable to the circumstances of their own home."
26 This concurs with Gould's (1981) argument about the salaried middle class benefitting from the provisions of the welfare state at the expense of labour and capital. See Chapter 2.

27 Cut backs in educational provision should have some effect on this prediction, but also on the salaried middle class who may move politically to preserve their privileges in this regard.

28 Some mobility between class groups obviously occurs, but in general the major class blocks are reproduced - see Westergaard and Resler (1975, Part 4).

29 Wolpe quotes the explicit aims of the Green Paper (DES, 1977: 6-7) on education to indicate the contradictions which exist in policies for education (Wolpe, 1978: 318, 319). Here for example it is being suggested that the educational system should at the same time develop individual qualities and abilities in pupils, but also promote an attribute combining the necessity for tolerance with an ideal of competition. In Wolpe's view, even the authors of the Black Papers purvey contradictory positions, one is the instrumental or utilitarian conception of education and the other that of a liberal or general education (p. 319).

30 There are in fact fewer female primary school heads than male (44% of heads are female), despite the fact that 69% of primary school teachers are women (1980 figures). Of secondary school heads 83% are men. At higher levels of education the situation becomes almost absurd: in 1979 the proportion of university lecturers who were women was 13%, of readers and senior lecturers 6%, and of professors 3% (EOC, 1982). Visitors to secondary schools from the external educational hierarchy are largely male - 90% of all senior education office staff, 66% of secondary advisers (with the exception of those for housecraft and languages) are men (Byrne, 1978: 118). Apart from the visibility of male power, men will of course be making the major educational decisions from, as Byrne (1978: 145) points out, a perspective of 'masculine thinking'.

31 The representation of women in cultural texts (including all those used in the educational system) and the media is a powerful instrument for the dissemination of the ideology of the sexual division of labour and of femininity and masculinity which we do not have the space to discuss here.

32 We will note in the results section of this thesis that elements of most of the general ideologies adumbrated here appear in the responses of our adolescents.

33 The specific content of the stereotypes or ideologies of femininity and masculinity can vary and change for particular groups and subgroups at particular times, and in particular social settings, and contain contradictory elements within them. See for example Willis' (1977: 148) discussion of the crossover between mental and manual labour and femininity and masculinity which enables his working class boys to evaluate positively and to embrace male manual work. See Clarricoates (1980) for evidence indicating that the way in which the gender code is transmitted and patriarchal relationships reproduced varies from one
establishment to another, in this instance primary schools. Consider for example the conflicting stereotypes of women as madonna/whore; capable consumer housewife and responsible mother/incapable dependent wife; dumb blonde/cunning minx.

34 One of the eight women consultant general surgeons in the UK (The Guardian 15 June 1982, p. 8) who neatly packed her reproductive activities - four children - into her summer breaks, reports: "There is an appalling prejudice against women in medicine. It's been a difficult and hard road to get where I've got, much more so than if I had been a man.... I applied for a post as Junior Surgical Registrar and was rejected ten times, until I realised I would never get it, I think, quite simply because I was a woman."

35 Perkins (1979: 135-159) provides an illuminating discussion and redefinition of the concept of stereotype, which she sees as symbols, prototypes of shared cultural meanings, and a powerful means of conveying ideological information. She makes the interesting point that not all stereotypes are pejorative, there are laudatory stereotypes, and that there are stereotypes of all structurally central groups - class, race, gender, age. Stereotypes are crucial vehicles for socialisation, and for control over dominated groups, for whom the problem of socialisation is acute since they must learn 'contradictory value orientations' - i.e. they must learn and accept the values and attributions of the dominant group, to which they themselves cannot aspire. This latter is a point similar to that made by Broverman et al (1972) in respect of women. These authors discuss the major male and female stereotypes in American culture, and argue that the traits which are considered appropriate for males and which enter into the male stereotype are closer to those considered appropriate for an adult than those which are intended to define women in the female stereotype. Different standards exist for women and for adults - if women adopt behaviour appropriate for an adult they risk censure for a failure in femininity; if they adopt feminine behaviour they are deficient in the general standards for adult behaviour. Anyon (1983: 35 footnote 6) lists others who have made this point.

36 Sassoon (1983) raised an interesting point in relation to media representation (particularly in advertisements for household products) of women as primarily housewives. A large proportion of the women watching work in the labour market; how is it that they do not reject the image of themselves as housewives? Sassoon suggested that this was because domestic labour is in fact a crucial part of these women's lived experience. (See Chapter 7, footnote 13 below for studies indicating that even when women work they still do most if not all of the domestic labour in the home.) The TV advertisement reinforces the ideology of domesticity and the notion of female responsibility for housework, and is realistic in terms of the women's experience, despite their role in the labour market. It reflects the contradictory nature of ideologies relating to women and of their own lived experience.

37 Parkin (1972: 81, 82) has a very general characterisation of three value systems in modern, industrial society, postulating an accommodating, subordinate value system which does not conflict with the dominant mode, but does not entirely accept it. The three systems he suggests are (1) The dominant value system, the social source of which is the
major institutional order: a moral framework which promotes the endorsement of existing inequality; among the subordinate class this leads to a definition of the reward structure in either deferential or aspirational terms. (2) The subordinate value system, the social source of which is the local working class community: a moral framework which promotes accommodative responses to the facts of inequality and low status. "Put in rather broad terms, it could in fact be suggested that the subordinate value system represents what could be called a 'negotiated version' of the dominant value system. That is to say, dominant values are not so much rejected or opposed as modified by the subordinate class as a result of their social circumstances and restricted opportunities" (p. 92). For Parkin this includes trade union activities, which take place within the framework of the dominant value system. (3) The radical value system, the source of which is the mass political party based on the working class: a moral framework which promotes an oppositional interpretation of class inequalities. Whilst these distinctions are rather stark, for analytic purposes no doubt, the second category captures the uneasy nature of hegemonic control.

38 Aggleton and Whitty (1984) in the context of a study of 20 young (teenage) agents of symbolic control, develop an interesting typology of what they regard as hegemonic and counter hegemonic responses in different sites in the individual's life. They identify these sites as educational, family/home, and subcultural. Aggleton and Whitty are concerned with the counter-hegemonic potential of radical or non-normative behaviour by young agents of symbolic control, but conclude, rather as MacRobbie (1978) and Willis (1977) do for working class girls and boys respectively, that processes of resistance and accommodation in the examples of seeming resistance which they uncover result in hegemonic rather than counter-hegemonic outcomes. In other words, their apparently resisting agents of symbolic control are in fact socialising themselves into the appropriate class location with its associated values and expectations.

39 See the discussion of Abercrombie and Turner (1978), Chapter 3, and footnote 56, Chapter 2, on Mann (1970) and Rodman (1963/4), for further relevant points in this connection.

40 This process might not be without hiccups. In the author's current research in schools, 'equal opportunity' arguments have been used to counter requests for positive discrimination for girls.
CHAPTER 2

THE THEORETICAL DERIVATION OF THE MODEL OF CLASS USED IN THIS STUDY

1 Introduction

In this chapter we will discuss the theoretical derivation of the model of class used in the study to allocate the sample of adolescents to positions in the social formation. The model stands at both the beginning and the end of this thesis. It was an object of the study to develop such a model, based on the work of recent social theorists, and to apply it in order to investigate ideological representations held by adolescents in specific class locations: the representations which we wished to investigate were those related to inequalities inherent in the social division of labour, and particularly those concerned with the positioning of women in this network of social relations and institutions. In the course of developing and applying the model many problems arose, not all of which have or indeed could be dealt with in the context of this work. Some will be touched on in the description and discussion included here.

Since we were working towards an empirical determination of class fractions or subsets we considered it necessary to give a detailed exposition of the concept of class relations and its empirical specification. In the past twenty years there has been a considerable resurgence of interest in the theory of class analysis rather than in its empirical specification. We hope that our analysis will reveal both the derivation of our own formulation and the points of productive difference. Our emphasis is on the middle class rather than the working class in this review, which both reflects the literature and the fact that this is an important feature of the current study.

A number of issues relevant to the discussion of the model used in the study will be raised and discussed in this chapter. These include (1) a discussion of concepts of class which have been used in sociological investigation and their influence on the model used in this study; (2) a consideration of the new middle class; (3) a brief discussion of cultural reproduction and the part played in this by ideology, which leads to a
definition of the sense in which the concept of ideological positioning is used in the study, together with its derivation from recent contributions to the field.

2 The concept of class

Class as a descriptive and analytical category has been a major tool of social investigation at both the theoretical and empirical level. The modern sense of the word social class emerged in the period 1780-1830, when a model of society with three class groups, upper, middle and working class, appeared, although the groups were not necessarily always labelled in this way. Marx, whose considerations of class have been fundamental in shaping the use of this concept in social research, adopted a notion of social class which was widely used by historians and social theorists at the time. The distinctive features which he added were the conception of social classes in terms of a system of production, and the notion of class conflict as the motor for social development and change, leading ultimately to a classless society.

Marx discusses various classes or groups in relation to particular modes of production identified as "epochs in the progress of the economic formation of society". These modes of production are (1) primitive communism, which occurs in the earliest and smallest types of tribal societies, in which there are no classes since there is no surplus production and no private property; (2) ancient society (Greece and Rome, slave societies); (3) medieval feudalism (based on serfdom); and (4) capitalism (based on wage labour). The last three types are based on control of the means of production, in the first two instances primarily land, and in the latter, capital. This relation to the means of production of classes is closely integrated with the division of labour, since without the division of labour there cannot be surplus production and without surplus production there cannot be classes. Relations between the classes in society involve exploitation, and conflict of interest, with a dominant or ruling class and subordinate classes. This gives rise to open class struggle which is the motor of historical development; however, "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before
the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society".5

Most of Marx's attention was directed towards understanding modern capitalist society and the relationship between the two major class configurations, the bourgeoisie, who owned or controlled capital, and the proletariat, who sold their labour power to the bourgeoisie in order to subsist. In the final paragraphs of *Capital* Volume II, written immediately before his death, when Marx began to lay out what later interpreters and commentators have frequently hoped would have been a systematic, definitive statement of his theory of classes,6 Marx also refers to landlords: "... wage labourers, capitalists, and landlords, form the three great classes of modern society resting upon the capitalist mode of production."7

Giddens (1973: 27, 28), admitting that Marx's use of class terminology is careless, argues that some clarification can be accomplished by regarding his work as outlining an abstract, dichotomous model of class domination, which generates problems when applied to specific historical societies, in which there are a plurality of classes - i.e. a concrete model of class relations. In this way a mode of production can be seen as based on a dichotomous class axis, complicated by the existence of other class groupings: (1) transitional classes, forming in society, e.g. the bourgeoisie and proletariat within feudalism; (2) transitional classes based on superseded relations of production, e.g. the feudal classes in nineteenth century societies in Europe; (3) quasi class groupings, such as slaves in the ancient world and independent peasantry in the medieval period; and (4) sectors or subdivisions of classes. This type of work of conceptual clarification, combined with reformulation of aspects of Marx's theory of social classes in ways which enable these concepts to be applied to late twentieth century capitalism, is an important trend in recent sociological discussions of class and class relations.

Just as Marx directed his formulation of class relations against the notions of class held by political economists at the time, particularly in the development of the concept of surplus value, which was designed to reveal the essentially antagonistic nature of class relations, so later social theorists produced their analyses of class relations in opposition to or development from Marx's ideas. Weber's concepts of class, status and power can be seen in
Weber saw class as an objective feature of economic relations based on property relations, and influencing the life chances of men, whether or not they were aware of it. He differentiated status groups based on 'honour' or prestige and life style from class groups:

"With some oversimplification one might say thus that 'classes' are stratified according to their relations to the production and acquisition of goods; whereas 'status groups' are stratified according to the principle of the consumption of goods as represented by special 'styles of life'."  

A further group, party, is concerned with and oriented towards the acquisition of social power, towards influencing communal policies whatever the content. All three groupings, which may be interrelated in different ways in different societies at specific times, are "phenomena of the distribution of power". In contrast to Marx's formulation, for Weber power is not assimilable to the economic organisation of society, and rather than the increasing polarisation between two major classes which Marx foresaw, Weber saw (from a later historical standpoint) increasing complexity in class relations, both within and between class groupings. The growth of a new middle class in the process of expanding bureaucratisation in both state and other large-scale organisations was also envisaged. Whatever were the inadequacies in predictive capacity, or failures in detailed and logical exposition of their conceptualisation of class, the work of the above writers has been extremely influential in the development of conceptions of social class.

The terminology of class and stratification has been used somewhat indiscriminately in the literature and definitions of class abound, but perhaps a distinction can be made between class and stratification models. Dahrendorf (1959: 76) suggests that the concept and category 'class' should be preserved for the analysis of the dynamics of social change and its roots in social structure, whereas 'stratum' should be used as a category for describing hierarchical systems at particular historical moments. A class model, whatever the elaborations, will at base be dealing with economically derived groupings, with differing interests and potentially or actually in conflict. A stratification model will be dealing with the layer cake society, pyramidal in shape, with few or many criteria for describing the content of the layers. The structural functionalist layer cake model has been very influential, although now largely discredited, and an interesting overview of the conflict
this model created in the USA in the '50s and '60s is provided in a book of readings edited by Tumin (1970). The basic debate was as to whether or not the inequalities inherent in the social pyramid were necessary and functional for the smooth running of society, or whether the idea that they were was merely an elaborate rationalisation and defence of privilege by a privileged group, and incidentally a classic case of theorized ideology by a self interested group of ideologists.12 Apart from this structural functionalist stratification model, which does suggest an explanation for the existence of differentiated strata in terms of social cohesion and function, other stratification models widely used in sociological research and for the gathering of official statistics, lay themselves open to the criticism that they provide descriptive categories essentially related to status (Nichols, 1979: 152 ff) rather than an explanation for the existence and reproduction of inequalities in society. In the case of government statistics the status orientation of the descriptive categories is quite explicit, the basic criterion for organising the occupational hierarchy being "the general standing within the community of the occupations concerned" (Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, 1970). Most of the scales of social class in general use in empirical sociological research are prestige rankings.13

A further criticism of sociological models of class is that emphasis on the social division of labour as exemplified by the occupational hierarchy produces a peculiarly truncated model of classes where the 'ruling' or 'dominant' class makes no appearance.14 This is usually a complaint about the invisibility of the bourgeoisie in sociological analysis from a marxist or neo marxist perspective. Some neo marxists locate the bourgeoisie in what is more generally defined as the middle class. Poulantzas (1975: 18, 19), for example, in identifying the bourgeoisie, cites as crucial determinants, in addition to formal legal categories of property ownership, (1) economic ownership, or "real economic control of the means of production, i.e. the power to assign the means of production to given uses and so to dispose of the products obtained"; and (2) possession, or "the capacity to put the means of production into operation" (1975: 19), so concluding that "managers are an integral section of the bourgeois class" (1975: 180).15 Braverman (1974) and Carchedi (1978) argue that the new middle class is a mixture of elements from the major classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat, implying contradictions and non-homogeneity of interests and positions within this class.
Despite the fact that argument continues from all theoretical perspectives about what social class is, or to which social class particular locations in the social structure (and therefore the incumbent agent) should be allocated, and despite frequent complaints within the field about the inadequacies of such an approach, occupation has in fact been used as an indicator of social class position across the range of theoretical positions in the social sciences, and is fundamental to empirical research. From a marxist or neo marxist perspective, occupation is an indicator of the relation to the means of production, or location in the social division of labour, elaborated latterly with considerations of the ideological and political positioning operating on specific economic class locations. Stratification models of society, whilst their authors frequently argue for a multiplicity of intersecting criteria for allocation to strata, can also be seen as deriving from this crucial dimension. As Blau and Duncan (1967: 7) suggest:

"The occupational structure in modern industrial society not only constitutes an important foundation for the main dimensions of social stratification but also serves as the connecting link between different institutions and spheres of social life, and therein lies its great significance. The hierarchy of prestige strata and the hierarchy of economic classes have their roots in the occupational structure; so does the hierarchy of political power and authority, for political authority in modern society is largely exercised as a full time occupation.... The occupational structure also is the link between the economy and the family, through which the economy affects the family's status and the family supplies manpower to the economy."

Monk (1970: 4) argues that

"occupation has remained the backbone of social grading because no better methods have been found, and because it has still remained a powerful and useful stratification factor, even though the interpretation has become more complex."

Reid (1977: 15) concludes that for the purposes of his extensive review of empirical research on social class differences in the UK he can use the definition "social class is a grouping of people into categories on the basis of occupation", since that is what has habitually been the basis for scales of class location of all types generated in this area. King and Raynor (1981: 21, 22) suggest the obvious reasons for this approach in empirical research:
"Occupational data is economical and easily collected, occupation has been consistently shown to be highly related to most other factors associated with social class, particularly income and education; and, not least, most people overwhelmingly choose occupational characteristics for their criterion of class."

3 The middle class

The model of the social division of labour which has been developed for this study, in its description of the middle class has been largely based on the distinction made by Bernstein (1977) between those located in the field of production, deriving historically from the old middle class and those in the field of symbolic control, the new middle class, who derive their position from the possession and manipulation of cultural or pedagogic capital. In trying to pinpoint positions in social space more closely and to identify positions which have been allocated to differing class locations and fractions by a range of theorists, an occupational hierarchy is related to this basic distinction. One of the objectives of the model was then to identify and locate in social space these fractions of the middle class - agents of symbolic control, and those in the field of production, in order ultimately to look at ideological differences between these groups as realised in the discourse of adolescents. The basic problematic could be regarded as the reproduction of class and patriarchal relations. The conceptualisation of the new middle class differs from many in the literature, although there are points of intersection and similarity. The range of approaches to the new middle class varies with the objectives and perspective of the social theorist(s) developing the analysis - at the broadest level perhaps they can be seen as concerned with the function or processes of reproduction of social classes, or the relationship between classes in terms of the possibility of social change. Most are concerned at some level with the extent to which this group, however broadly or narrowly defined, can be seen as a self interested group with the power to pursue these interests. We will consider here some representative characterisations of the new middle class, and their relation to the model developed for this study.
The middle class has posed a problem for marxists in terms of accommodating its existence to the two major class groups in capitalist society, since despite Marx's recognition of these classes as transitional or subclass groups as outlined above, the main force of his model of capitalist development suggests that the middle classes would gradually decompose, fall into the proletariat, and reinforce the centrality of the conflict between the two major blocks. The growth of the white collar sector, service and administrative functions, at all occupational levels in the social division of labour over the twentieth century in capitalist societies has been seen as a problem for this analysis. Efforts have been made either to adjust the two class model in order to enable characterisation of the middle class group in some way (a class in itself, a contradictory location between the major classes) or to find the boundary point within the middle class with varying degrees of precision in order to allocate class positions within this grouping to one or other of the major antagonistic classes. In the recent resurgence of marxist work this exercise has been considered to have practical political consequences in terms of indicating which groups are actually part of the proletariat (the revolutionary class) or with whom this class should form alliances for political action. The exercise has also been seen as a theoretical justification for specific political positions. 19

3.1 The professional managerial class

Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich (1979) take the position that the new middle class, which they prefer to call the professional managerial class, is a separate class, distinct from the old middle class, and its formation is specific to the monopoly stage of capitalism. The definition they offer of this new class is "salaried mental workers who do not own the means of production and whose major function in the social division of labour may be described broadly as the reproduction of capitalist culture and capitalist class relations" (p. 12). This group - cultural workers, managers, engineers and scientists - conforms to the two basic characteristics of a 'class' in their view, by sharing a common function in the broad social division of labour, and a common relation to the economic foundations of society. Included in this group are a wide range of occupations, skills, income levels, power and prestige, and the boundary lines between the class and "the ruling class above and the working
class below are fuzzy" (p. 13). They sketch the historical development of the class in the USA, and the nature of its relationship to the working class, which is one of antagonism, since they have appropriated the skills and culture once indigenous to the working class (p. 17). The Ehrenreichs argue that the professional managerial class has not become a new ruling class (top managers are part of the ruling class in this view, but not the managerial group as a whole) and has a class outlook which was historically distinct from and often antagonistic towards the capitalist class, based on occupational autonomy and the development of a technocracy. There are divisions within the class, for example between the managers, administrators and engineers, on the one hand, and those in the liberal arts and service professions on the other, but the commonalities are more significant. The groups within the professional managerial class are socially coherent (intermarriage), with intergenerational stability and characterised by a common 'culture' or lifestyle. The authors reject the abstraction of much marxist class analysis, and include dimensions other than economic position (occupation or relation to the means of production) in their characterisation of this class, although they do not provide empirical support for their assertion of commonalities at these other levels. The main purpose of the article, however, was to find an explanation for the dilemma that the left in the USA, largely located in the professional managerial class in the authors' view, have found themselves in, and to suggest that perhaps it is inappropriate to consider the working class as a revolutionary force, and that the nature of the antagonisms between the professional managerial class and the working class must be recognised and confronted before any broad anti-capitalist alliance can be formed. Some of the criticism that this analysis of the professional managerial class has received was based on its inadequacies as a model of class relations, particularly the authors' rejection of the concept of the new working class or proletarianisation of certain segments of white collar workers, their rejection of Marx's idea of classes as in dialectical relation, and their failure to consider the role of the state in monopoly capitalism. Other criticisms were related to the inadequacies of the political conclusions - suggesting that the working class is a revolutionary class, or that the paper is merely an attempt to rationalise and justify the position of the left within the professional managerial class. From the above brief description we can see that the authors want to include a very wide range of positions in the social structure in their middle class group, and posit this heterogeneous grouping as a self
conscious class with developed interests, frequently antagonistic to the ruling capitalist and the subordinate working class. It seems, however, even from the title used to express the nature of this class and certainly from the historical review of the development of the class, that it is only certain fractions of this heterogeneous grouping that the Ehrenreichs are interested in. Although the authors admit to cleavage within the group, now implicitly more narrowly defined, between essentially managers/administrators, and liberal arts/professionals, when they apply what they consider to be essential criteria of class position other than economic (for example culture, lifestyle, and social coherence), they insist that this cleavage disappears. Whilst the paper certainly provides interesting historical and descriptive material, and identifies even though it rejects the importance of fractions within the professional managerial class, its value as a model of class relations is limited by the conceptual confusions suggested here.

3.2 The salaried middle class

Gould (1981) attempts a similar analysis for a more closely defined segment of the middle class, in the context of the development and existence of the welfare state in the UK. Contrasting his position with marxist analyses of the welfare state which in his view, limited by the dual model of class conflict, can see the costs or benefits of the welfare state as accruing only to the bourgeoisie or the working class, he argues that the salaried middle class benefits most, to the cost of both capital and labour. He defines the salaried middle class as "those non-manual career hierarchies which we tend to associate with private and public bureaucracies" (p. 401) extending from the most senior officials to blue and white collar workers performing routine tasks, and looks at them as consumers and producers of welfare, in the areas of education, housing, pensions and health. The salaried middle class is seen as a separate class group which operates to further its own interests in these areas, and Gould suggests that capital, labour and the salaried middle class itself have been insufficiently aware of the growing power of this group, with the result that the class as a whole has been able to manipulate the other two, and that the "seeming lack of solidarity and apparent diffuseness of its class organisation are strengths since they have successfully disguised that growing power" (p. 402). He considers that this same lack of
awareness of the power and self interested role of the salaried middle class extends to sociological and marxist analyses of the group, and that only Gouldner (1979) seems to have recognised the new class as "independent and capable of advancing its own interests" (p. 411). Like the Ehrenreichs, Gould recognises divisions within the salaried middle class but considers that these divisions are not fundamental. The class interests of the salaried middle class are realised through their possession of cultural capital, their interlocking positions of authority and expertise in the state, private sector, trade unions, political parties and pressure groups, and their shared values. After a brief but relatively convincing analysis of the political position of the salaried middle class, Gould concludes

"that the salaried middle class should be credited with a degree of independence, cohesion and power; that the interests of the salaried middle class are effectively advanced with limited class organisation, visibility and consciousness; that it has assumed a high degree of power without capital, labour or itself recognising what has taken place; and that its role in welfare and corporatist politics has been neglected and underestimated" (p. 416).

Once again Gould ignores divisions within the middle class, even as defined by himself, which may be significant to both the nature and practice of power which these groups exercise. In the model developed in the current study, these differences can be identified. Gould does make a strong case for the exercise of power by the salaried middle class, but his conclusions should be seen as pointing the way to more detailed investigation of the salaried middle class, rather than proved by the weight of the data he brings to bear on his argument.

3.3 The new class

Gouldner (1979), taking a much broader sweep than the US or UK specific discussions above, sees the new class of intellectuals and technical intelligentsia developing in the third world, in the second world of the USSR and its satellites, and in the first world of late capitalism. The new class is basically the cultural bourgeoisie, in competition and conflict with the old moneyed capitalist class, or in communist society with the Party. In a series of statements about the nature and future of this new class, Gouldner suggests that it is a speech community with its own culture of critical
discourse, and "this grammar is the deep structure of the common ideology shared by the new class. The shared ideology of the intellectuals and intelligentsia is thus an ideology about discourse" (p. 28). He suggests that a general theory of capital should be developed in which moneyed capital and cultural capital are both included, and that the new class may in fact, despite internal contradictions, be the new ruling class of the future. At the moment he sees it as a flawed universal class, committed to knowledge, skill, and the continuance and expansion of its own elite privileges. The discussion is pitched at a very general level, despite the occasional recourse to historical or empirical material on the class Gouldner is hoping to identify. Once again the cleavage between what he calls the technical intelligentsia (which group appears in the field of production in our model) and the intellectuals (this group appears in the field of symbolic control) are combined, and their differences glossed over in order to maintain the broad sweep of the argument.

3.4 Class groupings and closure

Both Giddens (1973) and Parkin (1979) base their models of class on the concept of 'closure'; for the former the degree to which mobility chances both individually in a lifetime, and intergenerationally, exist; for the latter the degree to which class groups can operate with closure so as to exclude other groups, thereby indicating basic conflict between class groups.

Giddens sees the class structure of Western industrialised societies as threefold, upper, middle and lower or working class groups based respectively on three types of market capacity - ownership of property and the means of production, possession of educational or technical qualifications, and possession of manual labour power. This structuration of class relations is supplemented by three other sources of differentiation - the division of labour within the productive enterprise, authority relations within the enterprise, and the influence of distributive groupings (or consumption patterns). The middle class itself is differentiated by (1) differences in market capacity - i.e. the capacity to offer marketable technical knowledge or general symbolic competence, and (2) variations in the division of labour, or the system of paratechnical relations. Giddens' middle class, then, is based on educational
qualifications, location in the technical division of labour, and consumption patterns. Reproduction of class location in this model takes place through the coincidence of all factors on an intergenerational basis, and limited mobility between class groups. "The structuration of classes is facilitated by the degree to which mobility closure exists in relation to any specified form of market capacity" (1982: 159).

Parkin suggests that there are two main types of social closure, (1) exclusion, which is characteristic of a dominant class or subclass and involves categorising ineligibles and keeping them out; (2) usurpation, which is the attempt of a subordinate class or group to "bite into the resources and benefits accruing to dominant groups in society - a range of possibilities extending from marginal redistribution to complete expropriation" (p. 74). Parkin's dominant class is the bourgeoisie in capitalist society, containing groupings which others would place in the middle class. For him the dominant bourgeoisie maintains closure through two basic strategies, exclusionary rights in property (basically capital) and "closure practices sometimes referred to as 'credentialism'" (1979: 54). The former includes managers (as in neo-marxist versions), the latter professionals and other possessors of cultural capital. Parkin suggests that he is wanting to extend the marxist notion of the basic cleavage in capitalism occurring between the propertied and propertyless classes to include cultural capital as property. There is another element in the middle class for Parkin, lower level professionals, "intermediate white collar groups" (p. 108) who "may fruitfully combine exclusionary and usurpationary strategies but it seems likely that the latter will be adopted with some reluctance and only if the attempt to establish full closure fails to come off". He takes this position as part of an argument rejecting the notion of proletarianisation of subsections of the middle class, for which position white collar unionism is seen as a support. Parkin sees the latter as a contingent strategy linked to a particular economic climate, and no indication of proletarianisation, since "complete professional status" would be the preferred goal of these groups should the economic situation make this possible. Giddens also rejects white collar unionism and mechanisation as real indicators of the proletarianisation of sections of the middle class. In this they are both disagreeing with marxist attempts to include these groups in the proletariat.
Both these authors pitch their arguments, and models of the class structure and the nature and content of the middle class at a general level, and Giddens suggests that empirical investigation of particular class formations in particular societies is needed to flesh out the bones of the abstract model. Each of them provides a limited amount of empirical content to illustrate particular elements of the models they propose.

3.5 Economic, political and ideological determinants of class location and the boundary problem

Recent neo-marxist work in the wake of the Althusserian rereading of Marx, with its anti-economistic emphasis, asserts the importance of the ideological and political instances in the identification of class locations, or places, and Poulantzas (1975) for example produces a taxonomy which theoretically provides infinite flexibility in such identification. He elaborates the economic, political and ideological criteria which determine objective class positions in the social division of labour. His economic criterion is the distinction between productive and unproductive labour; the political criterion is the distinction between non-supervisory and supervisory position (the surveillance function of capital and the reproduction of the political relations between capital and working class in the production process); and the basic ideological criterion is the division between mental and manual labour, which for the working class means exclusion from the knowledge necessary to organise production. For Poulantzas, the new middle class is the "new petty bourgeoisie", consisting of white collar employees, technicians, supervisors, and civil servants, and the crucial question for understanding the structural determination of the working class in advanced capitalism is the identification of the boundary between this class and the working class. He puts the new and the traditional petty bourgeoisie (independent artisans, small shopkeepers, etc.) together in one class, since, although they differ on economic criteria, they have the same ideological relationship to the struggle between capital and labour. His most contentious criterion is for the economic position, the distinction between productive and unproductive labour, defined very narrowly as relating to the generation of surplus value in the production of physical products. This means, contrary to those who argue that there has been proletarianisation of the lower reaches
of the new middle class, that many who would be included in the working class in the more usual class models (marxist and stratification) become part of the petty bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{32} Whilst this schema does allow flexibility in principle,\textsuperscript{33} in Poulantzas' own use of the criteria there is some slippage - for example positions are excluded from the working class on the basis of one missing criterion of three,\textsuperscript{34} the old and new petty bourgeoisie are grouped together on the basis of one common criterion (ideological),\textsuperscript{35} and there must be deviation on all criteria to be excluded from the capitalist class.\textsuperscript{36}

Wright (1978) considers that this effort to locate class positions especially at the margins of the major classes and the contortions it requires can be overcome by the recognition of what he calls objectively\textsuperscript{37} contradictory locations within class relations. He takes three basic classes and locates what we are coming to recognise as our new middle class, with a supplementation from what could probably safely have been called the old petty bourgeoisie, between the three in contradictory locations.
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Wright identifies three central processes underlying the basic capital-labour relationship:
"control over the physical means of production, control over labour power, and control over investments and resource allocation.... The fundamental class antagonism between workers and capitalists can be viewed as a polarization on each of these three underlying processes or dimensions: capitalists control the accumulation process, decide how the physical means of production are to be used, and control the authority structure within the labour process. Workers, in contrast, are excluded from the control over authority relations, the physical means of production, and the investment process. These two combinations of the three processes of class relations constitute the two basic antagonistic class locations within the capitalist mode of production" (p. 73).

What characterises the contradictory locations is the non coincidence of these basic dimensions of class relations. He adds two other potential types of contradictory locations, those positions which "are linked directly to contradictory locations through families or class trajectories;"40 (this is to cover those outside the production process, such as housewives, students, the unemployed) "or occupy a contradictory location within the political and ideological apparatuses, i.e. execute but do not create state policy, or disseminate but do not control the production of bourgeois ideology" (p. 97).

In this type of conceptualisation the new middle class then crystallises the conflicts and contradictions inherent in the capitalist system. The point of the exercise is to recognise the conflicting interests within these groups and not to try to force them into one or other of the major groupings, since this will result in inadequate alliances and strategies for social change. A different type of analysis of contradictions is offered by Carchedi (1978).

Whilst he admits the importance of ideological and political determinants of class position, Carchedi is concerned with the economic determination at the level of production relations of the new middle class, which he sees, like the Ehrenreichs, as specifically arising in the stage of monopoly capitalism. Pitching his analysis at an extremely abstract level and after negotiating a seemingly endless process of conceptual clarification and development, Carchedi identifies the fundamental characteristics of the new middle class. This is that the class performs the global function of capital, which is the technical supervision and control of the exploitation process, previously in the hands of individual capitalists, and the function of the collective worker, which is to take part in the complex division of labour which contributes to the production of surplus value. Their position is doubly contradictory, since they are both on the side of capital and of labour, and
even when on the side of capital are both exploiters (or oppressors) and oppressed. Whilst the class as a whole performs both functions, positions within it have a larger component of one or the other. This brings Carchedi to his conceptualisation of the proletarianisation of the lower reaches of the new middle class (in terms of production relations, not consumption patterns, which are often used - inadequately in his view - to discuss this concept). The proletarianised new middle class includes those positions which almost exclusively perform the function of the collective worker, and whose labour power has been devalued (Braverman's (1974) deskilling) and reduced to the average value. The objective conditions for this group to become part of the proletariat exist (i.e. at the economic level in this analysis), but political and ideological conditions must also be met before they actually become part of the proletariat. 41 We can see, however, the same overall objective with regard to the identification of classes and class fractions, in neo-marxist work, the relevant alliances of class groups and fractions for political action (pp. 198-199).

The purpose of all this effort of adequate characterisation of the class structure in capitalism for the marxist and neo-marxist authors whom we have discussed is not merely to categorise social class positions, however multidimensionally, as we have seen, but to relate types of class relationship to both the class struggle and to the possibilities for change in the class structure and in the capitalist mode of production. To this end they stay firmly within their own discourse with the concomitant assumptions about the fundamental class relations in a capitalist mode of production (at the most abstract level, the dialectical relationship between capital and labour). As we have seen, the content, description and boundaries of the middle class and of the new middle class vary considerably even within the framework of a marxist model, as exemplified in the work discussed above, and in some instances considerable difficulty can be experienced in attempting to allocate agents to class positions on the basis of the criteria suggested. These authors tinker with the new middle class and its specific class location, in terms of class interests, awareness, or consciousness, either to explain the absence of a socialist revolution in capitalist society, or to suggest strategies which might lead to such an end.
3.6 **Descriptive models of the middle class and cleavage**

The two themes in the analysis of the new middle class discussed above, (1) the new middle class as a class in itself, from a marxist or non-marxist perspective, focussing on the commonalities of this class, and (2) the boundary problem, i.e. (a) where do we draw the line in the middle class so as to allocate the positions of the two major classes in capitalism? and (b) where are the significant class boundaries from the perspective of mobility chances and class closure? are matched by a third. This third theme consists of a careful categorisation of the various segments of the middle class, identifying the new middle class in this process, and emphasising the cleavages and differences within the broadly classified middle class. In this approach typologies are offered of the fractions of the class, for example the relatively similar categorisations offered by Goldthorpe (1978) and Scase and Goffee (1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goldthorpe:</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Large proprietors</td>
<td>Salaried professionals, administrators and officials, managers, higher grade technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Small proprietors, self-employed artisans and other own-account workers</td>
<td>Routine non-manual employees, lower-grade technicians, foremen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scase and Goffee</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial</th>
<th>Salaried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Active proprietors of productive assets, for example (A) Owner-directors (B) Owner-controllers</td>
<td>Managers, professionals and highly qualified technical employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Active proprietors of petty productive assets, for example (A) Small employers (B) Self-employed</td>
<td>Lower-grade managerial, professional, technical routine non-manual employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the identification of cleavages within the class, by the categorisation of different groups is seen as a potential explanation for the range of differences in "life style, attitudes and beliefs" (Scase and Goffee, 1982: 188)
within the middle class. Both typologies have the advantage of including the proprietorial, entrepreneurial, property owning class, and this group is the focus for the Scase and Goffee study. The latter authors admit that their categories are not watertight, and have to include positions in the interstices between their compartments, for example many classical occupations of the established middle class, such as independent professionals, which comfortably find a home in Goldthorpe's "old middle class". Both are also concerned with recruitment patterns and mobility chances, but from a more empirically grounded position than the broad theoretical perspectives suggested by Giddens and Parkin.

The model developed in this study shares with the marxist approach the emphasis on production, and with all approaches the use of occupation as the indicator of social class location, with the limitations which this entails, particularly, as we have noted in Chapter 1, the problem of the social class location of women. Neo-Weberian approaches emphasise the importance of other distributional or consumption behaviour patterns for the precise definition of class, and such dimensions are used in multidimensional stratification approaches. Frequently in practice, however, these elements are not adequately incorporated into the class or stratification model. They may be included as part of an abstract model of class relations, may be mentioned as important but not developed or integrated into the model. They may perhaps be isolated for detailed empirical investigation of particular communities or groups, where they have little general relevance. Most middle class positions discussed from the differing standpoints above can be located in our model, including the bourgeoisie, but we have chosen to look specifically at the line of cleavage between the holders of physical capital (including control over resources), and of cultural or pedagogic capital. These issues are expanded in the description of the model below, but first we will consider the way in which the concept of ideology is used in this study.

4 Ideology

The concept of ideology used in this study derives largely from recent developments in the theory of ideology, and relates particularly to the ideological positioning of an individual. Ideological positioning, it is argued, is
accomplished through the individual's experience of particular institutions in society and the power relations which permeate these institutions, and of which they are specific, if sometimes partial, and fragmented realisations. This usage places the individual both internally and externally. Internally, the lived experience of ideological messages embedded in the material and discursive practices of social institutions (e.g. the family, education, production, etc.) produces a concept of self. Mediating between the internal and external reference is ideological positioning in the sense of the set of representations of social relations, institutions, and organisation which the individual holds. These two aspects of ideological positioning lead on to the external reference which places the individual in a particular relation to other agents, subjects and groups in these complexes of social relations.

Many factors and sets of relationships will influence the ideological positioning of an individual, and one can envisage a complete analysis of the ideological positioning of one individual in all its complexity as a valid investigative task. This study is concerned with two major determinants of ideological positioning, class and intra-class location, and gender, and attempts to trace the effects of such positioning in the representations of adolescents.

The development of the conceptualisation of ideology used here and its roots in Marx's concept of ideology will be traced briefly in the following section.

The concept of ideology has a long history, appearing first in the work of Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836), where it had a positive connotation as the science of ideas which could overcome religious and metaphysical prejudices and form the basis for public education, and the route via reason to the just society (Larrain, 1979: 27; Drucker, 1974: 3-12). The concept if not the word can be traced earlier in the work of Machiavelli (1469-1527) and in Bacon's (1561-1626) conception of idols or false notions, where the connotation is negative. It is Marx's use of the concept which has been most influential, and his particular definitions have formed the starting point for considerable debate on the nature of ideology, and have contributed to a confused intellectual history for the concept itself. We will not attempt to give a history of the concept of ideology, and its application in the social
but will touch on facets of this development which have influenced the definition and use of the concept of ideology in this study.

Leaving to one side both the specific intellectual and political climate in which Marx produced his conceptualisation of ideology, and the multiple later interpretations and reformulations of his ideas which have comprised to a large extent the intellectual history of the concept, we could suggest with Giddens (1979) that Marx has two uses of the concept of ideology: (1) as a distortion of consciousness -

"Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious being, and the being of men is their actual life-process. If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process."

(Marx and Engels, 1976: 36)

This first usage is related to the polarity which Marx postulates between science and ideology; (2) as an expression of the interests of the ruling class -

"The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so that the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject to it."

(Ibid., p. 59)

Larrain argues that there is a link between Marx's two usages (which he traces in The German Ideology and implicitly in Capital) where ideology is seen as a form of distorted consciousness which conceals social contradictions, and that this concealment and the ideological forms which it takes are in the interest of the ruling class.

Implicit in these formulations of the concept, and certainly crucial to its later development by Marxists, is the differentiation of ideology as a system of ideas or discourse, and ideology as what has come to be called 'lived experience'. Marx was insistent that consciousness is not independent of
material conditions, that 'it is not consciousness that determines life, but life that determines consciousness' (Marx and Engels, 1976: 37).

Mannheim (1960) pointed out that total ideology (which he defined as the overall ideology of a group, class, or historical period) should not be regarded only as a system of ideas, but seen as an integral part of and facilitating the everyday experience and actions of members of a society.

There is a tension between the notion of ideology as false consciousness, emanating from or possibly imposed by the dominant class, and ideology as deeply embedded, inseparable from practical everyday experience of life, and implicated even in the construction of the individual subject her/himself. This has led some writers, particularly structuralists, to reject the idea of false consciousness and is seen for example in the influential work of Althusser on ideology - "Ideology is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (Althusser, 1971: 153). Gramsci's (1971) use of the concept of ideology has made a crucial contribution to these formulations.

Gramsci was concerned in his analysis of capitalist social formations with the nature of the state, politics and revolutionary practice, and particularly the relation between ideas and forms of action or behaviour. He developed the concept of hegemony, which he sometimes referred to as ideological hegemony, to explain the consent of the dominated classes or groups to their domination. Gramsci described the hegemony of the dominant class as the cement which binds society together, an analogy picked up by later structuralist writers. Although force is always the last resort of a dominant class, consent for their rule has to be obtained or a society could not function, be maintained or reproduced over time. For Gramsci the hegemonic organising principle, world view, or system of values, attitudes, beliefs or morality is diffused throughout the structures and institutions of society into every aspect of social relations. It becomes internalised for social actors, and especially the masses, as 'common sense'. Hegemony in Gramsci's work is a crucial aspect of the relations of classes and class fractions, and includes not only the ideological, but also the economic and political levels of social relations (Hall, Lumley, McLennan, 1978: 48-49). Expanding from Lenin's coercive conceptualisation of hegemony, Gramsci
includes the possibility of 'counter-hegemony' in his analysis of the capitalist system. Counter-hegemony can appear when a party or class can build an alternative world view or system of values with practices and relations which can form the starting point and the necessary basis for the overthrow of a dominant group or class.

Elements of Gramsci's thought in this connection have been important for more recent writers such as Poulantzas (1975) and Althusser (1970, 1971, 1977). Althusser represented a new direction in contemporary debate, opposed to the historicism and economic reductionism of earlier work. It has been pointed out that there are at least ten different not necessarily compatible definitions of ideology to be found in his work, and Althusser's conceptualisation of ideology develops and changes over time. There are, however, certain themes which recur. Ideology is seen as a distinctive level of social reality, a system of representations, to be known only through its structure, and essential to any society since it enables social cohesion. In a class society this cohesion is in the interests of the dominant class. A second theme is the opposition between ideology and science, where science breaks with ideology (a prescientific form) constituting a level of discourse which can produce new knowledge which then reflects back on ideology. Of science he writes: "Its particular labour consists of elaborating its own scientific facts through a critique of the ideological 'facts' elaborated by an earlier ideological practice" (Althusser, 1977: 184). The third theme involves the function of ideology in reproducing the relations of production and in the constitution of individual subjects and their 'interpellation' into positions in the system of social relations. Emphasising the materiality of ideology, Althusser insists that ideology "always exists in an apparatus and its practice or practices" (1971: 156), and that individuals live ideology through participation in these practices, resulting in the development of certain sets of beliefs or ideas about both the self and the self in relation to the social system. The most influential of his works on ideology is an essay on ideological state apparatuses which delineates the third theme above in detail, and describes the role and function of these apparatuses as distinct from the coercive arm of the state, the repressive state apparatuses, and indicates the role of ideology in the reproduction of the relations of production, and its relation to class domination and state power. "No class can hold state power over a long period without at the same time exercising its
hegemony over and in the ideological state apparatuses" (Althusser, 1971: 139).

There have been numerous criticisms of Althusser's conceptualisation of ideology, and reinterpretations of his work, from a range of positions. Amongst the main criticisms one can draw attention to the fact that, despite arguing for the relative autonomy of the three levels or instances of a social formation, the economic, political and ideological, the role assigned in reproduction to the ideological state apparatuses does not in fact recognise the relative autonomy of for example the political from the economic level. It is argued that the co-existence of multiple ideologies in capitalist society cannot be explained within Althusser's theoretical framework which sees the ultimate control of the dominant ideology working through the ISAs. As Benton (1977: 180) suggests,

"It is the relative inadequacy of the ruling ideology as a means of theorising certain categories (for example certain groups of women, racial minorities, and others) which provide the basis for the establishment of antagonistic ideologies, and the necessity of the principal function of 'ideological reproduction' which Althusser attributes to the ISAs."

The role assigned to the state in Althusser's formulation appears excessive, including for example the family and trade unions as part of state ideological control. Connell (1982: 139) argues that it is Althusser's functional definition of the state which requires him to include these institutions as state apparatuses, since they "materialise ideology and help reproduce, however indirectly, capitalist relations of production". It is also the case that ideology can work through institutions which Althusser includes amongst the repressive apparatuses of the state.

One direction of development from these critiques of Althusser's work has been to take up his emphasis on the constitution of the subject in ideology and to suggest that Lacan's rereading of Freud, various developments in semiology, and Althusser's rereading of Marx can be usefully combined to fill a gap in marxist theory, providing a more developed theory of the subject. Coward and Ellis (1977) and numerous contributors to the journal Screen argue from this position. For Lacan (1977) the human infant enters simultaneously into subjectivity and language, and the unconscious is
constituted, through the mirror phase (the recognition of a unified image of the self) and the resolution of the Oedipal complex, which are modalities of the imaginary and the symbolic respectively. The subject is then socially constituted and takes her/his (sexed) place in language and culture, and the unconscious, containing contradiction and heterogeneity, is split from the conscious, the ego. This conscious subject is the subject of bourgeois ideology, a coherent whole, positioned in her/his culture through language and ideology.

Interesting problems are raised by this approach to the insertion of the subject into a marxist theory of ideology, many of them commented on by Adlam and Salfield (1978) and McDonnell and Robins (1980). Is the subject of one theoretical discourse (Marxism) the same as that of another (Psychoanalysis); is there a need to have a theory of the subject in the analysis of ideology; a formulation which suggests that the resistance to change of ideological representations is due to the positioning of subjects in language through the construction of the unconscious, is open to the same criticism of attempting a universal and ahistorical explanation as is its proximate source - Freud's conceptualisation of the unconscious and of the Oedipus complex.

The fruitfulness of the above debates to a developed theory of ideology has yet to be realised. Certainly many of the ideas incorporated into the discourse in these recent discussions are stimulating and suggestive, and open new possibilities in the endless struggle to synthesise the work and ideas of Marx and Freud (or, as in the latest versions, Althusser and Lacan). The work of these recent theorists has influenced both the model of the social division of labour developed in this study, and the use of the concept of ideology. 5

5 Ideological positioning

Drawing from the above theorists, in this study the notion of ideological positioning has both an outward and inward reference with respect to the individual agent. It refers outwards to a particular set of representations of social relations and organisation which the individual holds, and concomitantly to the establishment of particular relations of the individual to other agents or subjects in those complexes of social relations. It refers inwards to
concepts of self. The image of self, world view, and conception of the relationship between the two held by the individual can be seen as coming from the lived experience of material practices embedded in the social relations of the specific institutions of a society, or as it might be described in another discourse, processes of primary, secondary, and continuous socialisation. We could say then that the data in this study, statements made by adolescents in response to questions about inequalities related to the social division of labour and to gender differentiation, can be seen as ideological representations reflecting what had been called variously, lived, practical or commonsense ideology. They can relate to self concepts, 'world views', or the relationship between the two.

Ideological positioning can be (1) relatively deeply embedded and general, for example the conception of self as male or female with the associated gender appropriate behaviour, attitudes, views, appearance for any given society, or (2) relatively manipulable through ideological apparatuses. The author takes the view that multiple ideologies operate in society, but within the overall context of a dominant ideology which is supportive of the smooth running of the capitalist system, and the maintenance of the patriarchal order, although not necessarily always coherently, consistently nor successfully. Abercrombie and Turner (1978) have attempted to turn the dominant ideology thesis on its head by suggesting with some plausibility, through a historical analysis of the various stages of development of society postulated by Marx, that the dominant ideology existed to maintain or develop the cohesion of the dominant class, and had little impact on the dominated or subordinate classes. They admit that the situation in late capitalism is more complicated, and seem to argue somewhat contradictorily that (a) subordinate classes in contemporary capitalism do not straightforwardly adopt the dominant ideology; (b) that there is some confusion amongst sociologists about what is the dominant ideology, implying some confusion and doubt on the nature and/or existence of such a phenomenon in contemporary capitalism; and (c) that there is no longer the need for a dominant ideology of the sort which protected the interests of the ruling class in feudalism and early capitalism, given the nature of late capitalism and the separation of ownership and control of the economic base. Whether the confusion of sociologists can be taken as indicating something about social reality or not, the existence, content and dimensions of a dominant ideology is an appropriate subject for
empirical research. At one level the current study, starting from the premise that there is a dominant ideological framework in society, however layered, adaptable, and assimilated it might prove to be, is investigating whether or not dominant ideological representations exist in the discourse of the adolescent sample in terms of their understanding of social inequalities, and in what way this is associated with class, a specific definition of fractions of the middle class, and gender. This section has dealt mainly with the concept of ideology in terms of the dominant cultural category of class, which has also formed the basis for the construction of the model of the social division of labour developed in this work. In this study the focus is on two basic principles for organising society, patriarchy and class, each of which we argue lead to the ideological positioning of individual agents. These principles are realised in the material practices and social relations of specific social institutions and reach individual consciousness through agents' locations in these institutions and experience of these practices. Most institutions in society have implications for the realisation of both of these principles, but perhaps the prime institutional sites for the realisation of the principle of class are those in production, the family, education and aspects of the juridico-political superstructure; for patriarchy these major institutional sites are those of production, reproduction, the family, education, the media and aspects of the juridico-political superstructure.

Ideology operates in the ways outlined above, in the context of an overall dominant ideology, which can be seen as legitimising inequalities based on both gender and class, to position agents in the social formation, and to provide them with both a view of the social world and a view of self. The dominating ideology is not unitary in its messages nor perfect in its reproduction, itself containing contradictions. The inadequacies of the dominant ideology suggested by Benton (1977: 180) and Abercrombie and Turner (1978) from different perspectives, and the disjunctions and contradictions inherent in the institutional practices of capitalism, combined with the history of counter-hegemonic positions developed historically in terms of both struggles of the working class and of women to overcome their domination, provide the spaces for the development of ideologies, world views and views of self counter to those expressed in the dominant ideology. Indications of these contrary views are also sought in the empirical data.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 R. Williams (1976). See also Briggs (1960).

2 Dahrendorf suggests that an imprecise use of the term class was typical at the time, and that Marx also exhibited this propensity (1959: 4). Ollman (1968), in a discussion of the variety of definitions of class implicit in Marx's work, and the variability with which the concept is used, argues radically and alternatively that to use Marx's concept of class it is necessary to accept his particular interpretation of social reality, that this and other of his key concepts such as 'class struggle', 'alienation' and 'surplus-value' "are equally unavailable to those who would use them to express non-Marxist views" (p. 580).

3 See Marx's letter to J. Weydemeyer, 5 March 1852 (Marx and Engels, 1968: 679).

4 Preface to Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (1859), see McLellan (1977: 388)

5 Ibid.

6 Dahrendorf (1959: 8-27) attempts to provide this systematic account. Dahrendorf's own contribution to the concept of social class is to argue that classes are constituted by positions in organisational hierarchies, characterised by the possession of or exclusion from authority. He sees the ownership (or not) of property as a subclass of the possession of authority. Class conflict exists, and is an important dynamic of social and structural change, but is based on a conflict of interest between those in authority, and those subordinated to this authority.


8 Gerth and Mills (1948: 193).


10 Connell (1977: 4, 5), in trying to "cut through the mighty jungle of modern literature on class and stratification", suggests a logical distinction between 'categorical' and 'generative' approaches. The former attempts to produce a systematic way of sorting people and underlies "most modern sociology of stratification, including survey research on mobility ... some American functionalist theories of social hierarchy, neo Weberian stratification theories ... versions of Marxism which take a bourgeois-proletarian distinction as a fixed framework, and devote themselves to fitting particular groups into it". The latter, of which Marx's theory of classes is an example, see elementary structures and processes as generating "a huge and complex historical reality". Other examples of this kind of approach are Dahrendorf, and aspects of Parsons' functionalist theory.

11 Ossowski (1963) discusses images of social class which have prevailed both as commonsense notions of social organisation, and as models for sociological analysis, identifying three basic types. These are: (1) a dichotomous model - rulers and ruled, rich and poor, exploitation of
workers by those for whom others labour (middle classes sometimes appear but as secondary groupings or appendages of the major classes in these models); (2) "schemes of gradation", either 'simple' based on a single criterion such as income; or synthetic with ranking based on multiple criteria; (3) the "functionalist scheme", classes as interdependent, cooperative, functionally interrelated groupings in the division of labour. He sees Marx's work as synthesising these three basic approaches.

12 As Bourdieu (1979: 81) suggests, "these ideologists always threaten to divert to their own advantage the power of defining the social world which they hold by delegation. The dominated fraction always tend to set cultural capital - to which it owes its position - at the top of the hierarchy of the principles of hierarchization." For Bourdieu, the power of defining the world is delegated to the ideologists by the dominant class fractions in society, those whose own power is based on "economic and political capital" (ibid., p. 80).

13 For example the Registrar General's scale (1970), the Hall-Jones scale (1951); and lately the Goldthorpe-Hope scale (1974). The latter was used in the development of the hierarchical ordering of occupational categories in the model of the social division of labour developed in this study, and as a means of allocation to social class in early analyses of the data. The sample was categorised on the basis of a 36 and 8 point breakdown of this scale (see Chapter 4).


15 See also B. and J. Ehrenreich (1979: 12, footnote 12) for a similar categorisation of managers.

16 For example Poulantzas (1975).

17 It is chiefly in the USA that multidimensional scales of social class have been developed. See Gordon (1958), especially Chapter 7, for a review of such scales, and indeed, for a review of US sociological work in the area of class and stratification to 1957. See Tumin (1970) for readings encapsulating development in the field to 1970.

18 This basic distinction has been taken from Bernstein, but in developing and operationalising the model some divergencies have been made from the original categorisation and some problems with the formulation have emerged. These are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

19 See Connell (1982) for an analysis of the work of Althusser, Poulantzas and Carchedi from this perspective. "The implicit politics of Althusserian class theory as theoretical practice, is an abstract militancy, without a political 'line' of its own, providing a general justification for a revolutionary vanguard party led by an educated but fairly intolerant elite who are the bearers of Marxist science; and a general devaluation of strategies connected with spontaneity, mobilization from below, incremental change, or use of the existing state" (p. 146).
The Ehrenreichs use Braverman's (1974) conception of the working class: "craftsmen, operatives, labourers, sales workers, clerical workers, service workers, non-college-educated technical workers".

A number of criticisms and a rejoinder by the authors are included in Walker (1979).

For example by Gough (1979); Ginsburg (1979); and Westergaard and Resler (1976).

The latter is Galbraith's definition of a corporate technostructure (1969). This position also implicitly accepts the proletarianisation of the lower reaches of the middle class, and excludes what Scase and Goffee (1982) call the entrepreneurial middle class.

Gould also suggests that social scientists reinforce the view of the salaried middle class that it is in a world dominated by big business and manual trade unions, by describing the class as suffering from weak or false consciousness, and through its own members - academics, journalists, marxist intellectuals - the class unconsciously perpetuates a series of contradictory mythical views of the world whose only underlying consistency is that the significance of the salaried middle class is understated (p. 412). Whilst this latter statement has the heads I win, tails you lose quality of most psychoanalytical arguments, the existence of contradictory views on this class perpetrated by its members cannot be denied. This chapter describes a number of such views.

Gould suggests that the salaried middle class is represented in both Labour and Conservative parties in the UK, and is the power behind both the consensus politics in post-war Britain and the present conflicts in the two main parties, which are essentially in his view between capital and the salaried middle class in the Conservative Party, and the working class and the salaried middle class in the Labour Party. "The breakdown of that consensus has arisen because capital and labour can now see that their interests have not been served although they have as yet failed to detect where the real blame lies" (p. 415). The Social Democratic Party reflects the desire of some salaried middle class members for overt, independent political representation: "Its more mature representatives know instinctively, however, that covert power and seeming dependence are a preferable political stance." (p. 416).

See the bibliographic note (Gouldner, 1979: 94-101) for a brief overview of significant work on the new class.

This is similar to Parkin's (1979) position of extending the concept of property to include cultural capital.

An important part of Parkin's position is that there are other cleavages which cross cut class cleavages, and he discusses those based on gender, race, religion, or ethnicity. He also discusses closure and usurpation as practised by subgroups within both the working and middle class. He proposes that his model of class is applicable to socialist as well as capitalist societies, where he considers that marxist models fail.
Laclau (1975: 102) suggests of Poulantzas that "his attitude when faced with a complex reality is to react with taxonomic fury".

The old petty bourgeoisie in Poulantzas' view are a hangover from the simple commodity production of pre-capitalist modes of production, the new petty bourgeoisie part of the capitalist mode.

And contrary to Marx in his comparison of a teaching factory and a sausage factory, in both of which the workers produce surplus value (Marx, 1976: 664).

Wright (1978: 55) points out that on Poulantzas' criteria for the US economically active population the working class (non-supervisory manual wage earners in the productive sector) constitutes less than 20%, and the new petty bourgeoisie swells to 70%.

Connell (1982: 132/3) argues that so much flexibility has been introduced, especially in Poulantzas' further distinction between determining structures (the ideological political and economic instances of the social formation) and conjunctural field (the realisation in any specific historical conjunction of the social relations engendered by the determining instances) that the system is inherently unstable. He suggests further that there is no way of establishing coherently the relationship between the determining structures and the field of social practices, and that what Poulantzas in particular (and Althusserians in general) have performed is some sort of linguistic trick. "The abstract analysis of the first field (based on Marx on the capitalist mode of production) sharply limits the number and names of class concepts that can be deployed in the second field, but puts little other restraint on what can be done with them there" (p. 135). And that this helps to explain "that characteristic combination of a tight-laced conceptual system with a promiscuous application of class categories in practice" (p. 135).

Supervisory roles excluded from the working class on the political criterion.

As well as similarity in position on the basis of the ideological criterion, Poulantzas also argues that these two groups of agents hold similar ideologies, including the elements of reformism, individualism and power fetishism (the state seen as a neutral force arbitrating between social classes). Although recognising differences in the ideologies of these two groups, Poulantzas considers that the commonalities are sufficient to be able to regard them as a single, intermediary class.

We have noted above (p. 81) Poulantzas' criteria for inclusion in the bourgeoisie.

Marxist analysis is concerned with objective class locations, as opposed to much sociological work on subjective class location, or images of class (see in general on this topic Roberts et al, 1977).

These are top managers, middle managers, technocrats, and supervisors, but the first and the last tend to merge respectively with the
bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and the really contradictory locations are the middle two in this analysis.

39 Wright gives some examples - researcher in a laboratory, professor in elite university, some white collar or highly skilled craftsmen - the identifying factor is some degree of control over the physical means of production, outside the authority structure.

40 Wright attributes the notion of class trajectories to D. Bertaux, Destins Personnels et structures de Classe, Paris. 1977. A class trajectory is a lifetime structure of positions through which an individual passes in the course of a work career. Movement from one job to another within the same trajectory cannot be considered social mobility, movement from one trajectory to another can be.

41 Carchedi also discusses the labour autocracy, who, he argues, are petty bourgeois at the level of ideology, politics, and distribution relations, but still proletariat at the level of production relations.

42 See Birnbaum (1960) for an extensive review of theoretical contributions and empirical applications of the concept in sociology to that date. The article includes an extensive, annotated bibliography.

43 Williams (1976: 205) comments that "this notion of hegemony as deeply saturating the consciousness of a society seems to be fundamental".

44 Anderson (1977: 5-78).


46 In Lenin and Philosophy, 1971.

47 ISAs: educational, religious, political, legal, trade unions, communications, cultural apparatuses and the family. RSAs: government civil administration, armed forces, police, courts, prisons etc.


49 See Althusser's defence of this usage in terms of the distinction between private and public (1971: 137-8) and Laclau's critique (1975: 100).

50 See McDonnell and Robins (1980).

51 Hirst (1976) argues that not all analyses of ideological practice require consideration of the human subject, for example legal practice might invoke a legal subject which is not a human subject - say a joint stock company.

52 This reference both outward to society and inwards to self concepts is not exclusive to recent neo-marxist approaches. Kinloch (1981: 169), in a trenchant critique of sociology as ideology, and an even more detailed exposé of the group background and experience of individual American sociologists than Gouldner (1971) defines ideology as: "The symbolic
reaction of particular socioeconomic groups to specific division of
labour situations, representing attempts to reassert social order through
highly integrated and exclusive world views ... they are, nevertheless,
highly significant to an individual's self concept, social relations, and
reactions to social change."

53 See Chapter 4 below for further discussion of the level of
interpretation of responses to the questionnaire used in the study.

54 To give two slightly contentious examples here: (1) the ideology of
mothering or motherhood (see Badinter (1981) for a historical
perspective on the maternal instinct and the ideology of mothering and
its manipulation during and after the Second World War in the UK.
During the war many women were needed as workers in the absence of
men and had to be drawn from their role as mothers; post war they
were required to return to kitchen and hearth (Bowlby, 1965; Rutter,
1972; Wainwright, 1978). (2) Patriotism in the context of the British
war with Argentina in the Falkland/Malvinas Islands, generated for the
period of conflict, maintained for political advantage, and pushed no
doubt to the background of the collective consciousness when
agreement with Argentina on the future of the islands is finally made.
In this connection see "Bankers demand backing for loan to junta", The
Guardian, Friday 17 December 1982, for a good example of the political
dangers inherent in this type of manipulation. To prevent Argentinian
economic collapse (and the consequent collapse of the international
banking system) British banks were obliged to contribute to a $1.1
billion loan to Argentina. The chairmen of the British banks wanted
public government approval of this act (approval had in fact been given
by the government) so that they would not suffer any political backlash.
The government did not want the political backlash to recoil onto them.

55 This thesis refers to class relations and the maintenance of the
dominance of the ruling class.

56 Some support for their position can be found in Mann (1970: 432) who
reviews a number of empirical studies in order to examine the forms
and extent of value commitment in the UK and USA, and concludes that
value consensus does not exist to any great extent, there is a greater
degree of consensus amongst the middle class than the working class,
and that working class individuals exhibit less internal consistency in
their values than middle class people. Rodman (1963/4), reviewing
theoretical positions on common value systems and studies of juvenile
gang delinquency, proposes the concept of lower class value-stretch to
explain lower class positions and responses to their deprived situation.
That is, the lower classes have a wider range of values and a lower
commitment to them than the middle class.

57 See Chapter 1, p. 61, for a discussion of ideology in connection with
the reproduction of gender and class.

58 See Chapter 1 for a discussion of patriarchy.

59 Not all inequalities in society derive from gender and class position;
other criteria for differentiation of groups such as religion, race,
geographical location, citizenship, party membership, can form the basis
for privilege or exclusion from privilege. In different societies at
different times the specific principles and the salience of particular principles for differentiation varies. Patriarchy would seem to be a fundamental principle from which a hierarchical ordering of privilege based on gender has been derived both historically and cross culturally in the present day. Class, too, however defined, appears critical in the distribution of privilege, particularly in Western industrialised societies. For example the conflicting images and stereotypes of women which are found within a dominant patriarchal ideology (see Perkins, 1979).
CHAPTER 3

THEORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL OF CLASS USED IN THE STUDY TO DISTINGUISH THE SUBSTANTIVE SOCIAL GROUPS

1 Introduction

Our intention in this study is to explore differences in ideological positioning as this relates to social class location, and particularly to fractions of the middle class. The descriptions of nominal social class commonly used did not meet our requirements since we wanted to make sets of distinctions which are not customarily made. We were, however, influenced by certain formulations of class which have been discussed previously, using them to enable us to construct our model in a way which allows us to make the distinctions we require. The model itself is exploratory and tentative, and some of the problems we encountered in our efforts to construct and use it in the study will be touched on in the following description and discussion. The model makes it possible to locate agents in social space with some precision, although not all relationships and positions which can be identified are put to the test in the current study.

The starting point for our conceptualisation of the positioning of the individual in the social formation is the social division of labour. The location of the individual agent in the social division of labour is a critical determinant of that individual's consciousness. There are ideological messages embedded in the individual's particular experience of work and life and in the particular organisation of the society of which s/he is part, which are both acquired and in some cases transmitted by the individual. The resulting ideological representations of the principles underlying the social division of labour which s/he holds will differ according to location in this social space. Ideological positioning is generated by and through the social division of labour, based on the dominant organising principles of a society, and is transmitted through various institutions. The primary socialising institution is the family, but, as we have seen in the discussion of ideology in Chapter 2, a range of other institutions and agencies provide the locus for the interactional practices and social relations which transmit ideological
messages about the society and the self. We have noted that the school and the educational system are important amongst these agencies.

To relate ideological positioning at the broadest level of society to the social division of labour we are suggesting a tripartite division in terms of three basic interrelated fields. These are the fields of production, of symbolic control and of the state. We do not intend to enter here into the complex discussion about the nature of the state, its power relations and boundaries. For our empirical purposes we shall distinguish what we take to be the core functions of the state in identifying this field: the legislative, judiciary and military functions. These include those agencies which provide the possibility for the realisation of state power through coercion or force - the police and the armed forces. From this perspective, agents and agencies of the state can operate in both the fields of production and of symbolic control. This will be discussed in more detail below.

Each of the three fields can be conceptualised as a set of relations based in material practices and institutions, and we consider that a basic distinguishing characteristic of the fields is their relationship to the material base of the society. Agents in the social division of labour of the field of production specialise in the production, distribution and exchange of physical resources and associated services and the circulation of capital. Their procedures of communication and the meanings realised by these procedures through their social relations can be said to have a relatively direct relation to the material base. The agents are subject to the distribution of power and the principles of control which arise from such a base. In the case of the dominating agents operating in the specialised agencies which make up the field of symbolic control, the procedures of communication and the meanings they realise have a relatively indirect or attenuated relationship to the material base of production. They deal in the means, contexts and possibilities of discursive resources and by implication the principles of cultural production and reproduction.

In general, and briefly, the state can be thought of as a set of agencies providing both ideological and material support for the basic organising principles of the society. In the case of patriarchal capitalist societies, these principles are those of class, based on control over the means of production,
and patriarchy, based on hierarchical gender differentiation in favour of men. This overall support is not accomplished, however, without contradictions. The state exists in a wide range of institutions and agencies, and their practices and social relations; conflicting aims and requirements may be generated in these varied institutional sites.

The source for the model of class used in this study and for the basic distinction between the fields of production and symbolic control lies in the distinction made by Bernstein (1977: 127-129) between certain fractions of the middle class, which he saw as developing historically from the old middle class (omc) of the nineteenth century to the new middle class (nmc) of the twentieth. The distinctive characterisation of the omc and the nmc is their relationship to production, and the resultant forms of organic solidarity which has developed within these groupings. Bernstein has taken the concept of organic solidarity from Durkheim (1964) who had contrasted mechanical and organic solidarity. Mechanical solidarity characterised the form of social cohesion experienced in a social group with a simple division of labour; organic solidarity developed as a result of increasing complexity in the division of labour. In describing the omc Bernstein suggests that this group has a relatively direct relationship to the means and forms of production, that is that they own or control capital in various forms - in Bernstein's terms they exercise ownership or control over specialised physical resources. Bernstein describes the omc as having an ideology of radical individualism and form of socialisation which produced specific unambiguous role identities and relatively inflexible role performances. The nmc, in this formulation, has in contrast a relatively indirect relationship to the means and forms of production, but a relatively direct relationship to the means and forms of cultural reproduction. This group controls not capital but dominant forms of communication and the transmission of critical symbolic systems, chiefly through control over various forms of education and symbolic markets (Bourdieu, 1977: 8). For Bernstein, the ideology of this group is based on the concept of the person, rather than the individual, and their form of socialisation can lead to ambiguous personal identity and flexible role performances.

Bernstein argued that an individualised organic solidarity developed in the former group as a result of the increasing complexity of the economic...
division of labour, and a form of personalised organic solidarity developed in
the latter group as a result of the increasing complexity of the division of
labour of cultural or symbolic control. He makes a distinction between
dominating power, which is associated with production and enjoyed by the
section of the middle class located in the field of production, and dominating
control which is associated with cultural reproduction and enjoyed by the
section of the middle class located in the field of symbolic control, and
argues that the former limits the latter. Those in the field of symbolic control
have relative autonomy from the economic base but are limited by the power
originating in the mode of production.

Bernstein's formulation of the relationships within and between
fractions of the middle class seemed a fruitful path to pursue in examining
the middle class although, as with other formulations discussed in Chapter 2
above, it is not without problems of interpretation. In the following discussion
we will pursue the relationships between agents, agencies and fields beyond
the limits of the model which is actually used in the thesis, in order to reveal
complexities and ambiguities which inhere in the model itself. We will attempt
some clarification of these complexities and ambiguities.  

At the broadest level the model used in this study maps the above
distinction onto the two fields of production and symbolic control. Those in
the field of production have functions which are related in a more direct
manner to the mode of production; those in the field of symbolic control have
functions more directly related to specialised agencies of cultural production
and reproduction.

The development of capitalism since the nineteenth century has been a
process of movement from entrepreneurial to corporate capitalism. The old
middle class in the nineteenth century, in terms of our model, was located
largely in the field of production, with perhaps a small proportion in the field
of symbolic control - in education and the professions. The growth of both
corporate capitalism and in the functions and activities of the state has led
to the expansion of bureaucratic organisations in both the public and the
private sectors of the economy. In addition we have seen since 1945 until
recent years, a massive increase in the complexity of the social division of
labour of agencies of symbolic control as a result of changes in the functions of the state.

The expansion in these types of functions and the demand for individuals to fill such spaces in the social formation has led to the growth of what we have seen variously described in the discussion above as the new middle class. The process of the development of this class involves the expansion of education and an increasing demand for particular types of qualification and certification, which are the basic criteria for allocation to functions within bureaucratic administrative and commercial organisations. Once located within these forms and types of organisation, individual agents, as part of class groupings, have a vested interest in the continuing expansion and functioning of such organisations and in the appropriation of the pedagogic capital which forms the basis for the reproduction of these sets of social relations. This emergent new middle class can be located in our terms in both the field of production and that of symbolic control, but it is the nature of their relation to education and pedagogic capital which is a crucial element in the process of reproduction.

2 Divisions within and between the fields of symbolic control and production

There are divisions which cut across the two fields which we have outlined:

(1) Between the fields of production and of symbolic control;
(2) Within the field of symbolic control, according to specialised agency;
(3) Within the field of production, between agents of production and agents of symbolic control located in the field of production.

2.1 Divisions between the field of production and symbolic control

We would argue that education is more salient, and a more critical determinant of consciousness for agents occupying dominant positions in the
field of symbolic control than for those in the field of production. The former may be more dependent on the accumulation and development of pedagogic capital for access to positions within the social formation, and especially to positions within the field of symbolic control itself. We could suggest that the relationship between education and work would be seen as stronger for those in the field of symbolic control than for those in production. For the latter the place where the education occurs - the particular school or university, might be more relevant and pertinent than the specific type, level or class of qualification acquired. In addition, those in the field of symbolic control are likely to be more involved in the processes and principles of the education they receive. Theories of social control and the formation, deformation and reformation of individuals and their social relations, which inform educational practice, are likely to shape the perspectives of agents in the field of symbolic control to a greater extent than for those in the field of production, since they may be more involved in these practices, and more committed to education as a means of their reproduction. Such theories, we could argue, will implicitly or explicitly be active both in the socialising practices within families and in the practices in which the parents participate in their work. We could add that the shift from property to skills, from reproduction through physical resources to reproduction through discursive resources (in the historical development of the new middle class and agents of symbolic control) leads to an emphasis on the role of the woman. Women in the home contribute to the reproduction of class relations through their pedagogic relationship with their children.

We would expect that the field location of the family, on the basis of the father's occupation, will affect the classificatory principles which are realised in the family. There are more women in the field of symbolic control than in that of production, given the occupational distribution in the UK, and we would expect these women to hold relatively weak classificatory values (see Chapter 6). As mothers they would be likely to favour theories of child development which entail a practice of both weak classification and weak framing. We note from our data that fathers in the field of symbolic control are more likely than those in production to marry women who are located on the basis of their own current or past work in the same field, thus reinforcing the effect of field location.
From the above we could expect different classificatory principles between the fields of symbolic control and production, realised in the agencies of primary and secondary socialisation.

There may be differences, even opposition, between the two fields with respect to the state. We could suggest that (i) dominant agents in the field of production may like to see a reduction in public expenditure and certain forms of state activity; whereas (ii) agents in the field of symbolic control might like to see public expenditure expanding, since it is the field of their own activity, and specifically in the case of education, it is crucial to their means of reproduction as a class group.

2.2 **Divisions within the fields of production and symbolic control**

Agents specialising in symbolic control themselves, at any given historical conjuncture, could be operating as insulation maintainers, repairing, regulating, or reproducing the social relations of the social division of labour, and the concomitant power relations. They may, however, be operating as redefiners of boundaries, agents of potential change in the relations between the categories of the social and sexual division of labour and the concomitant power relations. Thus these agents of symbolic control might hold strong or weak classification of the social and sexual division of labour, and indeed may move from one position to the other. One could put forward the hypothesis that in times of economic recession, agents in the field of symbolic control might move towards stronger classification of the principles, forms and relations of social organisation, but this, as most of the theoretical propositions put forward in this section, would be an issue for specific investigation.

In general terms we would argue that agents of symbolic control who are located in the field of production are likely to be more similar to agents in the field of production than to those located in the field of symbolic control in their ideological positioning. They will therefore have a tendency towards stronger classification of the categories of the social formation. The basic structure of the argument can be expressed in the model below (Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1
Pedagogic capital and the fields of the model

As individuals members of a class acquire pedagogic capital, they can be described as specialising in dominating principles of communication. Their control may extend over physical resources and discursive resources, located in the field of material production and field of symbolic control. They can be seen as located in the public sector or private sector.

By examining more closely the output or products of the public and private sectors, we can draw out some of the ambiguities which influence the ideological positioning of these agents of symbolic control. Public agencies are those regulated by the state, and private those owned by groups or individuals for profit or gain.

Figure 3.2
Products of public and private sectors and agents of symbolic control

In the public sector, either services or texts are produced by agencies and agents located in the field of symbolic control. It is in the private sector that ambiguity emerges. Services in this instance are professional practices offered for hire either to individuals or to a group enterprise, for profit or personal gain (for example, private doctors). These agents are then linked to the field of production and this may influence their ideological positioning, causing them to be more like agents in the field of production than like agents of
symbolic control within the field of symbolic control. In terms of the model used in this study these are agents of symbolic control operating within the field of production and are influenced by that location.  

Greater ambiguity is engendered within the category "text (marketed)" in the private sector. Here we have agents and agencies of symbolic control functioning in and directly regulated by the market conditions of the field of production. Within such agencies we are likely to find an internal division of labour and power between those directly concerned with gain and the demands of the market, and those directly concerned with the creation of the text to be marketed. The structurally different interests of these groups are liable to lead to conflict — we can think of the differing interests and concerns of film companies and producers as opposed to directors and actors in films; of theatre managers and owners and theatrical producers as opposed to playwrights and actors in the theatre; of gallery owners and artists, employers and architects, fashion houses and designers. We could argue that those directly concerned with gain and the demands of the market within the category "private, text (marketed)" are agents in the field of production; but those who create the texts are operating in the field of symbolic control. In the examples given above what we have essentially are agencies operating in the field of symbolic control within which are agents who are themselves located in either the field of production or of symbolic control, and influenced by the ideological positioning engendered by their location in these fields. Tension and conflict, differing interests and objectives are generated by such intersections of agents, agencies and fields. Detailed examination of the specificities of the ideological positioning of such agencies and agents would be a valuable empirical exercise.

At a general level, if we consider all agents of symbolic control whatever their field location, we would expect to find a potential conflict with their employers who hold power and define practice whether in a public or private agency. In the educational system which has produced agents of symbolic control, discursive resources have been historically separated from the field of production and its social relations. Such agents then can feel themselves to have inherited and certainly attempt to monopolise the reproduction of a space of relative autonomy from the demands of the local economic situation. This relative autonomy can however be foreclosed by
those with power, their employers. Our general statement about agents of symbolic control is that, whilst they are indirectly related to the field of production by virtue of their pedagogic socialisation, their actual field location will affect their interests and ideological positioning.

Our model maintains the distinction between the fields of production and symbolic control, but as we have seen there is overlap between the fields in terms of both institutions and agents. Agents of symbolic control can be located in the field of production; agents in the field of production can function in agencies of symbolic control; functions, agencies and agents of the state can occur in all fields in addition to the core functions of the state which we have identified in the model. Examples here are state education located in the field of symbolic control, and state owned enterprises located in the field of production.

Figure 3.3
Interrelationships between the fields of the model
2.3 The model we have used

We have thought it of value to pursue our investigation, which we regard as tentative and exploratory, only at the broad level of the two fields we have outlined in the model. For any future use the model would require elaboration and extension incorporating the fruits of the process of conceptual development which the distinction between the two fields has undergone (see Bernstein, 1985).

In our use of the model some of the positions outlined above can be identified. We have looked for example at ideal typical locations within our broad fields, which exclude any agents of symbolic control located in the field of production, and focusses on those agents who are in positions of dominating power or control in the organisations or enterprises in which they are located.

Although we expected that the classificatory principles held within the working class would vary with field location, we were unable to investigate this issue since most of our working class sample (97%) were located in the field of production.

We can separate two analytically distinguishable features of the model. The model can be seen at the level of offering a principle for derivation of a more specific description of class and within class groups than occupational scales in current use. This description is clearly informed by theories of class formation. At this level of description we could leave open predictions about differences in the expected positions taken by individuals located on our map. The question put to any data would be, how do groups of individuals located in different sectors of the map respond? From this point of view we would be concerned to examine the specific underlying conditions of ideological variation and change of groups according to field location and class position. Such a study would require a very large sample of individuals within each location, or it would need to be focussed on specific locations in depth.

We are, instead, tentatively proposing in very broad terms the conditions for ideological variation within and between the fields of our model. We make these proposals more as a call for research than as confident prediction. We have not, in this study, operated with the specificity which the
model, in principle, offers, and our hypotheses are based on combinations of groups which we have in fact separated both in the above discussion and in the model.

3 The hypotheses taken to the data

We will conclude this section with some hypotheses derived from the model which have guided our investigation of the data.

(1) At the level of the broad distinction between fields in our model, we would expect that those in the field of production would take a more conservative position (in support of the status quo) on issues relating to both the social and sexual division of labour. In terms of the concepts used to analyse our data, we would expect those in the field of production to have stronger classification of the categories of the social division of labour and of gender differentiation than those in the field of symbolic control.

(2) We would expect those in the field of symbolic control to be influenced to a greater extent than those in the field of production by the processes of education. This would manifest itself in a greater concern to acquire education and greater support for the meritocratic ideology in its educational realisation. Once again, in terms of the concepts used to analyse the data, we would expect from this group a greater recognition of both the systemic and the classificatory relation between education and production.

(3) We cannot make clear predictions for the working class as a whole with respect to education, since we could expect differences within even the indigenous working class. We can indicate some possible positions:

(i) a recognition of the systemic relation between education and production which could lead to: (a) acceptance of the meritocratic ideology and of their own relative success or failure in terms of both educational and occupational aspiration in these terms; or (b) a rejection of that ideology and/or of the capacity of the educational system to enable them to realise any high levels of occupational aspiration;
(ii) a notion of the irrelevance of education for the form they expect their life to take, basing expectations more on family and/or neighbourhood patterns of employment and experience.

(4) If we consider again the sexual division of labour, we might expect more traditional views, stronger classification of gender differentiation from the working class adolescents than from those in the middle class, and particularly from boys for whom sexual division may constitute the only area of power.

It is difficult to offer hypotheses about changes in classification consequent upon age. One could imagine multiple influences on the adolescents (including peer groups, the media, school, etc.) might have varying effects on them, changing or reinforcing the positioning generated in the primary socialising context of the family. For example, in the case of gender classification, we might expect:

(i) a movement towards stronger classification, as concerted ideological messages reinforcing gender hierarchy are experienced;
(ii) a movement towards weaker classification, as counter hegemonic messages from various sources are experienced;
(iii) a weakening of gender classification could also be effected by adherence to ideological messages related to equality and meritocratic reward.

In the case of classificatory features of the principles of the social division of labour offered by the adolescents, similar alternative expectations could be held. We have included the variable of age in the study in order to examine any changes which occur.

Our hypotheses are tentative in that the sample consists of children at school rather than individuals with personal experience of work and the sphere of production. We are thus considering the ideological positioning of our adolescents in relation to the class and field location of their family.

In the following section we will give the empirical specification of the class and field location of the sample and briefly indicate the way in which we have considered the issue of women and class.
Empirical specification of the class and field location of the sample

The focus in the above description and discussion has been on the middle class, which provided the major impetus for the initial development of the model. Any agency or organisation within the three fields will have people working in it, however, who are not members of the middle class. In order to give a precise location for any individual in the social space defined by the three fields which we have delineated above, we have mapped a further dimension onto these fields - the occupational hierarchy, a class-linked hierarchy of functions. The particular form of this hierarchical ordering used here is taken from a range of sources, varying in the degrees of precision with which they order functions, but which share a basic consensus on the ranking of the occupational structure.\textsuperscript{13} We have also incorporated distinctions which are related to our overall theoretical concerns.\textsuperscript{14} Table 3.1 lays out the network of social relations and agencies produced by this juxtaposition.

In this formulation a person's position is defined with reference to location within three interrelated systems: location in a field, location in a specific subsection of a field, and location in the hierarchical ordering of occupations. We consider that ideological representations will be related to (a) similarity, or difference in hierarchical position across different fields; (b) similarity of hierarchical position within the same field; and (c) variation within the field related to the specific subsection of that field in which the individual is located.

Most of our manual workers are concentrated in the field of production, whilst our non-manual workers are more evenly spread across the fields of production and symbolic control, with a few representatives of each in the field of the state as defined in the model.\textsuperscript{15} As we have indicated above, our major concern at this stage in developing the model was to enable us to examine more closely those fractions of the middle class discussed above in the fields of production and of symbolic control, and our sample was designed to meet this requirement, but the general model can be applied, as we have suggested here, to both the middle class and the working class. We would expect there to be variation in the ideological positioning of our manual groups related to their location in the different fields, and to test this
Table 3.1: The model of the social division of labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symbolic Control</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Large Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self employed or employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employed, higher grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employed, lower grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technical specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial administration</td>
<td>Commodity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Large scale or higher grade</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reproductive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Small scale or lower grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaping: Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaping: Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self employed non professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Own business/ small employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical/secretarial, low level white collar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Semi-skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hypothesis we would need to obtain a sample of manual workers much more evenly distributed across the two basic fields than we have managed to achieve in this case. We might also expect variation in response in terms of the subsection of the field of production in which the individual was located. Given the nature of most manual labour, however, and the sectors defined within the field of production, there will always be a preponderance of manual workers in this field. We will describe the categories of the network of social space generated in the above way and used to allocate our adolescents to class positions, giving examples of occupations falling into the categories of the typology.

4.1 Description of the model of class used in this study

4.1.1 Sectors within the field of production

1 - Commodity: This covers all commodity production including foodstuffs, raw materials, and the construction industry. Examples here are factory process workers, miners, bricklayers, clerical and office workers, entrepreneurs, managers and professionals working in such industries.

2 - Distributive: This is the distribution end of the chain of commodity production including transport workers who move goods, those who sell, or who manage or own outlets or organisations involved in the distribution of goods. A person who works as a manager in a firm which both produces and distributes, unless s/he is specifically a sales manager (distribution) will be included in the "Commodity" group. Examples are lorry drivers, shop assistants, retail managers, shop owners.

3 - Monetary: Those who work in and for financial institutions involved in the circulation of capital, e.g. banking, insurance, stockbroking, building societies, at all levels.

4 - Service: All forms of service, including the catering industry, public transport industry and personal services. Other specific examples are hairdresser, self employed taxi driver, estate agent.
We have made this category of production rather wide compared to some conceptualisations of productive work (for example that of Poulantzas (1975)), but the subcategories within our major groupings on both axes enable us to go to quite a fine level of distinction in selecting particular categories of worker, or particular locations within the social formation.

4.1.2 Functions within the field of symbolic control

When applied to the middle class group within this field, the members were regarded as dominant agents of symbolic control, and this terminology will be retained for our discussion, although the field itself has been extended in the general model to include manual workers in the specialised agencies which operate in the areas of symbolic control.

5 - Diffusive: Involved in the function of the circulation of ideas and information in the mass or specialised media, broadcasting, the performing arts. This category includes actors, musicians, dancers, models, film and theatre directors, and workers and technicians working in the relevant agencies.

6 - Reproductive: Involved in the function of teaching and education at all levels, nursery, primary, secondary, tertiary and further education. Manual workers in these agencies. In the original formulation reproducers were a subcategory of diffusers.16

7 - Reparative: Those working at any level in the medical and psychiatric services, public or private; and in the social services. Their function is to prevent, repair or isolate what count as breakdowns in the mind, body, or in social relationships.

8/9 - Shaping: This has two elements:

8 - Science: Those specialising in scientific and technical developments and practices.17
9 - Culture: This category includes the arts and design\(^{18}\) (novelists, poets, composers). We have in this particular usage placed religion in this category, but in the original formulation, religion was placed with the legal system in a separate category of Regulators, which could in some instances overlap with Repairers. In the current model the legal system is located in the state, but individual members of the legal profession working within companies in the productive sector would be located as professionals in the field of production.

10 - Executive: This includes those engaged in administrative functions and is principally seen as the executive arm of the legislature - the Civil Service at all levels - but also includes local government. Administrative functions also exist in the above agencies, and in the current application, with the introduction of the hierarchical ordering in conjunction with field location, individuals can be precisely placed within the field.

4.1.3 The core functions of the state

11 - Legislative: Producing the law, parliament.

12 - Judiciary: All levels of the legal system and law enforcement.

13 - Military: The armed forces.\(^{19}\)

4.2 The occupational hierarchy

Much of the class linked hierarchy of occupational functions is self explanatory from the description given in Table 3.1, but some further information is necessary on one or two points. Manual work is divided into skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled manual work, and in most of the published scales there is considerable agreement on which jobs go where within this division. We have included supervisors of manual workers, foremen in immediate contact with the men or women they supervise in this grouping. These individuals will often have come from the shop floor, and operate in the area between the productive worker and the managerial function.
"Clerical, secretarial, and low level white collar" is a category which is largely occupied by women given the vertical sex segregation of the occupational structure. In this particular study, few of the fathers could be placed in the category as low level white collar workers, since our intention was to find fathers more deeply embedded in the fields corresponding to fractions of the middle class. As a result of attempting to locate the mothers of our sample in the model, we concluded that in order to locate women adequately, this category would require expansion, elaboration and redefinition. This would be a necessary requirement for any future development or use of the model.

The following category, "small entrepreneurs", is divided into those who employ people (5-99 employees) and those who do not, or who employ four or less. If greater definition of this function were required for a particular purpose, these categories could obviously be broken down into smaller groups on the basis of number of employees, as is done with the allocation of the entrepreneurial function in the Hall-Jones Scale (1951). Company owners with over 100 employees are in the "large entrepreneur" category. The managerial/administrative function is broken down into "small scale or lower grade" functions, which contains lower grades of administration and managers and those in small scale enterprises in commerce, public utilities etc., and "large scale or higher grade", which contains managers and administrators in large commercial undertakings or public utilities, and senior officers in local or central government. It is clear that much of this section is considerably influenced by Goldthorpe and Hope's (1974) scale of occupational prestige.

The "professional" group appears next in our ordering, although this category is not restricted to occupations where the holders must belong to a recognised professional body, such as the legal and medical professions. Qualifications of specific talents or skills are required, however, and we have included the teaching profession and artists and performers in this grouping. Members of the teaching profession are categorised as "employed, lower", or "higher" grade, with the higher grade preserved for university and college level, and the lower for all schools; artists are seen as self employed cultural shapers, and performers appear in the subsection "diffusive". The "other" category was included in case we were unable to allocate an occupation when
the model was used for categorising our adolescent's parents' occupations, but remained unused.20

5 Women and class

We discuss the thorny issue of the class location of women in Chapter 1 above. Major criticisms have been made of the practice of allocating women to a social class on the basis of their position in a family, either of origin or of marriage. The family has traditionally been the unit of analysis for sociological studies of class, and the focus of such studies, following Marx, has been on production, and the location of the male family head in the social division of labour and relations of production. There have been major attempts to redress this balance, for example by focussing on the family and gender relations and suggesting a second class system generated in the context of these sets of practices and relations, with a material base in women's labour or reproductive capacity. Other attempts at a satisfactory expression of women's class location have emphasised women's work in production as a source of their own class definition or consciousness. The problem of the class position of women remains unresolved, and piecemeal solutions, particular ways of integrating women into particular class models, or exhortations about the necessary integration of the sexual division of labour with the social division of labour abound in the literature. The elements of the total picture are available, most agree on what is required, but the exact interrelationship between class and gender remains unspecified. The current study falls somewhat into both piecemeal and exhortation camps.

The model used in the study follows the tradition of focussing on production and the labour market to allocate our subjects to a class location. Since the adolescents are not yet working it is their family of origin which we use to place them in the class structure, and we place both fathers and mothers into class locations on the basis of their occupations. Where sufficient detail is available (88% of our mothers work or have worked), class is defined by relation to production, indicated by the individual's occupation, with intra class variation specified by our particular model. The family is seen as a crucial socialising agency, and it is expected that the conceptualisation of both class (the social division of labour) and gender (the sexual division of
labour) which the adolescents hold will be influenced by their placement in a family in a particular class location.\textsuperscript{21} We do have cross-class families, and those with parents in different fractions of the middle class. In most of our analyses we locate the adolescent on the basis of the father's class location, but in some we take both father's and mother's position into account in looking at and interpreting the adolescent's responses.

The development of a class model which would adequately capture the specificity of the position of women in relation to their location in the family and in production was a task beyond the range of this study, much as we would have wanted to have accomplished it. We concur with Cooper (in Reid and Wormald, 1982: 28) that "it might be argued that the major enduring problem for the social analysis of the position of women in society is the problem of the relation between patriarchy and class domination as the chief principles of social organisation". This problem is discussed in Chapter 1 above.

The following tables give the proportion of mothers for each of the age, gender, class and within class groups who work or have worked, full time and part time.\textsuperscript{22}

In this chapter we have outlined the model of class and the division of labour which we developed for use in this study, focussing as we were on particular fractions of the middle class. We have indicated some of the difficulties in our approach and the complicating factors which arise from the interrelated nature of the fields, agencies and agents which we wished to identify. We have also indicated briefly areas in which the model would need to be elaborated and improved in any future application. We have derived some tentative hypotheses which we have taken to the data, and the following chapters report the empirical study. The detailed exposition of the concepts used in the study is integrated with the presentation of the results in Chapters 5-11, but we start in Chapter 4 with a description of our sample and methodology.
Table 3.2:
Mothers' work for those in our sample with a precise field location (in percentage terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently works full time</td>
<td>32 31</td>
<td>32 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently works part time</td>
<td>42 43</td>
<td>35 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mothers currently working</td>
<td>74 74</td>
<td>67 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers who have worked full time or part time in the past outside the home</td>
<td>8 9</td>
<td>14 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mothers who work or have worked</td>
<td>87 83</td>
<td>81 92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total mothers in sample who currently work = 74%; who have ever worked outside the home = 87%
NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1 Kohn and Schooler (1973: 117), in a study of the impact of occupational experience on psychological functioning, suggest that their results support the position of Marx and the structuralists that "men (sic) similarly located in the structure of society come to share beliefs and values because they experience similar conditions of life". They conclude: "A man's job affects his perceptions, values, and thinking processes primarily because it confronts him with demands he must try to meet. These demands, in turn, are to a large extent determined by the job's location in the larger structures of the economy and the society. It is chiefly by shaping the everyday realities men must face that social structure exerts it psychological impact."

2 The term is taken from Bourdieu (1978: 203), who defines field as "a system of differentiated positions which are united by objective relations of complementarity, competition, and or conflict and which can be occupied by relatively interchangeable agents who, in the strategies which put them in opposition to those who hold different positions, are obliged to take account of the objective relations between the positions."

3 In other words the economic field.

4 From a Marxist perspective the role of the state in capitalist society is threefold: (1) to facilitate the process of capital accumulation (this is implicit in Marx's conception of the relationship between the state and society - the state as 'supervisor' of the operations of capitalist production. The more explicit expression of this relation in Marx is the state as the vehicle for the realisation of the interests of the dominant class, an agency of class domination (see Giddens (1973: 51)), (2) to ensure a favourable context for this process, and (3) to provide legitimation for the process. Poulantzas amongst others has pointed out that the overall concern of the state to protect the long-term framework of capitalist production may conflict at particular historical points with the short term interests of the capitalist class. Offe and Ronge (1981: 82) suggest that "policies of the capitalist state by no means unequivocally 'serve' the interests of the capitalist class; very often they are met with the most vigorous resistance of this class."

5 Bourdieu's distinction is between the property owning middle class whose reproduction depends on the transmission of physical capital and the non property owning new middle class whose privileges depend on the transmission of cultural capital. See Goldthorpe and Llewellyn (1977) for a discussion of the extent to which the new middle class does reproduce itself (pp. 267, 273). Marceau (1974: 222) indicates for France the extent to which the propertied class fails to reproduce itself. Parkin (1979: 63ff) argues that the less than perfect reproduction rates demonstrated by the dominant classes, whether based on property or credentials, is an indication of "a system designed to promote a class
formation biased more in the direction of sponsorship and careful selection of successors than of hereditary transmission".

6 Bernstein has been developing and clarifying the distinction since his first identification of it. The latest description appears in Bernstein (1985).

7 Bourdieu and Boltanski (1978) argue that the dominant class has moved from a mode of reproduction involving the direct transmission of physical capital, to one in which education and cultural capital play a crucial part. This may be less efficient in ensuring that any individual will be a member of the same class as his family of origin, but allows for the reproduction of the class as a whole. A similar point is made by Parkin (1979: 63). We would argue that a proportion of the dominant class reproduces itself by direct transmission of physical capital, and a proportion supplements physical with cultural, or more precisely pedagogic capital. The relatively unchanging distribution of wealth in the UK and the role of public schools and the role of ancient universities in the reproduction of this class give implicit support to the argument. The new middle class, recruited in mobility terms from both the dominant class (to some degree) and points further down the social scale, are more reliant, in some cases in the transition period totally reliant, on pedagogic capital for their position in the social formation, and for the means of transmitting this to their offspring. This description suggests a further cross cutting line in our two fields, those higher in the hierarchy and closer to power (in production) and control (in symbolic control) constitute parts of the dominant class.

8 Bernstein's concept of classification is used to analyse the data in this study, and the concepts of classification and framing are defined and discussed in general in Chapter 6, p. 210. The specific way in which the concept of classification has been applied to each of the topic areas of our study is discussed in each of the relevant chapters (i.e. Chapters 7, 8 and 9).

9 Gould (1981), as we have noted in Chapter 2 above, has suggested that the members of what he calls the salaried middle class, some of whom would be agents of symbolic control in our terms, work within state organisations in support of the interests of neither capital nor labour. Gould considers that this group works in support of its own interests to the detriment of those of capital and labour, and the apparent lack of solidarity and diffuseness of the class organisation of the salaried middle class masks their growing power. He draws attention to the contradictory views about this class which are disseminated by its members (for example academics, journalists, and marxist intellectuals) which serve further to disguise the significance of the class.

10 This formulation has arisen out of discussion with Bernstein.

11 Bernstein now locates these agents in the field of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1985) but their ideological positioning is likely to be regulated by their market situation.

12 See Chapter 9 for a description of these concepts and their use in the study.
See Reid (1977) for a discussion of the range of class/occupational hierarchies used in social research. The particular formulation developed here is heavily influenced by the prestige ranking generated by Goldthorpe and Hope (1974). See also Coxon and Jones (1979) for a critique of sociologists' methods and approach to the study of social class and the occupational hierarchy. These authors, using an intriguing combination of interpretative and more formal methods in an empirical study of subjective understanding of social stratification, attempt to recover individuals' cognitive maps of the social hierarchy. Nichols (1979) argues that both sociologists and official statistics when talking about class are largely referring to status.

For example, the category of supervisory role amongst manual workers which was related to Poulantzas' (1975) notion of domination and subordination at the political level.

The adolescent sample distributed onto this network of social relations is given in Chapter 4, p. 149.

This formulation differs in some respects from the original, Bernstein (1977: 129).

For the purposes of the model the separation between science as a modality of symbolic control and science as an aspect of production is made at the level of the individual and the type of organisation within which s/he works. The pure scientist and teacher is located in symbolic control and the scientist working in a commercial organisation can be seen as a professional (agent of symbolic control) in the field of production. At the extremes this distinction clearly works, but there is interplay and interaction between the two modalities for the assimilation, dissemination and practical application of scientific theory and practice. One could argue that the theoretical products of science appear in the symbolic field, but the practical applications occur in the field of production. If we think, however, of the development of new technology (and particularly of information technology), it is the logic of thought over a long period which results in technological and scientific development, but particular technological developments can themselves change and affect both discourse and the process of scientific invention/discovery. I am indebted to C. Knee for drawing this point to my attention.

For Bourdieu and Delsaut (1975), couture houses are located in the cultural field. In our formulation they would be regarded as in the field of production. Such organisations would also function, as would much advertising, as forms of ideological control, especially with respect to women.

The distinction between the State and the structure of symbolic control has similarities with Althusser's (1971) distinction between ideological and repressive state apparatuses, but in our formulation, ideology is diffused in each of these areas. It should be noted that in most of our analyses people working in agencies of the state as defined in our model were excluded, since their numbers were few, and our focus was on the fields of production and symbolic control.
20 Some examples of work done by fathers in our sample falling into the categories of the model are included in Appendix 1.

21 We have some data on family practices related to the class locations generated by our model garnered from a study by Wells (see Chapter 6).

22 The distribution of mothers' and fathers' occupations by field of the model for the middle class group appears in Chapter 4, Table 4.8, p. 155.
CHAPTER 4

THE SAMPLE AND METHOD USED IN THE STUDY

1 Introduction

The first three chapters of this thesis have laid out the theoretical background for the work. We discussed in Chapter 1 the literature on gender relations in order to place this work in context, and to indicate the sources of particular conceptualisations employed in the study. We outlined our use of the concept of patriarchy, and developed a model indicating the ways in which we see patriarchal and class ideologies reaching the consciousness of individuals in the society. In Chapter 2 we discussed the origins of the model of class (or the social division of labour) developed for use in this study, and its relationship with other modes of theorisation of class groups and relations.

In Chapter 3 we described the specific model of class used in the study, and touched upon some problems in empirically grounding the theoretical constructs of class and class fractions employed. The development of the model in a form in which it could be used to allocate individuals to class locations drew closer attention to the complexity of the interrelationships between the fields of production and symbolic control. To some extent these issues were dealt with in the construction of the model, but some issues were irresolvable and must be seen as indicators for the direction in which any future specification of the model must go to progress. The model, as developed at the stage it had reached when the empirical study was undertaken, has been used and the following chapters are a description of the application of the model to our sample and the testing of hypotheses which we derived from the model.

This first chapter in the empirical section of the thesis (Chapter 4) describes the origins of the study in previous work on the social division of labour, and the construction of the sample in some detail. This is followed by a discussion of the methods employed and a description of the questionnaire, and the rationale for inclusion of particular topics and questions. The basic coding categories developed in the analysis of the data are described with some examples from the adolescents' responses, which provide a feeling for
the nature of the data. The remaining chapters in the empirical section of the thesis describe the analyses which were undertaken on sections of the questionnaire which dealt with specific topic areas, and the results of the analyses.

2 The Sample

2.1 Origins of the study and construction of the sample

The original impetus for the research reported here arose from a study of eight-year-old children undertaken within the Sociological Research Unit at the Institute of Education. This study of 60 eight-year-olds, selected so as to represent typical middle class and lower working class children, revealed a considerable degree of awareness and knowledge of aspects of the social division of labour, and of inequalities, together with class differences in the content of this awareness. For example, the children were easily able to grade occupations in terms of income level, with a clear idea of who earned most and who least, identifying a board of directors as top earners, and a road sweeper as the lowest earner, despite an inadequate understanding of the amounts of money involved. When asked whether differential economic return for work was fair or unfair, the children had strong views which were related to their social class background - most middle class children (particularly boys) thought it was fair; most working class children thought it was unfair. (Sixty percent of the middle class children thought it fair; seventy-six percent of the working class children thought it unfair.) We were surprised to discover these views in eight-year-old children and were able to trace in their responses to these and other questions a range of statements which we saw as reflecting certain ideological messages available in this society.

At the age of eight we might expect some influence from the school experience on the child's understanding of her/his social world, but perhaps a greater impact could be attributed to the family. Certain questions were posed by these findings. Do these ideas about social life and the supporting ideologies change with age, and if so in what way? Would working class children maintain their views of the inequities of income inequality as they grew into adolescence? We decided to examine these questions and that two
stages of adolescence should be investigated - 12-13 years of age, the second year of secondary education, and 15-16, the fifth and final year of compulsory schooling. The choice of these ages was dictated by the type of experience the adolescent could be expected to have had or be having in an educational setting. The second year pupil has some experience of secondary education, and is at the point where her/his future educational career is being focused as a result of previous experience and the choices which must be made about public examinations and specialisation. The fifth year pupil will have experienced the effect of these decisions and will also be orientated to her/his potential future life and career. We wanted to look at adolescents who were still at school since we were interested in the ways in which they conceived of work, their place in it, and the ideological basis of their legitimations of the principles of the social and sexual division of labour. To this end the last year of compulsory schooling was taken, since for many working class children the next step is joining the labour force. The two age points were seen as having particular relevance in terms of both the educational process and its relationship to the social division of labour.

The need for specific subgroups within the middle class dictated the location of our sample in the educational system. At the outset of the research, the model of the social division of labour derived from the distinction between those located in the field of production and those in the field of symbolic control had not been fully developed; indeed one of the aims of the research was to develop such a model. The broad parameters of this model were, however, defined. Our major concern was to select a middle class sample containing adolescents whose fathers were located in the fields of production and of symbolic control. This sample was drawn from fee paying public schools and further details of these schools will be given later in this chapter. The working class sample was drawn from state comprehensive schools, chiefly in the Inner London area. The working class sample was defined by having fathers engaged in manual, skilled, semi- or unskilled work, or working in supervisory capacities in connection with this type of work.

It can be seen that for the class location of our adolescents we are using father's occupational position and the child's own educational experience. We use the father's occupational position to locate our adolescents' families in a nominal social class hierarchy since (i) this follows
the mainstream sociological approach to nominal social class; (ii) our concern was with aspects of the social division of labour and its impact on people in specific locations in that division, which is defined by their occupation and we wished to use occupational function in order to distinguish subgroups within a common social class location. We have discussed above (Chapter 1, p. 69 and Chapter 3 p. 130) the problems associated with the class location of women, which is an issue squarely placed in the problematic with which this study is concerned - the interrelation between class (revealed in the social division of labour) and patriarchy (revealed in gender hierarchy).

The traditional approach to this problem is to assign women to the class of their family as dictated by the male 'head' of the family, that is the father for their family of origin, and husband for their family of marriage. For most purposes of analysis we have taken this approach for our girls, and located them by their father's occupation. As indicated in the discussion of women and class above, we are not unaware of the inadequacies of this procedure, more especially for adult women, and have assigned the mothers in the sample to class positions on the basis of their current or past work experience. In some cases in our analyses we have looked at the relationship between the mothers' and fathers' location in the social division of labour and have used the mother's location itself as an independent variable when examining the adolescents' responses.

For some of our general comparisons, where the father's occupation was not available, the child could be allocated to the broad categories of middle or working class on other information available to us, for example the school attended, selected as we have noted on general class related grounds, or other information internal to the individual's completed questionnaire.

2.2 Obtaining a sample with the required attributes

2.2.1 The middle class sample

We needed to obtain a sufficiently large sample to be able to establish an empirically viable distinction between the two fractions of the middle class specified in our model, those in the fields of production and of symbolic control. We proposed to take our middle class sample from independent
schools, aiming to include both highly academically oriented institutions, with a 'traditional' pedagogic practice, and schools which could be considered to have a somewhat more 'progressive' style. 3

Initially we thought that parents in the field of symbolic control might be more likely to send their children to schools with a more 'progressive' pedagogic style; this was borne out in only one of our schools. Middle class parents might choose a school as either a modifier or an enhancer of the habitus of the home, and all but one of the schools we used had relatively similar proportions of children from both the field of production and of symbolic control. We approached a number of schools which met our criteria, and five agreed to let us conduct our research. All but one girls' school which was included in our sample were very expensive fee-paying schools, with fees averaging from £1,800 to £2,000. The sizes of the schools ranged from 500 or less (small) through 800 or so (medium) to 1,300 (large).

Overall the five schools which agreed to let us conduct our research met our basic requirements. The range of parental occupations allowed a division into the two groups in whom we were particularly interested, those in the field of production and those in that of symbolic control. There were a limited number of members of the field of the state as defined in our model (see Table 4.3 below), and we eliminated this group from detailed study.

2.2.2 Brief descriptions of the schools from which the middle class sample was obtained

(1) A medium sized girls' school which had just changed to mixed ability intake at age 11+ in the year of our study, but which previously had a fee-paying, high academic intake. The stated aim of the school is to provide a broadly balanced education including academic and creative work, and to encourage responsibility and an awareness of community needs, both in school and in the broader society. A wide range of subjects is offered at 'A' level GCE, and the girls can mix science and arts subjects. The school has a good academic record and a relatively 'progressive' style. There was a predominance of parents from the field of symbolic control in our sample from this school.
(2) A small, mixed independent school with wide age range and a progressive teaching style. The school had a mixed ability intake, and parents from both small scale entrepreneurial and managerial occupations in the field of production, and professional and other backgrounds from the field of symbolic control. The school is in a pleasant location, well equipped, with an interested and articulate student body. About 66% of the students take GCE 'A' levels, and over 50% go on to university.

(3) A medium sized independent girls' school with a strong academic tradition, and a highly selected intake. The school is in a very attractive building and setting and has a wide range of facilities. There was a slight preponderance in our sample from this school of parents from the field of production. The school is described by the head teacher as a "very personal, family school, despite its size" with a strong sense of identity and loyalty. Ninety-five per cent of the girls take 'A' level GCE and 80% and more go on to university. The school has a tradition of a particular interest in languages and science.

(4) Once again the physical setting is appealing with pleasant buildings in attractive surroundings for this medium sized independent school with a selective high academic intake and a commensurate reputation. Whilst previously a boys' school, the school had just changed to a mixed intake and girls were present in the first and second years. Consequently our younger age group from this school was mixed, the older group was all male. The girls were thought to be of exceptional ability for their age group and there was a slight preponderance of parents in the field of symbolic control amongst the girls in our sample from this school. In general, however, the deputy head teacher reported that the parents came equally from business and professional backgrounds and this was borne out in the distribution of our sample into the fields of production and symbolic control. Ninety per cent of the pupils take 'A' level GCE and 50% of these go to university.

(6) A large, ancient, independent boys' school in beautiful surroundings. The school has a high academic intake, 90% of the pupils take 'A' level GCE, and 70% of these go on to university. The parents in our sample from this school were equally distributed between the fields of production and of symbolic control.
2.2.3 The working class sample

We expected that within the manual working class, occupational position and function would in some way regulate the ideological position of the family and therefore the socialising experience of the children with respect to our research issues. As a consequence it was of importance to ensure as far as possible that we drew a sufficiently large sample to include a range of positions and functions to allow for empirically viable subdivisions in terms of types of work.

The largest proportion of the working class are located in the field of production. As distinct from our middle class sample, we had no a priori principle which would enable us to select schools in order to draw a sample of working class families which would permit the subdivisions between production and symbolic control. To obtain a sample distributed across these fields we would have had to approach our target sample through the parents at their workplace and this was prohibitively expensive and time consuming, as was the alternative method of taking an extremely large sample from schools and hoping thereby to pick up a larger proportion of manual workers in agencies of symbolic control. Our aim for the working class groups was then to obtain a distribution across the subdivisions of the field of production, and to look particularly for any differences which might appear between service and commodity producing subgroups in the working class. In fact no clear differences were found amongst the subgroups, and the results of this analysis are not reported in this study.

As we wished to limit the number of variables in the working class sample, we chose schools in areas where there was a relatively low proportion of different ethnic groups.

The initial approach to the selection of schools for the working class part of the sample was to choose, with the aid of A Social Atlas of London and lists of the schools in the ILEA area and in the outer boroughs of London, schools which were located in parts of London which contained a high proportion of manual workers and a low proportion of different ethnic groups. A large number of schools was selected, and initial contacts made. The school heads approached in this way indicated that we would have to make contact
with the LEA and obtain permission to use our questionnaire in their schools before they could consider our request for the school to take part in our study. We decided at this point to confine our study to the area of one education authority, in order to facilitate the organisation of the necessary permission, and the ILEA, covering a large part of London, was the obvious choice. We accordingly approached the ILEA for permission to go into some of their schools. After protracted negotiations, including a detailed scrutiny of our questionnaire by a number of committees at the ILEA, permission was finally given for us to use ILEA schools. The questions about family background which appeared on the questionnaire were considered to be contentious and we had to persuade the ILEA of the necessity for the inclusion of these questions in the study, and the total anonymity which would be assured to the pupils. We were fortunate enough to have the cooperation of the Research and Statistics Department at the ILEA, to whom we conveyed the basic requirements which we had for our sample: that the schools should have mixed ability intake and that their catchment area should as far as possible include a high proportion of indigenous manual workers. The ILEA made it clear to us that they had no formal statistical or other information about the social class background of pupils in their schools. They could, however, comply with our request at the general level of specification of types of catchment area. They accordingly provided us with a list of schools, the head teachers of which were prepared to consider letting us undertake our investigation in their school. We then carefully considered the characteristics of the locality in which the school was placed and made a further selection on our two criteria of suitability.

2.2.4 Brief descriptions of the schools from which the working class sample was obtained

(1) A medium sized comprehensive with a mixed ability intake. Most of the children aimed to take some examinations and about 15% were capable in the teachers' view of taking GCE 'A' levels. In the period immediately prior to the time of our visits, there had been some overcrowding due to a fire which had limited accommodation, and caused some year groups to have lessons on another site. The staff reported good relations amongst themselves and with the pupils, and a core of long-term staff provided stability in the
school. There was a good atmosphere amongst the pupils, and they were
diligent and attentive in our sessions.

(2) A medium sized mixed voluntary school, which had previously been a
grammar school but had had mixed ability intake for four years prior to our
visits. Located in a large and attractive community centre with a wide range
of facilities, the school was seen by the children and staff as part of the
local community. Some attempt had been made to encourage children to take
courses more usually considered appropriate for the opposite sex, although the
attempt was in its infancy and little success could be reported. The staff
seemed dedicated and concerned with the children, and concerned also about
the fact that many of the parents were unemployed since the area in which
the school was located was a depressed one. The collection of data was
undertaken prior to the rapid acceleration in levels of unemployment seen in
recent years.

(3) A large, mixed comprehensive with a wide range of facilities on an
attractive site. The school is organised on the basis of year groups and tutor
groups within each year, in order to give a sense of community and
involvement in what can be seen as a rather large and potentially intimidating
school.

(4) A medium sized mixed comprehensive with a bright, brisk
atmosphere. A common core curriculum based on mixed ability teaching is
followed for three years. The main examinations taken at fifth year were
CSE, but there were an increasing number of GCE 'O' level entrants. The
sixth form can take a range of 'O' and 'A' levels, in cooperation with other
local schools.

(5) This was a small, mixed school with a contracting catchment area,
no sixth form, and destined for closure. Despite this, the teachers maintained
good morale, and pursued a 'relaxed formal' teaching style.

(6) A large mixed comprehensive, in modern buildings in an attractive
setting, with mixed ability intake. Setting takes place in the third year and a
wide range of subjects are offered at GCE 'O' level and CSE. Music is a
particular interest of the school and large numbers of the pupils play musical
### Table 4.1

The sample in manual/non-manual terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIDDLE CLASS</th>
<th>WORKING CLASS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments. The atmosphere in the school is good and the students were relaxed and cooperative.

#### 2.3 Description of the sample

The sample was a form of quota sample, where the requirements of the main variable of social class location was defined by parental occupation and educational experience, that is type of school attended. Schools were chosen within the constraints we have described above so as to have representatives of the social class groups we sought for our subjects typical amongst their intakes. The variables of age and sex indicated which groups to take from within the school. The working class part of our sample was distributed across skilled, semi- and unskilled work in proportions comparable to the distribution in the working population. The middle class part of the sample had a much higher proportion of parents at the upper end of the occupational hierarchy than in the population at large, given our specific interest in particular sections of the middle class.

In broad manual/non-manual terms, our sample was distributed as in Table 4.1.

In some early analyses of the data, prior to the detailed specification of our model, we allocated the subjects to social class groups on the basis of
a prestige scale developed by Goldthorpe and Hope (1974). This was a recently
developed scale based on a sample of 10,000 men, and we thought that it
would have some currency in sociological research, so that our sample
description would be comparable to that of others. We allocated the
adolescents to Goldthorpe and Hope's 36 point scale on the basis of their
father's occupation, and for some purposes used an eight point collapse of this
scale. The distribution of the sample on this collapsed scale, with the
categories defined briefly, was as follows (see also Table 4.2):

Categories of collapsed scale:

Non manual
1 Top professional and administrative, higher
managerial
2 Managerial other, and entrepreneurial large and
small
3 Self employed and salaried professional (lower
grade), administrative and technical, managers in
services and small administrative units
4 Low level white collar

Manual
5 Service
6 Skilled work, all levels including supervisory
7 Semi-skilled
8 Unskilled

In some instances in the results reported in the thesis, where a broad
manual/non-manual division is used to define the middle class and working
class, the total sample of 950 adolescents is used. In others, after the
specification of our model, we could only use individuals who gave us
sufficient information so as to be placed in our model, and the sample size
falls to 811. In the presentation and discussion of the results which
particular sample is being used is specified.

The distribution of our adolescents in terms of our model of the social
division of labour given in Table 4.3. Details of the contents of the categories
have been discussed above in Chapter 3.
Table 4.2
The sample in terms of an eight-point breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Symbolic Control</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Large Employer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self employed or employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employed, higher grade</td>
<td>5 1 1 3 7</td>
<td>5 3 0 3 1 1 6 23</td>
<td>4 1 2 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employed, lower grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technical specialist</td>
<td>1 1 1 6 1 3 6 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Large scale or higher grade</td>
<td>2 0 5 7 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Small scale or lower grade</td>
<td>9 1 4 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self employed non professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Own business/ small employer</td>
<td>2 0 2 8 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical/secretarial, low level white collar</td>
<td>2 1 4 7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisory</td>
<td>2 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Skilled</td>
<td>7 6 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Semi-skilled</td>
<td>3 5 4 8 4 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Unskilled</td>
<td>1 5 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In some instances this large sample was subsampled to give us particular groups which were of relevance to specific questions we were taking to the data, or to the pursuit of specific issues of concern derived from the theoretical suppositions of the model. We will define and describe these major subsamples here, and we refer to them when used in particular analyses. These distributions refer entirely to subsamples based on the allocation of the adolescents to our model of the division of labour.

2.3.1 The working class subsample

For the working class group the chief subsample contained those adolescents for whom we had a precise field location for the father. We omitted those who could only be allocated to the broadest manual grouping on the basis of other criteria, such as internal evidence from their questionnaire responses, or school attended. The distribution for this subsample was as in Table 4.4.

2.3.2 The middle class subsample

In the middle class group, three subsamples were created:
(i) The entire non-manual group for whom we had, on the respondent's report, a field location for the father. We subdivided this into two groups:
   (a) Those with fathers in the field of production
   (b) Those with fathers in symbolic control.
The distribution on these criteria was as in Table 4.5.

(ii) From within this group a more closely defined subgroup based on both the field location and the hierarchical position of the father's occupation was created. Here the main distinction is between entrepreneurial and managerial/administrative functions in production and professionals in agencies of symbolic control:

   **In the field of production:**
   Self employed non-professionals, small scale and large scale entrepreneurial functions, small and large scale managerial and administrative functions.

   **In the field of symbolic control:**
   Professional - self employed or employer, high or low grade professionals (technical specialists were omitted).

In terms of our model, these groups should constitute 'ideal typical' representatives of the two broad field locations. We would expect that compared to the total group of those in the fields of production and symbolic control, the groups in this subsample would be closer to the direction predicted by our model in the ideological positioning revealed by their answers. The distribution of these ideal typical middle class fractions is shown in Table 4.6.

(iii) A second subgroup from within the entire non-manual sample for whom a field location was available consisted of respondents whose father and mother were both located in the same field. The distribution of this subsample is shown in Table 4.7. A comparison between this group and the whole non-manual group for whom we have the father's field location might serve as an indication of the effect of the mother's field location on various of the issues we address.

Table 4.8 shows the relationship between the field location of the mothers and fathers in our middle class sample, including those in the field of
Table 4.5

The middle class subsample by field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SYMBOLIC CONTROL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6
The 'ideal typical' middle class subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th></th>
<th>SYMBOLIC CONTROL</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7
Both mother and father in the same field for the middle class sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father and mother in PRODUCTION</th>
<th>Father and mother in SYMBOLIC CONTROL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4.8

## Relationship between field locations of fathers and mothers in our sample

### 12+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symb. control</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>27 (47)</td>
<td>15 (26)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>41 (60)</td>
<td>19 (28)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>68 (54)</td>
<td>34 (27)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>10 (20)</td>
<td>29 (58)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12 (17)</td>
<td>36 (79)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>22 (18)</td>
<td>85 (70)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>96 (36)</td>
<td>130 (49)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symb. control</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
<td>22 (39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22 (45)</td>
<td>21 (43)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>41 (39)</td>
<td>43 (41)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>15 (29)</td>
<td>29 (56)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td>37 (66)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>27 (25)</td>
<td>66 (61)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M+F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>70 (31)</td>
<td>117 (52)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>15 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the state as defined by our model, who are excluded in the presentation of the results.

This distribution includes mothers whose children have given us a past or present job for them. It is interesting to note that in our group fathers in the field of symbolic control are more likely to have wives in the same field (70% at 12+ and 61% at 15+) than fathers in the field of production (54% at 12+ and 39% at 15+). Fathers in production were more likely to have wives for whom no work was given, or who were doing voluntary work or studying. It is also the case that in general in our middle class sample, girls' mothers were mentioned as working more than were boys' mothers. Although this may be merely a peculiarity of our sample, or may reflect the fact that girls notice and report their mother's work to a greater extent than do boys, it may also have some influence on the kind of responses which the middle class girls gave about women's work inside and outside the home. 4

3 The methodology employed

3.1 Choice of procedure

The initial planning for this research was based on an assumption that an interview method would be used to investigate adolescent responses to issues relating to the hierarchical ordering of the social division of labour and the interrelated gender hierarchy. The earlier study on eight-year-olds previously mentioned had employed an interview technique combined with photographs of agents in particular locations in the social division of labour (all male), and it was hoped to use comparable questions and approaches and related techniques in the study of adolescents. To this end an interview was developed and piloted. Variations on questions, on structuring the interview, and different approaches to the issues were tested during this period, as were the techniques of using photographs or names of occupations written on cards as eliciting material. It soon became apparent that this approach was too ambitious and the choices open to us were either to take a much smaller sample than we had envisaged, or to adopt a less intensive and time-consuming method. The possibility of maintaining or even increasing our proposed sample size was offered by the use of a questionnaire. After due
consideration of both the advantages and limitations of this method, some of which are discussed below, we decided to take this course. The initial interview piloting was used as a basis from which to develop the questionnaire, which was itself tested in a number of versions, enabling us to clarify certain ambiguities in the wording, and the effect of the ordering of particular sequences of questions.

3.2 Advantages and disadvantages of a questionnaire method

The comparative advantages and disadvantages of questionnaire and interview techniques in the social sciences are well rehearsed. In our particular case perhaps a few points on the potential advantage of the anonymity of the questionnaire format should be made. First, since many of the questions were related to what the respondent thought about women in certain roles and performing certain functions in the social and gender differentiated division of labour, an interviewer, with a particular gender of course, may have influenced the response in a much more direct way than if the respondent were merely completing a questionnaire. It might be hard for a boy to tell a female interviewer that he would not like to work for a woman boss, whereas he could feel quite happy to make this comment in the anonymity of writing. It might be difficult or embarrassing for a girl to tell a male interviewer what work she would like to do as a boy, but a female interviewer might elicit quite a different response. In fact, in pilot interviews, this question, posed by a female interviewer, provoked some extremely interesting comments on prejudice and discrimination against girls in the labour force and training and educational programmes from 15+ year old girls.

Another more general point is that in an interview a respondent who is face to face with another person may feel obliged to produce an answer to a question for which s/he has no answer. In a written response a moment can be taken for thought, or the question can be omitted. This latter course may cause some frustration for the researcher, but might more nearly realise what the respondent wishes to say at that moment. In some of our considerations of our responses we have read a non-response as being a particular kind of response (for example in Chapter 11, p. 381).
A disadvantage which should be mentioned is that of varying capacities for and speed of writing which may differentially affect individuals from different social class or educational backgrounds. Three mitigating comments can be made in this connection: (i) At our most general level of analysis the elaboration of any arguments or statements made by our respondents are not utilised; only the first and second main elements of the argument are included in our coding. This might discriminate against a more lengthy and elaborated response but allows for a person of few words to convey the same essential arguments in a way which is encompassed by our coding. (ii) Only limited space was available for each written answer. (iii) The presence of the researcher made it possible to note when writing difficulties were occurring.

3.3 Mode of interpretation

A more important and general point is related to the level of meaning which we both wish to use in our analyses and to impute to our respondents. This requires some explication. In principle we wish to regard the comments made by the adolescents in response to the flow of questions as indicative at some level of what we have called their ideological positioning, which we consider regulates the ideological representations they hold about certain key issues related to the fundamental categories of social organisation of gender and of class. Our approach is based on the notion of the primacy of the social division of labour and the hierarchical ordering of gender relations based on the principle of patriarchy in the shaping of individual consciousness, and the positioning of individuals which these divisions accomplish. At a general level, for the individual, positioning refers to the establishment of a specific relation to other agents or subjects, and to the creation of specific relationships within the subject; a conceptualisation of self. We argue that variations in ideological messages both received and transmitted by the individual agent, and their resulting ideological representations of the principles underlying the processes and organisation of the social formation, will be related to the agent's location in the social space defined by both the social division of labour and the sexual division of labour.

In social psychology, where the type of statements our questionnaire generates are described as attitudes, the reference point is the individual and the level at which s/he might hold the views s/he expresses; these can be
more or less enduring, deeply held or more superficial. The levels at which attitudes can be held are distinguished as - at the most superficial level – beliefs, progressing at the next level to attitudes, then to values, and finally to personality, a fundamental psychological construct (Oppenheim, 1966: 169). In our perspective, the reference is to the social nature and origin of such views and their source in social relations of production and reproduction, which regulate in our terms ideological positioning. Just as in the social psychological model a stated belief can be held at a superficial level, and perhaps changed with the input of new data, it can also reflect much deeper levels of psychological organisation, so that a given ideological representation might reflect back on deeply grounded ideological positions, though not necessarily in itself a position which the individual is committed to uphold. It would be possible, for example, to convince an anti-feminist male that he is wrong in his belief that all feminists are lesbians, but this would not necessarily change his underlying anti-feminist position.

It will be seen in the later discussions of both the questions and the responses to them, that most of our questions are open ended and projective, with the exception of those seeking descriptive details on school plans and family background. The open ended and projective nature of the questions and the particular sequencing of some sets of questions (for example a series on the political process which gains meaning from their ordering) constitute our method of eliciting ideological representations. We conduct our analysis at two levels:

(1) The general positioning of the groups based on our variables of class, age, gender, and location within class. Here, by aggregating individual responses to particular questions we hope to be able to infer, from the types of ideological representations produced by each group, the ideological messages which lie behind these representations.

(2) The positioning of individuals. Here we aggregate the responses to a set of questions for each individual, again inferring from the ideological representations which they produce, the ideological messages which they are receiving and reproducing, and the resulting ideological positioning. The basic model is shown in Figure 4.1.
3.4 The structure of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was constructed primarily as a means of considering the effects of the interaction between class and patriarchy on adolescents' modelling of gender differentiation. Other aspects of their conceptualisation of the social world and its processes are clearly related to this basic concern. We would argue that it is in the interactional practices of the family that the principles and practices of gender differentiation and an orientation towards class relations are initially established and legitimised. Orientation towards the social division of labour and its social relations are likely to be a complex function of the interrelationship between class, education and gender, in the same way that the location of an individual agent in that division is a product of this interaction. For us it is the operation of the principles of patriarchy (which privileges men) and social class (which privileges certain groups within society) which generates the reproduction of the social division of labour. As we have said, these principles have their socialising origin in the practices of the family, but are found operating throughout the institutions and practices of the social formation. Our intention in the construction of the questionnaire was to address patriarchy through a series of questions on gender differentiation, and class through questions on the social division of labour.

As important adjuncts to these primary concerns, we also intended to address
the adolescents' understanding of the processes of education, and of certain features of political relations.

3.4.1 Modelling

We are using the term 'modelling' in order to provide a conceptual basis for examining the underlying structure of the adolescents' responses within each of the specialised areas of the questionnaire. It is through this notion that we have tried to escape from an atomised or question by question interpretation of the questionnaire so as to be able to take a more global approach and so reveal the form and degree of coherence which the adolescent is creating in the specific areas of our concerns. In using this term in preference to such terms as image, concept and model, we are stressing both process and the active participation of the subject in this process. This approach avoids an overdetermined conceptualisation of the adolescents' understanding of the social world and allows for the possibility of the existence of both dominant principles on which social organisation is based and which are supported by multiple ideological messages, and for the existence of contrary models of the social formation and important aspects of it, generated by dominated groups and subgroups and also supported by ideological elaborations. If we are able to identify distinctive forms of such modelling, particularly in relation to our basic variables of class, class fractions, age and gender, we can then consider the relation of ideology to such forms.

Some questions which were posed in the questionnaire can be seen as falling into more than one area of our concerns. We refer particularly to questions on aspirations for future work, which may be part of a modelling of the social division of labour and one's own location in that division; and in relation to gender, part of the modelling of gender differentiation. We shall discuss these particular questions below in relation to gender differentiation, but their relevance to the modelling of the social division of labour should be noted.
3.4.2 Modelling of gender differentiation

Questions:
1. What would you like to do when you leave school?
2. What sort of job do you think you will do when you start working?
3. What gave you the idea of doing that work?
4. Suppose you were a girl/boy (opposite sex to the respondent), what work would you like to do?
5. If you have given an occupation in answer to question 4, do many (same sex as respondent) do the work you mention?
6. Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls? (If yes, why is that? If no, why not?)
7. Are some jobs mainly done by men and others mainly done by women? Give reasons for your answer and examples of the kind of jobs you were thinking of.
8. Do you think you would be happy working for a woman boss or supervisor? Why is that?
9. If you got married and your husband was earning less than you (wife was earning more than you), would it bother you?
10. Who is responsible for looking after the home and family?
11. Is housework different from other kinds of work? If yes, in what ways?
12. Generally speaking, who usually does housework?
13. Do you think that people should be paid for doing housework? If yes, why? If no, why not?
14. A lot of women do housework and also have a job outside the home. For what kinds of reasons do they have jobs outside the home?
15. If a husband and wife both work outside the home, who should do the housework? Who should look after the children if there are children?
16. Does this usually happen?
17. Do you think you will get married? If yes, at about what age?
18. (for girls) If you do get married will you work after your marriage?
19. If you do get married, what work do you think your husband/wife will do, if any?
20. What would you say will be the most important thing in your life?
21. For (same sex as respondent) in general, what would you say was the most important thing?

22. What about for (opposite sex to respondent)? What would you say was the most important thing for (opposite sex)?

These questions did not appear as a block, although they were in the above order in the questionnaire. Some groups of questions, for example those on domestic labour, formed a sequence. The questions from the above set which are used to create an index of the strength or weakness of the classification of gender specialisation are discussed in more detail in the section of this study where that index is described (Chapter 7). It might be helpful, however, to make a few comments here. The basic focus is on women and work, both domestic labour and in the labour force. The questions were designed in such a way as to reveal aspects of gender differentiation. We were influenced in constructing the questions by other empirical studies and by current debates on the issue of gender relations, and planned to compare our results with those of other studies.

There is an extensive literature on work aspirations and expectations, much of it drawing attention to the element of reality which colours such choices, as it relates to social class, education and gender. We wished to be able to compare the results of our questions on aspiration with this body of work, particularly in connection with the stereotyping of girls' occupational choice. We differed from some interpretations of female stereotyped occupational choice, by considering social class differences in such choices and the implications of the expressed aspirations of girls in different social class locations. Despite our use of the word 'choice' in this connection, in which we follow the literature in this area of study, we consider that structural and cultural constraints operate to make the notion of 'choice' a misnomer, particularly in the case of women.

The question which called on our respondents to identify with the opposite sex and say what work they would aspire to as such (question 4 above) was taken from Sharpe (1976: 173) who used it in an interview with English, West Indian and Asian schoolgirls. In that situation, the question, in combination with a follow up question on why they did not aspire to the same job as a girl (which was usually the case), generated a considerable amount of
material which indicated recognition of discrimination against women in the labour market. We had similar experiences in pilot interviews with these questions. We tried to approximate the same sequence of questions in the questionnaire, with partial success. The initial question, however, did provide interesting material on sex typing of occupations, and the ability or otherwise of the adolescents to identify with the opposite sex, which we saw as related to a dimension of domination and subordination.

Other questions dealt with problems which have been raised in connection with women working outside the home, for example would our respondents be prepared to work for a woman boss (question 8 above). Hunt (1975) and Bass (1971) found that male managers considered that women do not make good supervisors or managers, and when pressed the respondents in the Bass study expressed the feeling that women would not be accepted in a supervisory role by other workers. Our questions about women earning more than men (question 9 above), personalised by its setting in the adolescent's projected future family, sought responses to a reversal of the more usual hierarchical ordering of male and female earnings.

The series of questions on domestic labour (questions 10 to 16 above) grew out of a consideration of the then current debate on domestic labour, and although not directly tackling some of the more esoteric of the issues arising from it, these questions were intended to provide some empirical material relevant to this debate. 8

The adolescents' orientation towards the basic gender differentiating institution of marriage were elicited (question 17). The question on what work their future spouse would do was expected to indicate any desire for upward mobility through marriage on the part of the girls in our sample (question 28). Turner (1964) and Psathas (1968) relate women's ambitions and aspirations to marriage to a man who will provide the means for realisation of such ambitions. The question on the appropriateness of sex segregated education (question 6) is relevant both to gender differentiation and to our series of questions concerned with the educational process in general. We expected, however, that the adolescents' modelling of gender differentiation would be revealed in different ways by all of these questions, as would elements of the ideological support for this modelling. In this, as in other series of questions,
issues specifically suggested in one question were sometimes raised in answers to other questions by our respondents. This is partly due to the interrelatedness of the questions, and the underlying area of social life which they address, and partly to the sequencing of the questions. Some of the indices which we use in the analysis of the data incorporate this possibility.

3.4.3 Modelling of the social division of labour and social relations

Questions:
1. What are some of the reasons for which people work?
2. What are some of the effects that a person's job can have on his or her life outside work?
3. People get different amounts of money for the work that they do. Why do you think this happens?
4. Some jobs are highly paid and some are not. Can you think of a few jobs that get the highest pay and a few that get the lowest pay and list them under the headings below?
5. Do you think it is fair or unfair that some people earn more money than others for the work they do? (Space left for respondents to tick FAIR or UNFAIR). Give reasons for your view.
6. What could the people in these jobs do if they thought they should earn more money for their work? Secretary, company director, factory worker.
7. For what reason(s) do people go on strike?
8. Why are people unemployed?
9. Are there countries which do not have unemployment? If yes, which ones?
10. What are trade unions for?

The questions which focussed on income differentials, the factors on which these differences are based, and the actual income distribution in terms of specific categories of worker, were a crucial sequence in the attempt to elicit the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour and its social relations. These questions were also used in basically the same form in the study of eight-year-olds which formed the original impetus for the current research, and were important for comparative purposes. We considered that the reasons given for differential economic returns to work and the equity of
the income distribution give insight into the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour and allow space for ideological representations concerning the legitimacy of forms of social organisation to emerge. Other questions attempted to look in various ways at what the adolescent saw as the impact of work on the life of the individual (question 2 above); the purpose or reason for working (question 1); the degree of autonomy or control that the worker has over her/his life and work (questions 1, 6, 8); and the meaning and influence of institutions such as the trade unions. We expected the specific location of the adolescent's family in the social division of labour to have an important effect on her/his modelling of that division.

3.4.4 Modelling of educational processes

Questions:
1. What have you got out of being at school?
2. Will the things that you are doing at school be useful to you when you leave or not? If not, can you suggest what would be useful? If yes, in what way will they be useful?
3. What are some of the things that help people get on at school?
4. If you were to have children what would be most important in their education?
5. Do you expect to take any public examinations while you are at school? Yes, or No. Please give subjects (headings: GCE 'O', CSE, Other).
6. If you do expect to take exams, who decided that you would be taking these examinations?
7. At what age do you expect to leave school?

These questions attempted to elicit
(a) what the adolescent thought was the value or purpose of her/his education, and its relevance to her/his future life (questions 1 and 2);
(b) to what extent the messages which the society and school convey about the purpose and value of schooling encouched in the notion of the meritocracy were revealed in the responses (questions 1-4);
(c) the degree to which the respondent felt that s/he operated as an autonomous individual in making important decisions about her/his life and future, specifically related to examinations to be taken (question 6);
(d) information about the individual's own relation to the educational process in terms of type, level, and subjects of any examinations to be taken, and expected age of leaving school.

3.4.5 Further aspects of social and political modelling

1. Do you own anything yourself? If yes, give some examples.
2. Is there anything you would like to own? If yes, what?
3. Are there things which are considered to belong to everybody? If so, what are they?
4. Are there things which ought to belong to everybody but do not? If so, what are they?
5. What stops you from doing exactly what you want to do?
6. Who do you think runs the country?
7. What is the importance of political parties?
8. Are there any changes you want to see happen? If yes, what are they?
9. If you want to see changes, how can these be brought about?

We decided to focus in this topic area on questions of order, change and property, as being particularly important in our exploration of gender and ideology. Although not obviously related to the political process, we sought to ascertain from the question on constraint on action (question 5 above) the degree to which emphasis would be put on personal and moral constraint, on the family and similar institutional adult authority and control, or on the power of the state itself through the legal system and the police. We looked at whether or not the notion of parliamentary democracy was recognised and/or endorsed in the question on 'running the country' (question 6). We also expected that this question would provide information which could be related to existing material on the political socialisation of young children involving recognition of authority figures (for example the work of Hess et al (1962 to 1969)). We hoped that the questions on change (questions 8 and 9), which came at the end of both the sequence, and the questionnaire, would direct our respondents to give general societal responses, rather than ones associated with private and personal aspirations, and this was realised in the responses.
3.4.6 Questions requiring information

The most crucial of these, and the ones on which the study is based, are those relating to the past and present work of the respondents' father and mother. Questions were also asked about the number of siblings which the adolescent had, and their family position.

4 Administering the questionnaire

There were certain limitations from an administrative point of view which affected the amount of time for which we could have access to our subjects. This was dictated by the timetabling of the school and the time available, usually consisting of one to one and a half hours (a double period or an afternoon session). On some occasions the school preferred that a teacher remained in the room, but whenever possible we tried to ensure that this was not the case.

The questionnaire was presented to whole year groups or subdivisions of these suggested by the school on the basis of availability at the time the researcher was in the school. On some occasions return visits were made to present the questionnaire to groups who had originally been unavailable. All schools were visited at least twice in order to administer the questionnaire to each age group. The questionnaire in fact took the subjects about an hour to complete, in some cases a little longer, and was undertaken in the presence of the researcher, who was thus enabled to deal with any queries that arose, and to discuss with interested students any issues which they considered important at the end of the session when the scripts had been collected. Queries during the completion of the questionnaire were dealt with in a non directive fashion, and the researcher indicated that the pupil should interpret the question at issue in her/his own way. A general intention in this procedure was an attempt to assure the respondents that their completed questionnaires would be entirely anonymous, would not be made available to the school in any way connected with the individual respondent, and would be accessible in that form only to the researcher. We cannot know whether the respondents accepted our definition of their situation. Some respondents certainly felt
free to make quite dramatic and occasionally obscene comments or statements.

The condition of anonymity which we offered to our subjects meant that we were entirely dependent on their report for certain questions of information which we posed for them, including the crucial items on the occupation of their mother and father.

5 Coding the responses

5.1 Objectives and problems of coding

5.1.1 Sources of the categories

A series of coding categories was developed for each question, derived from three sources: first, a careful consideration of the responses of our adolescents both in the pilot studies, and in the actual study; second the theoretical presuppositions and orientation of the study as a whole, and third, the categories used in other studies or previous studies by the current researcher which influenced the construction or content of the questions.

5.1.2 Allocation of responses to categories

(a) Level of interpretation

Although in many cases the coding categories were self evident, responses to our questionnaire varied in length and explicitness. The problem of what the respondent meant by her/his statement or comment is a fundamental one in social research, and applies equally to any methodology employed. In a sense it is compounded in the problem this thesis approaches, which is the existence of differentiating class and gender based semiotics, that is male and female and social class based differences in conceptualising and understanding the social world and in articulating this modelling of social organisation. At the extremes the same statement made by individuals in different locations in the social space defined by the social division of labour and gender differentiation may have different meanings; and conversely the
same meaning may adhere to different statements coming from individuals in these different locations. At a general level our way into the problems raised here has been through aggregation and through the method and levels of analysis employed. We have undertaken a question by question analysis, in which we examine the proportions of the groups based on our differentiating variables who respond in a particular way for each question. We use in this, as in other instances where the basic coding categories are involved, the general position and the initial argument which the respondent uses to support this position. An example from a question on the appropriateness of gender differentiated schooling would be: "Yes", which gives the basic position accepting such differentiation. The legitimation is given by the rest of the argument: "Because for instant (sic) what would a boy become if he studies needlework or a girl who studied football or woodwork. They are not helpful for a person who will not use them later on in life." In this case the unit taken for analysis is a question and we consider that by aggregating group responses we can read through to an indication of the ideological messages which provide support for particular positions.

At another level of analysis we have taken as our unit a topic area from our questionnaire, and have aggregated the individual's responses on a series of questions, using again her/his basic position and main argument, justification or qualification, so as to produce a general position on that topic area. This is once again related to their social class location and gender.

(b) Reliability of allocation to categories

More than half of the original coding of the questions, excluding those on parental occupation, was undertaken by four coders employed by the Sociological Research Unit, who were third year or graduate social science students. The coding categories were entirely designed by the current investigator, who held extensive briefing sessions with the coders prior to the coding and provided a coding manual. The actual coding was then checked by the current author in two ways: First by a random selection of coded responses to see whether the coder's allocations agreed with her own. Second, by detailed discussion of items on which some question had arisen for the coder where a consensus on the allocation of responses emerged. The extensive discussion of the coding categories both before and after coding
resulted in the development of a coding language in which all of the coders (including the current author) could work. This issue is discussed by Cook (1977) in connection with a much more elaborate and complex coding system than was used in the original coding for the current study.

5.2 The basic coding

The questionnaire, with its set of basic coding categories, is available from the author in the form of a manual. Here we shall give some examples of the coding, taking one or two questions from each topic area and giving quotations from respondents which preserve their own spelling. These quotations may include elements other than the one for which they are used as an example, which in some cases will also have been coded in another category. The general coding system was reclassified in a number of ways for specific analyses of certain sets of questions, and the recoding will be described in the chapters where these specific analyses are reported.

The coding networks\[^{10}\] allowed for between one and three elements of a response to be coded for each question, depending on the complexity of the question. For the most general type of analysis the first element of an argument would be taken as the one most important, or most spontaneous of the set the subject provided, unless s/he indicated otherwise. This could be done by underlining or by the use of capital letters.

5.2.1 Topic area: 1. The social division of labour and its social relations and gender differentiation

(a) Aspirations and expectations

The first two questions on the questionnaire, "What would you like to do when you leave school?", and "What sort of job do you think you will do when you start working?", were expected to operate differently for different class groups. We expected that the middle class groups might give some form of further education in answer to the first question, and the second question was therefore designed to ascertain the occupational aspiration. For the working class, who might expect to go straight to work on leaving school, the first question operated as an aspiration, and the second as an expectation.
The first question was accordingly coded so as to retrieve both sorts of response and covered education, type of subjects to be followed in terms of the arts/science split, and work, broken down into specific categories of manual and non-manual work, based on the Hall-Jones (1951) scale; the second question was coded so as to pick up differences between aspiration and expectation. On both questions we recorded whether or not the child aspired to the same occupation as either father or mother, and we looked for certain stereotyped occupations for both girls and boys.

(b) Aspiration as a member of the opposite sex

The types of response which we categorised on the question which asked for the adolescent's aspiration as a member of the opposite sex were as follows: aspirations which were different from those expressed as a member of her/his own sex; stereotypical responses for female aspirations, for example "secretary, air hostess"; the level of masculine occupation aspired to (classified as in the Hall-Jones scale); female entrepreneurial activity, for example "dress shop, beauty salon"; and non sex typed occupations, for example in the arts, the performing arts and certain areas of the media. We are not arguing here that women have free access to these jobs or that patriarchal hierarchical ordering is not apparent in such areas, but that a few of these jobs are not obviously in female occupational ghettos.

5.2.2 Topic area: 2. Gender differentiation

(a) Gender differentiated education

In the question on the appropriateness of gender differentiated school subjects we were hoping to capture both traditional justifications for gender differentiation in school practice uncritically accepted, the elements of patriarchal ideological support for such differentiation, or rejection of such messages, and/ or the acceptance of alternative ideological positions. The question was coded in terms of overall agreement or disagreement with the proposition, or the expression of an ambiguity of response, and reasons for the position taken. These reasons were covered in the following coding categories, with some examples of responses falling into the categories:
(1) Preference
"Because boys don't like doing sewing and girls don't like doing metalwork" (12+ wc girl)

(2) Appropriateness for sex defined roles in future work or life
"Yes because woodwork is more useful to a boy than a girl and cookery is more useful to a girl. Because the girl is likely to be a housewife and thus need to know how to cook" (12+ mc boy)
"It does not seem right, e.g. needlework for boys, woodwork, metalwork for girls" (12+ wc boy)

(3) Negative comments
"Yes because girls can't do men's jobs in metalwork and woodwork because they aren't strong enough" (15+ wc boy)

(4) Both should learn the same, or are the same
"I know of no reason why boys should not be able to do as well as girls at any subject" (15+ mc girl)

(5) Counter sex role needs and suggestions
"No, it should be equal as boys need a basic knowledge of subjects such as cookery and needlework and it is useful for girls to know woodwork and such like so as not to be too dependant on others" (15+ mc girl)
"No, many women like to become engineers and do metalwork and technical drawing, whilst single men have to cook their own meals and mend their own clothes" (15+ mc boy)

(6) Comments on discrimination
"I don't think anything is more suitable for girls and others for boys because now we have the sex descrimination act which helps (sometimes)" (12+ mc girl)
"No. Sexist" (15+ wc girl)

(b) Male and female work

In the question on male and female work, ("Are some jobs mainly done by men and others mainly done by women?")
examples, we are attempting to elicit acceptance or rejection of traditional
gender differentiation in jobs and ideological representations related to such
positions as revealed in the reasons given, and any recognition of the
existence of legislation in the area. The question was coded as follows:

(1) **Examples**
"Steel factory workers are usually men and shirt factories are usually
women" (12+ wc boy)
"Bricklaying for men and cleaning for women" (15+ wc boy)
"Men do a lot of jobs like being a mechanic, building etc. but the only
jobs women do are being a secretary and being a housewife" (15+ wc
girl)

(2) **Specific reference to sex discrimination legislation**
"Some jobs are much more suitable for men, despite the sex
discrimination Act, and the same for women, e.g. Needlework teaching
is mainly done by women, whereas decorating and carpentry is more of
a man's job" (12+ mc girl)
"I don't think so since the sex discrimination act has come in" (15+ mc
girl)

(3) **Prejudice and discrimination**
"At the moment some are but this is because women are not thought
good enough for some jobs. Most secretaries, nurses, and people who do
not do the bossing of things are women" (12+ mc girl)
"Because men and women haven't integrated and men are not yet ready
to accept women into their society" (15+ mc girl)

(4) **Preference**
"Some jobs are mainly done by men and others by women because a
 docker women wouldn't really enjoy it. and I don't think that a man
secretary would enjoy it either" (12+ wc girl)
"Mostly men work in mines because women don't like getting dirty"
(15+ mc boy)
Physique
"The very dangerous jobs like mining and building are usually done by men because they are stronger and women are more likely to get frightened" (12+ mc girl)
"Men do heavy labour e.g. dustmen, building sites, miners. Women do not do so many physical jobs, housewives, cha ladies, cleaners etc." (15+ mc girl)

Traditional differentiation
"Some jobs are traditionally male, some are female, i.e. nursing (female), dustman (male). I think people are 'scared' of trying to change" (15+ mc boy)
"I think that this is beginning to disappear. But I think it will be a long time before women work on building sites or men become shorthand typists. If only because of tradition" (15+ mc boy)

Statement of equality
"Because men are just as capable of doing the jobs like sewing, washing, shopkeeping etc. and women can do farming, veterinary etc." (12+ mc girl)

Domestic role
"Well most women are at home looking after the kids and most men bring the money home to look after the family" (12+ wc girl)
"Man do more jobs because woming have got to look after the babys" (12+ wc girl)

5.2.3 Topic area: 3. The social division of labour and its social relations

(a) Income differentials

Two of the questions which dealt with aspects of the social division of labour were concerned with reasons for differences in income. The first asked why people get different amounts of money for the work they do, and the second asked whether or not these differentials were fair or unfair, and for what reason. These questions derived from the study of eight-year-olds which we have referred to previously, and similar coding categories related to those
used in this earlier study were used. The answers were broadly divided into responses which referred to the function or occupation itself, or responses which referred to the agent performing the tasks, since there had been class related differences in emphasis among the eight year olds on this issue. The middle class children were more likely to refer to the function and the working class children to the agent. In this question we were hoping to elicit legitimation arguments and elements of the meritocratic ideology. The categories used were as follows:

**Function:**

1. **Importance, responsibility**
   "Some do more important jobs" (12+ mc girl)
   "I think this happens because the role may be less important in a firm and therefore one would get less money paid. All roles in a firm are important but without these salary differences our society would collapse. As this has been rooted in us for so long it is taken for granted" (12+ mc girl)
   "Because what they do is more important. Well that was the idea. Unions have a lot to do with monetary matters and they can sometimes dictate how much they want" (12+ mc girl)
   "Much more responsibility on higher paid" (12+ mc boy)

2. **Difficult, hard**
   "Some jobs are more difficult or exacting than other jobs. Also some require people who are highly skilled" (12+ mc girl)
   "As the more academic work you do, or the more demanding the work is, the higher the standard becomes, and the more skilled worker you need to do. Also very highly paid jobs are often a great strain on people" (12+ mc girl)
   "Because judges take risks and have worked a long time wera dustmen don't have to be educated" (12+ mc girl)

3. **Quality, top or better jobs**
   "Some have higher positions and are supposed to do more work than people under them" (15+ mc girl)
   "Because they have a better or harder job" (12+ wc boy)
(4) Reference to ownership, property or wealth

"Some businesses are more lucrative than others, one can't expect high pay from a poor firm" (15+ mc boy)

"Some trades have a larger reserve behind them so employers can afford to pay more" (15+ mc boy)

(5) Demand

"People get different amounts because their job is often more needed" (12+ mc boy)

"This happens because some peoples' work is needed more than others" (12+ mc boy)

"Some people have skills and ability that are always in demand, if there are not many people who do possess these skills then those that do are assured of work and can therefore demand high wages" (15+ mc boy)

(6) Skill, training, qualifications, education

"The skill involved in the work may be greater, therefore warranting more pay. Some need more qualifications" (15+ mc girl)

"It happens because for a profession you need knowledge and skill and this has to be acquired with time and they receive more money than the unskilled people who do not take A levels or careers and are less able to do skillful jobs" (15+ mc girl)

Agent:

(1) Intelligence, brains

"Some do harder work, need higher level of intelligence" (12+ mc boy)

"Because some people are cleverer and work harder" (12+ mc girl)

(2) Experience

"It depends on age and the amount of time and effort put into your work" (15+ mc girl)

"They might have been at the firm or company longer, so might have had a rise, whilst there, which a new employee of a month or so would not" (15+ mc girl)
(3) **Hard work, diligence**

"This happens because the people who get a lot of money have to work very hard and the people who don't get a lot of money don't work as hard" (12+ mc girl)

"Because some people deserve money for their hard work i.e. the professions. But builders work hard but they didn't work at school so they deserve what they get" (15+ mc boy)

(4) **Reference to long hours**

"The hours are very long and strenuous" (15+ mc girl)

"Longer hours, harder" (12+ wc boy)

(5) **Gender or race**

"Sex discrimination" (12+ mc girl)

"Because males think that because the job is being done by them it deserves more money. If the job is higher in status then OK they do more work so they should get more money but women should get the same opportunities" (12+ mc girl)

(6) **Skill, training, education, qualifications**

"Because some people went to better schools which means they got more O and A level which gives them a better job, which gives them more money" (12+ mc boy)

"If you are more skilled you should get more money. If people have been lazey at school it serves them right if they don't get much money" (12+ mc girl)

"People may have spent many years training for a specific skill" (15+ mc girl)

5.2.4 **Topic area: 4. Educational processes**

(a) **The value of education for the individual**

In the general question on what the respondent thought they had got out of being at school, most of the adolescents gave multiple responses and up to three elements were coded. The following are typical responses:
(1) Intrinsic value
"An education" (15+ wc boy)
"I have attained great knowledge, not only subjects, but life" (15+ wc boy)
"I have enjoyed my school life so far immensely. I have gained a great deal of knowledge ..." (15+ mc girl)

(2) Benefit for the future related to work
"I have learned about work, which I will need when I leave school" (15+ wc boy)
"Learned to do maths, learned to do English. And engineering which is all needed for a job later on" (15+ wc boy)

(3) Benefit for the future: general
"Understanding of people and world" (15+ wc boy)
"I think I have gained a lot in both knowledge and companionship. I have learnt more about other people, how they think and feel and new horizons have opened up for me on the world and its people. It has been very interesting" (15+ mc girl)

(4) Qualifications
"Going to school is worthwhile to get good qualifications so you can take more interesting and better paid jobs" (15+ mc girl)
"I will get qualifications to be a lawyer. You also get friendship and a sense of being in a group" (15+ mc girl)
"All I think I will get out of school is good qualifications in O and A levels. School also teaches you how to work and learn" (15+ mc girl)

(5) Social aspects
"I have learnt how to make friends and to be more sociable" (15+ wc girl)
"I have made many friends" (15+ wc girl)
"I have learned to encounter and be interested in people..." (15+ wc girl)
"Academic qualifications, and also getting to know people from different backgrounds. Also an ability to make myself a unit of a strong, close knit community" (15+ mc girl)
(6) Negative comments

"Not much, mainly rubbish" (15+ wc boy)

"I feel teachers are not prepared to put themselves out for you" (15+ wc boy)

"I have always found school a bore and in the long run most of the maths English, History, etc will be forgotten" (15+ wc boy)

(b) How to get on at school

Brains, ability and hard work are essential requirements for success and advancement in the meritocratic ideology. Douglas (1968) suggests that parental support is significant for success at school. We asked what our respondents thought were some of the things that help people to get on at school in part to see whether any of these views were endorsed. The responses were coded as follows:

(1) Brains, ability, talent

"Talent, hard work? (sic), favouritism, friends" (15+ wc girl)

"Being able to learn the work, hardworking, other interests" (male)

"High IQ, good masters, interest" (15+ mc boy)

"Being clever, keen and being able to learn things easily" (15+ mc boy)

(2) Other personal characteristics

"A good personality, kindness and unselfishness" (15+ wc boy)

"The only thing that seems to help people at school is ambitions. If you've got something to work towards, then you're likely to get on better. But it's you that has to do it" (15+ mc girl)

(3) Hard work and study

"People, work, lessons are some of the things that help you get on at school" (12+ wc boy)

"Concentration, enthusiasm" (15+ mc boy)

"An ability to socialise well and willingness to work" (15+ mc boy)

(4) Teachers

"I don't get on at school because I don't like the teachers" (12+ wc girl)
"Having very easy going teachers who don't just think you're another pupil but really like and care about you" (15+ wc girl)
"Good relationships with teachers" (15+ mc girl)
"Good teachers who aren't boring and can keep control of the class without flying into tempers and lots of facilities" (15+ mc boy)

(5) Friends
"Good relations between friends and teachers, and a personal desire to acquire knowledge" (15+ mc girl)
"I think the main thing is relations with fellow pupils. If a pupil is bullied or ignored he/she won't get on well, or won't go to school. Secondly comes relations with teachers and if the teachers are interesting. I think too much discipline also makes people resentful and maybe rebellious" (15+ mc girl)
"Nice people around to work with" (15+ mc girl)

(6) Parents
"Encouraging parents, nice teacher and good teachers (although that often means the same thing" (12+ mc girl)
"I think friends help you make it through the school years of your life and also the encouragement from parents" (15+ mc boy)
"Teachers, friends, sometimes parents" (15+ mc girl)

(7) Interest in school subjects
"Cooperation with teachers and liking the subjects that you are doing" (12+ wc boy)
"Making the right decision when coming to choose your subjects, otherwise your work can pressure you and get you down" (15+ mc girl)

A plaintive cry from one of our respondents suggested that "There is nothing that really helps" (15+ mc girl), and another thought that "having nice little questionnaires to fill in" was helpful (15+ mc girl).
5.2.5 Topic area: 5. Further aspects of social and political modelling

(a) Who runs the country?

The question "Who runs the country?" was in part inspired by work on the political socialisation of young children, which sees them as locating power in the president (Hess and Easton, 1962), the prime minister, or the queen (Greenstein, 1969). We were also interested to see whether the cue word 'run' would stimulate ideas on the power of the unions, and whether the fundamental notions of parliamentary democracy held sway in the adolescents' minds. To that end our coding covered the following categories: the government, parliament; the prime minister; the queen; political parties or a particular political party; the civil service; trade unions; the people. Some examples of the comments made are:

(1) Trade unions
"Trade Unions and the workers. Because it is up to them whether they strike or not. Thus stopping the industries of the country from going" (15+ mc girl)
"Wrongly the unions, who dominate the decisions of the government" (15+ mc boy)

(2) The people
"Indirectly the people do (those over 18) for they elect/vote for MPs who contribute to and run parliaments - responsible for legislation" (15+ mc girl)
"Everyone" (15+ mc girl)

(b) Political parties

A question on the importance of political parties was coded as follows:

(1) Representation of differing viewpoints
"Represent different ways of running the country" (15+ mc girl)
"To cater for everybodies views, in each social class" (15+ mc girl)
(2) **Representation without reference to difference**

"To express the feelings and needs of the public, though few succeed to do this" (15+ mc girl)

"To represent the people" (15+ mc boy)

(3) **Leadership and the preservation of the national interest**

"If they are democratic they give the people a chance to get what they want, if not they organise the country better" (15+ mc boy)

"It is important because they help the country and push everybody into place" (12+ wc girl)

"The importance of political parties is to rule the country well" (12+ mc boy)

(4) **Law and order**

"To enforce good laws and keep the country running" (12+ mc girl)

(5) **Negative comment**

"To make people laugh" (15+ mc girl)

"They aren't important" (15+ mc girl)

"To be honest, I don't think much of them, but we need a government if there isn't going to be anarchy" (15+ mc girl)

(6) **Expressed disinterest in politics**

"I don't know really as I don't like politics or understand them" (12+ wc girl)

5.3 **Refocussing the basic coding for specific analyses**

The basic coding networks were refocussed in a number of analyses, and the details of these respecifications together with their theoretical justification will be given in the chapters in which the results of these analyses are reported. By refocussing the categories we produced:

(a) a normative collapse of the basic coding categories reported in more detail in Chapter 5.

(b) a measure of field orientation relevant to fractions within the middle class, reported in Chapter 5.
(c) an index of the strength or weakness of gender differentiation, reported in Chapter 7.

(d) an index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour and its social relations, reported in Chapter 8.

(e) an index of the adolescents' modelling of educational processes, reported in Chapter 9.

6 Methods of analysis

We have taken the path of a large scale survey partly as a result of the exigencies of the research activity, and partly to provide a unique basis for a study of this type. The size of sample is unusual in such a study, and enables us to break our sample into smaller units, containing respectable numbers, and to consider the relationship between a number of influences.

Early examinations of the data showed us that there was considerable similarity in the overall position of our adolescents on certain of the issues which we wished to examine. This is particularly true of the material on gender differentiation (see Chapter 7 below). Whereas techniques based on correlational methods (e.g. stepwise regression) and forms of discriminant analysis might give us a more elegant description of the data, we consider that these forms of analysis might not capture the detail of the material. As a consequence we have carried out a method of analysis involving cross tabulation, since this procedure enables us to distinguish between the responses of groups critical to our theory. We have then sacrificed elegance of statistical description for what we consider to be a more productive understanding of the specificities of our data.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1 The study was designed by Professor Bernstein. A number of researchers worked on the project, but a considerable amount of the analysis of data and most of the writing up was undertaken by the present author and is reported in a series of SRU/SSRC papers—Varnava-Skouras and Holland 1976, Holland and Varnava-Skouras 1977a, b, c.

2 See Dahlberg and Holland (1984).

3 In our use these terms can be defined in relation to each other. None of the schools we approached or which finally allowed us access could be described as in the vanguard of 'progressive' educational practice, and even in the least academically oriented school, fifty percent of the pupils went on to university. The relatively more progressive schools tended to have a more relaxed regime in which the hierarchical relations between teachers and students were less explicit and there was a greater toleration of the students' extra-academic interests. The curriculum of the progressive schools was almost identical to that of the traditional schools, the differences between the schools lay in the social relations.

4 Tangri (1972) found some evidence that the college women in her sample who were role innovators had educated, working mothers whom they used as role models.

5 Practical reasons related to the time available and the concomitant facilitation of school cooperation, together with the need to retain the interest and involvement of the respondent in what was a rather long questionnaire suggested this approach. It did not deter individual respondents who had specific and extensive comments or statements to make on particular issues from continuing on to space available on the back of the questionnaire.

6 See West (1978) for a discussion of the importance of the division of labour for the class location of women. See also Ritter and Hargens (1975) on women's class identifications.

7 Some of this literature is discussed in Chapter 12.

8 The domestic labour debate and its ultimate demise in the sterile reaches of economism is discussed briefly in Chapter 1 above.

9 An introduction on the front of the questionnaire (see Appendix 2) explained the research to the pupils, and was the introduction given to them by the researcher.

10 See Holland (1983a) for a description of a network used by the current author in an earlier study, and the book in which it appears (Bliss, Monk and Ogborn, 1983) for a description of the use of systemic networks in the analysis of educational and other qualitative data.

11 The data for this study were collected during a period when a Labour government was in office, and the media frequently placed emphasis on the power exerted by the trade unions.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSES AND RESULTS: GENERAL MEASURES

1 Introduction to the results

We have now established the theoretical background for this investigation and described the sample and methodology employed. This and the following chapters in the empirical section deal with the results and interpretations of our analyses of the data. In this chapter we will describe the overall style and content of the presentation of the results, and discuss the results of some broad and general measures which formed our initial approach to the data.

1.1 Types of analysis

The analyses which have been made of the data in this study fall into three broad categories:

(i) General analyses which attempt to delineate in various ways the overall shape of the data, and which constituted our initial approach to the material;

(ii) Analyses directed towards the adolescents' response to a topic which was covered by a series of questions in the questionnaire, for example the topic of gender differentiation or sexual division;

(iii) Analyses which examine responses to a particular item, covered by a single question.

To take each of these in turn:

(i) Where the unit of analysis is the total sample frequencies

These analyses take the form of broad indices which attempt to provide an indication of trends in the data which emerge when the responses to most
or many of the questions on the questionnaire are aggregated. The results from this type of analysis are discussed in this chapter.

(ii) Where the unit of analysis is a topic area

In this case we have taken groups of questions which cover a particular topic and looked at them as a set. In most instances we generate some form of score which encapsulates the basic position taken by the individual on the set of questions. The major analyses of this type relate to the three topics which form the focus for our study: (a) gender differentiation; (b) the social division of labour and its social relations, and (c) the educational process. When all of the questions on a particular topic are not included in the overall measure for that topic, the results on these individual questions are presented in the chapter where the topic as a whole is considered.

(iii) Where the unit of analysis is an item covered in an individual question

In some instances it was impossible to include all of the questions dealing with a particular topic in an index encapsulating the adolescents' modelling of that aspect of social organisation. The reasons for exclusion are discussed in the chapters where the individual topics are considered. When this exclusion occurs we look at the questions which were excluded from the index for a given topic separately, indicating the proportions of our class, intra class, gender and age groups who took similar or differing positions on these questions or items.

In some instances we have included results on individual questions which do appear in one of our overall indices for a topic. Our reason for doing so lies in the nature of the responses to such a question. If the question is clearly located in the topic area for which an index has been developed, and it is possible to include it in the index, then this is done. If in addition there is some indication that the responses to this question reflect themes or overall trends which we have noted elsewhere in the data, then we also present the relevant results on the individual question. As an example, there is a question which asks about sex segregated education which is clearly relevant to an individual's modelling of gender differentiation, but which also
reflects rather dramatically, clear differences between our gender and class groups. This question is included in the index of classification of gender differentiation, and is also reported individually at the end of Chapter 9 (p. 345) on educational processes.

Two forms of presentation of the data are made when dealing with an item: (a) the results on a single question or item are presented; (b) the results on a short series of questions are presented when these questions are interrelated and the logic of the sequence of responses demands it.

1.2 Presentation of results

Three different categories of result are presented:

(i) Differences between our groups which reach statistical significance.

(ii) Differences or similarities, which are not statistically significant but which are indicative of an overall trend in the results.

(iii) Selected quotations. These quotations are not a representative selection from the responses made, but are used to illustrate a particular position taken by some of our students, or given as an indication of unusual or interesting comments.

In our presentation of these analyses and results we will start at the most general level, and proceed to more detailed approaches and accounts within these analyses. The description of each of the analyses will include, where relevant, detailed description and justification of the coding systems used.

The remainder of this chapter consists of a presentation and discussion of the results from the general analyses which were performed on the material. Chapter 6 will start with a general introduction to the analyses of specific topic areas from the questionnaire, discussing the use of the concept of classification in the study and its derivation from Bernstein’s work. The second part of Chapter 6 will present the results of an analysis of a piece of research undertaken by G. Wells (1984) on children and language. Wells was
kind enough to provide us with some of his data, collected in an entirely different context. Our analysis of his data enables us to make the link between the model of class which we have developed in this study and family interactional practices indicated by maternal reports of behaviour. Chapter 7 presents the results for the area of the questionnaire which dealt with gender differentiation. The format for this presentation is the same as in the following two chapters on specific topic areas - an introduction to the topic area, a discussion of the particular usage of the concept of classification, and a description of the index developed for the area. This description includes:

(a) the refocussing of the original coding required with the questions used and examples of the recoding;
(b) the construction of the index;
(c) the results of the analysis;
(d) the results for questions which were dealt with individually, that is not incorporated in the index for the topic area, and
(e) a brief summary of the results.

Chapter 8 will follow this pattern in discussing the topic area dealing with questions on the social division of labour; Chapter 9 will do so for the section on education. Chapter 10 introduces a comparison of children in the working class who have high educational aspirations with the rest of the working class children, and with other groups in the middle class. Chapter 11 deals with further social and political issues, presenting the results in a question by question form, since no index was developed for this topic area.

The questionnaire began with a series of questions dealing with the students' aspirations and expectations about their future work, an area which has been the subject of considerable previous research, and which in the context of this study was relevant to our question areas on both gender differentiation and the social division of labour. We will consider these questions in Chapter 12, placing them in the perspective of existing work with a brief review of the literature on occupational choice.
2 Discussion of initial indices and analyses

2.1 Introduction

In this section we will describe three summary approaches which we initially took to the data. We decided first to see whether it would be possible to capture in one general index the degree of support for or rejection of dominant societal values as this was realised across the range of relevant questions in the areas covered by the questionnaire. We hoped that this initial analysis would provide clues for progressing to a more delicate exploration of the adolescents' responses. This resulted in

(i) a series of indices based on support for or rejection of what we have seen as dominant societal values. In one sense this analysis provides a summary of the general ideological position of our groups, but it also points to future, more specific analyses. We also undertook

(ii) a factor analysis, which sought to indicate the existence or otherwise of underlying dimensions to the questionnaire, based on the major topic areas of the study.

Finally we made our first analysis of differences within the middle class group with (iii) an index covering a series of questions for which we considered that we could predict the general responses of the intra middle class groups in the fields of production and symbolic control.

2.2 Indices of support for or rejection of dominant societal values

Each of the questions on the questionnaire could be seen as generating one or more items on which we had the views of our sample of adolescents. To produce the indices discussed here, we scored the individual's response to each question on the basis of a three point collapse of the original coding categories, which represented (1) support for, and (2) rejection of prevailing or dominant practices and values in society. The third point represented responses which were not assignable to either of these two categories. Support for the prevailing values and practices was scored +1, rejection or
the espousal of contradictory values was scored -1, and non assignable responses were scored 0.

We can indicate briefly the basic positions of support or non-support for societal values and practices for the main topic areas of the questionnaire. In the case of (a) gender differentiation:

(i) Support would be indicated by an acceptance of patriarchal definitions of the divisions between men and women and the concomitant marginality of women in work. There would be an acceptance of the basic distinction between the public sphere and the private or domestic sphere, with men located in the public and women in the domestic sphere.

(ii) A respondent with a non supportive position would stress the importance of work and a career to women, and/or of their income for the family, and would suggest that domestic responsibility in the home should be shared between women and men.

In the case of (b) education:

(i) A person taking a supportive position would accept the meritocratic argument, and value education, suggesting that if one has intelligence and works hard at school this will lead to the acquisition of qualifications which will be rewarded in the labour market. This acceptance would extend to the school and the educational system which would be seen as performing well in providing students with a good education and so enabling them to take advantage of this situation. The stress here would be on the systemic relation between education and production or work. (See Chapter 9, p. 324 below for a discussion of the systemic and classificatory relations between education and production.)

(ii) An adolescent holding a non supportive position would emphasise the classificatory relation, and talk about the intrinsic value of education. This is still a valid societal norm but less dominant than the emphasis on the systemic relation, as has become apparent since the instigation of the Great Debate in 1976, and particularly with recent changes in the focus of the educational system. More extreme versions of the non supporting position (even
oppositional positions) would involve rejection of the meritocratic argument, and a questioning of the content of educational provision and the performance of the educational system.

In the case of (c) the social division of labour:

(i) Elements in a position supportive of societal values and practices would be an acceptance of the income distribution in the occupational hierarchy and the use of various legitimising arguments to support this position - for example a meritocratic argument or one based on the importance, responsibility, or prestige which is seen to inhere in particular occupations; unemployment would be seen as a problem of supply and demand, or the reason would lie in inadequacies of the (potential) workers; strike action would be considered to be motivated simply by desire for more money, by selfish or trivial reasons, or seen as the exercise of inappropriate power held by unions; trade unions themselves would be seen as preserving the interests of their members, or in a relatively negative light, especially if they were considered to wield too much power.

(ii) Elements of a less supportive or even oppositional position would include: a refusal to accept the fairness of the income distribution or ambivalence on the issue; unemployment would be seen as a product of inadequacies of the system or the management of the economy rather than as the fault of the worker, or more specifically unemployment might be seen as a result of discrimination against certain categories of workers; there would be a recognition of a range of objectives for strike action, including responses to injustice and unfair treatment of workers. The individual would support the position of trade unions, seeing them as a counter to the power of the employers.

The above outlines can be seen as 'ideal types' of positions which support or question dominant social values. Although some individuals might prove to be totally supportive, or totally questioning (or rejecting), it is more likely that individuals would hold a mixture of supportive or questioning positions as revealed in their responses to the questions put to them in this study. The measures then seek to ascertain, at a very general level, whether or not the individual is relatively supportive or questioning overall, by
summing her/his responses on a series of questions, and to see whether any differences emerge for the groups defined by our basic variables of class, intra middle class groups, age, and gender.

Descriptive questions which sought information about the adolescents' family or their educational aspirations, and those for which a three point scale was not appropriate, were excluded from the indices. The questions related to occupational aspirations are examples of exclusions on the latter grounds, since such aspirations vary with class and gender and cannot be classified in general as acceptable or unacceptable in the light of prevailing values.

Three sets of questions were used for this analysis. In each case each individual was given an overall score summing her/his responses to the series of questions used in the set for each of the indices. The indices of support for or rejection of dominant societal values were as follows:

(1) The first index was based on a combination of the set of forty-one items generated from the whole set of questions, excluding only those which were descriptive or provided information, and those for which no meaningful normative scale could be produced.

(2) For the second index, this set of forty-one items was further reduced by the exclusion of those questions or items on which a large proportion of the sample gave non assignable responses. This resulted in a set of nineteen discriminatory items which were combined to make an index.

(3) Finally an index was produced from the reduced set of nineteen discriminatory items, excluding the questions on sexual divisions. Questions on gender differentiation and sexual divisions could well be expected to produce quite different responses from our gender groups, and we wanted to make a comparison of the gender groups which excluded these issues.

Each individual was allocated a score representing the summation of her/his responses over the series of questions or items included in each index. For each age, gender, class and intra-middle class group the distribution of these scores was produced. These distributions were then collapsed into those
relatively supportive of prevailing practices and values, with positive scores, and those relatively opposed, with negative scores. Chi square tests were performed on the resulting frequencies and the groups compared on this basis.

2.3 Results on the indices relating to dominant societal values and practices

2.3.1 Gender differences

We took the distributions of the scores of girls and boys on the three indices described above and for each index collapsed them into (i) those relatively supportive of the prevailing values, with positive scores, and (ii) those who were relatively opposed, with negative scores. The chi square tests which were performed on the resulting frequencies indicated that in all cases girls were less supportive of what we have described above as the prevailing societal values than boys, often significantly so. Table 5.1 gives the level of significance of the difference between girls and boys for various combinations of our class and age groups. For the class comparison we have used the broadest categorisation of class based on the manual/non-manual distinction, into middle class and working class. We are looking here at comparisons between girls and boys for the following combinations of age and class:

(i) The entire group, middle class and working class, both age levels;
(ii) Middle class and working class groups combined for each age level;
(iii) Middle class and working class separately, but both age groups combined;
(iv) The groups separated by class and age, boys and girls within each class at each age level compared.

We can see from Table 5.1 that our combined groups show a high level of difference between girls and boys on all indices. When the groups are separated, however, we see that gender differences are greatest for the mc groups, and that at age 12+ there is no significant difference between girls and boys in the wc on any of the indices. At the older age level the only group for which the difference between girls and boys reaches a high level of
Table 5.1
Levels of significance of differences between boys and girls on three indices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGES AND GROUPS</th>
<th>(1) Index of support for status quo</th>
<th>(2) Index of support for status quo on reduced set of items</th>
<th>(3) Index of support for status quo on reduced set minus sexual division questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+ 15+ MC + WC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ MC + WC</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ MC + WC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ 15+ MC</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ 15+ WC</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ MC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ WC</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ MC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ WC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The figures from which this table is derived are to be found in Appendix 4.
significance are for those in the mc on the reduced set of discriminatory items. We see that the level of significance of the difference between girls and boys is reduced or disappears as we move from index (2) based on the discriminatory items, to index (3) also based on these items but excluding questions on sexual division. This is an indication that the questions on gender differentiation produce different responses from our gender groups. In the light of the commonly held belief that women are more conservative than men, it is also interesting to note that in all cases in the above results girls take a position less supportive of the prevailing societal values than do boys. Within the mc group, differences between girls and boys, with girls always less conservative, are generally greater on these indices for those in the field of production, than for those in the field of symbolic control.

This tendency for girls and boys in the field of production to show greater difference between them than those in the field of symbolic control is a finding which recurs in a number of instances in this study. It must have implications for the reproduction of class relations for the intra-mc group within the field of production.

2.3.2 Class and intra class differences

The above three indices, which provide us with some clear differences between girls and boys in our sample, do not indicate statistically significant differences between classes and the groups within the mc. The differences which do emerge, consistently, if small in size, indicated that on these three indices the wc groups were more supportive of societal values and practices than the mc, and within the mc, those in the field of production were more supportive than those in the field of symbolic control. It seemed, however, that more specific indices were needed if the analysis was to progress.

2.4 Factor Analysis

We undertook a factor analysis of the responses to the set of forty-one items generated by the entire set of questions, in order to identify, if possible, an underlying structure to the questionnaire related to the topics which subsets of questions had been designed to address. The individual
responses to each question were scored on the basis of the three point collapse of the original coding categories discussed above. Did the subsets of questions which we considered to represent a coherent and cohesive topic actually have this dimensionality in the responses of our adolescents? An unrotated principle factor analysis with iterations produced some evidence to support an argument that a proportion of the questions on sexual division possessed this expected underlying structure. This result was reproduced for the two basic social class groups, with greater structuration in the mc responses, and also, in all cases, for the reduced set of nineteen discriminatory items. For the other topic areas we had constructed in the questionnaire, the picture was not so clear cut. It was still the case, however, that for each topic, some of the items derived from the questions associated with the topic could be seen as related to different underlying factors. We regarded this result as providing some support for our conceptualisation of the underlying structure of the questionnaire. (See Appendix 3 for further details.)

2.5 Intra mc differences on selected questions

Although overall we had found that, in many instances, the wc took a more traditional stance, supportive of the prevailing societal values on the indices we discuss above than did the mc, we considered that this overall position for the mc might mask differences associated with those adolescents whose families were located in the different fields we had identified within the mc; those of production and symbolic control. We saw some indication of support for this expectation in the indices discussed above. At a general level we would expect that those in the field of production would be more supportive of dominant societal values than those in the field of symbolic control. We argue further that those in the field of symbolic control have control over the transmission of critical symbolic systems through control over forms of public education and symbolic markets, and that therefore the adolescents from this field should be more oriented towards education and a meritocratic ideology than those from the field of production in contemporary Britain. We included questions on gender division in our index of field differences since (a) this was a major focus of the study; and (b) positions demonstrating strong or weak patriarchal values can be clearly identified on these questions. On the above criteria we selected twelve questions for which
we considered that we could make general predictions of the position which would be taken by our two intra-mc groups. The following refocussing of our original coding categories was made for these questions.

2.5.1 Refocussing of coding categories for the index of field orientation

Q1 Aspiration: what would you like to do when you leave school?

Here the basic distinction is between work and education, but we also included aspirations to enter the army or join the police, as indicating a rather strong support for the existing forms of organisation of society, and a desire for its preservation.

Responses expected in the field of production
An occupation, the army or police force

Responses expected in the field of symbolic control
Continue education

Q2 Suppose you were a girl/boy (opposite sex to the subject responding), what work would you like to do?

The distinction here is between responses which do not question the stereotypical division of labour between the sexes as exemplified in the labour market, and those which do as indexed by aspirations which are not sex typed. We also included female entrepreneurial occupations as potential opposite sex aspirations for those in the field of production.

Production
Female stereotyped work, typical male work, the armed forces, female entrepreneurial work, refuse to respond

Symbolic control
Same as the individual's own aspiration, occupations which are not readily sex typed or are undertaken by either sex (e.g. some forms of the arts, design, the media, teacher, except nursery teachers)
Q3 Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls?

We used a simple dichotomy between those who accept differential education based on gender and those who consider it inappropriate.

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
Yes | No

Q4 Would you be happy working for a female boss or supervisor?

This question, and question 5 below, examines counter sex role expectations in work, and in the family, and we postulate that the more conservative will reject such suggestions, and the less conservative will accept them.

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
No, or not sure | Yes

Q5 If you married and your husband was earning less/wife was earning more than you, would it bother you?

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
Yes | No

Q6 If you were to have children, what would be most important in their education?

The basic distinction here is between the systemic and the classificatory relation between education and production (see Chapter 9), the former stressing the link between education and work, and the latter valuing education for its intrinsic worth, in this instance
focusing on the person, the imaginary future child, rather than the function of education.

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
Specific subjects, | Education generally, reference
reference to work, | to the child as the subject
relevance | of education

Q7 Some jobs are highly paid and some are not. Can you think of a few jobs that get the highest pay and a few that get the lowest pay and list them under the headings below?

Here we are examining whether there is a strong differentiation between the categories of the social division of labour, as exemplified by the income distribution and by an implicit recognition of the mental/manual division, or whether there is a mixture of categories.

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
Clear separation between manual and non-manual jobs, | High and low pay less strongly associated with the manual/non-manual division
non-manual jobs earning the highest pay, manual the lowest

Q8 Do you think you will get married? If yes, at about what age?

Older marriage can be seen as indicating the pursuit of further education; a degree of uncertainty about marriage might indicate a questioning of expected patterns of social behaviour. Most of our respondents did expect to marry, and given the demographic pattern in contemporary Britain, are realistic in this expectation.

Production | Symbolic control
---|---
More certainty | Not certain whether they will marry, or will definitely not marry
Younger marriage

Delayed marriage, plan to marry later than mid twenties, due possibly to a longer period of education.

The following three questions deal with the sexual division of labour, and the distinction is between an unquestioned acceptance of traditional sexual divisions, or some questioning of these arrangements as indicated by a suggestion that domestic responsibility should be shared.

Q9  Who is responsible for looking after the home and family?

Production
Mother, or father if taken in a more general sense, breadwinner

Symbolic control
Both parents, the family as a whole (shared responsibility)

Q10  Generally speaking, who usually does housework?

Production
Mother, wife

Symbolic control
Mother with specified help from various family members, all of the family or household

Q11  If a husband and wife both work outside the home, who should do the housework? Who should look after the children, if there are children?

Production
The mother

Symbolic control
Parents should share
Q12 A lot of women do housework and also have a job outside the home. For what kinds of reasons do they have jobs outside the home?

The strongest conservative or patriarchal response is seen as financial need, for only such a powerful motive could subvert the more normal practice of women’s confinement to the domestic sphere.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symbolic control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money, need</td>
<td>Other more general reasons, negative comments about housework, reference to the positive benefits of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2 Results on the index of field orientation

The initial response of the individual was used for this measure, and for each of the above questions the individual was allocated a score of +1 if her/his response was considered typical of a member of the field of production, -1 if it was typical of a member of the field of symbolic control, and 0 if the response was not assignable to either of these categories. Responses to all twelve questions were combined into a summation score. The scores were collapsed into those more typical of the field of production, positive scores, those more typical of the field of symbolic control, negative scores, and those which on balance could be regarded as neutral, scoring 0. The frequencies of respondents in the two fields falling into categories of response typical of the fields were generated and chi square tests performed on these frequencies. Table 5.2 shows the level of significance of the differences between members of the two fields within the mc for our age and gender groups. All differences are in the predicted direction and one-tailed tests were performed on them.

We can see that there are significant differences between the groups within the two fields in the expected direction on this index of the field differences. Those in the field of production are significantly more likely to give responses we have judged to be typical of this field and those in symbolic control more likely to give responses typical of those in the field of
Table 5.2
Levels of significance for differences between adolescents in the fields of production and symbolic control in giving answers predicted for those fields on a set of questions*

(1) The total MC sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male + Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Embedded groups from within the fields of production and symbolic control based on father's location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male + Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Mother and father both in production or symbolic control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male + Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The figures from which this table is produced are to be found in Appendix 4.

** Some categories were too small to perform the test.

symbolic control. This is true for the total groups allocated to the two fields, for the embedded groups in the two fields (see Chapter 4, p. 151), and for those for whom both mother and father were in the same field.

It was suggested that, although we have located the individual in a particular field on the basis of the father's occupation, the strength of their ideological positioning with respect to this category might be weakened or enhanced by the field location of their mother. Most of the mothers in our sample worked at the time of our study, and all but a handful had worked at some stage in their life. Some details of their work appear in Chapter 3, p. 132. This issue is related to the general problem of the class location of women (see Chapter 1, p. 49) and the importance of the mother in the
socialisation of the child and ultimately the reproduction of class and gender relations. We decided to examine groups of individuals within the mc with the following characteristics:

- **Pure production**: Father and mother both working in the field of production
- **Father prod, Mother SC**: Father in field of production, mother in symbolic control
- **Father SC, Mother prod**: Father in symbolic control, mother in production
- **Pure SC**: Father and mother both in symbolic control

Table 5.3 indicates that the field location of the mother has some impact on the responses of the adolescents.

It is a matter of considerable interest to note that if the mother is in the same field as the father, as expected, she reinforces the tendency to give a response which we have taken as typical of the field of either production or symbolic control; if she is in a different field she reduces the tendency to give a response typical of the father's field.

A careful inspection of Table 5.3 also indicates that girls are more likely than boys in all instances to give responses typical of those in symbolic control, and boys are more likely than girls to give responses typical of those in the field of production. This is the result of the general tendency for girls to give less traditional responses in this study, but also of the impact of the items on sexual divisions which were included in the index. On these items we predicted a position less supportive of traditional patriarchal attitudes for those in symbolic control, a position which was taken, as we have noted in the indices above, more frequently by girls than boys. It is still the case, however, as we have seen from Table 5.2, that there are significant differences between girls within the two different fields in the expected direction. The differences which emerge on issues of sexual division are considered more fully in the sections on gender differentiation below in Chapter 7.
Table 5.3
Percentage of selected groups within the sample giving 'Production' (P) or 'Symbolic Control' (SC) types of response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of response</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male + Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic control</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ plus 12+ N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The index of field orientation, based on predicted responses to twelve selected questions or items by the groups within the mc, indicated that there are significant differences between these two groups in the predicted direction. Those in the field of production are more likely to give responses typical of that field than of the field of symbolic control; those in the field of symbolic control are more likely to give responses typical of that field than of the field of production. The field location of the mother also influences the responses made by these groups on the index. A mother in the same field as the father reinforces the tendency for a response typical of that field; a mother in a different field from that of the father reduced the tendency to give a response typical of the father’s field location.

3 Overview

These initial analyses of the data have given some overall indication of trends within the material. The summary indices which we developed to examine support for or rejection of dominant societal values showed that, contrary to the commonsense knowledge that women are more conservative than men, the girls in this study take a stance more critical of dominant societal values than do the boys, and this difference reaches significance in many cases. We noted that it appeared to be the questions on gender differentiation which produced the greatest difference between boys and girls.

A factor analysis indicated that there was some degree of underlying cohesion to our questions on sexual divisions, but little evidence for the other sections of the questionnaire of this underlying dimensionality. The application of the index of field difference showed that there were significant differences between these groups in the predicted direction. This index included questions on both sexual and social divisions, which we separate in later analyses, and so was influenced by the tendency of the girls to give less traditional responses than the boys. It seems that girls were more likely to give responses which we predicted as typical of members of the field of symbolic control than were boys. However, it was clear that the girls themselves differed significantly on this index, depending on the field in which they were located. We looked at the influence of the location of the mother in the fields of symbolic control and production, compared with the
father's location. If a respondent had both mother and father in the same field, there was a tendency for the group response to be more typical of that field, a mother located in a different field from the father reduced the tendency to give a response typical of that field.

We have seen that there are significant differences between girls and boys in response in this section, and between the intra-mc groups in our study, and that it is questions on gender which are most likely to produce these differences. In addition, the field location of the mother has an effect on the positioning of both girls and boys. The results on our general index of differences between the mc groups in the two fields suggest that the mother's field location plays a crucial part in processes of ideological positioning in terms of both gender and class, and ultimately on the reproduction of class and gender relations. Our findings in this connection are supported by the analysis of data provided by Wells which is reported in Chapter 6 which indicates that the field location of the mother affects the interactional practices of the family.

We could argue that the more liberal views of certain of the girls in this study, especially in connection with sexual divisions, can be traced to the influence of the mother. This can be seen as one of the spaces for the development of counter hegemonic ideological positions within the institutions of society. We will see later in the study that the expression of this possibility in the responses of the mc girls is less likely to occur in the case of class ideological messages than it is in the case of patriarchal messages.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1 This finding concurs, however, with that of Sidanius and Ekehammer (1980) who tested 532 Swedish high school students (18 years old) with a conservatism scale. These authors found that girls were less generally conservative, less racist, pro-Western, and punitive, but more religious and egalitarian than boys. The article provides a useful review of different schools of thought on the source of the divergent political styles of men and women.

2 This interpretation of the meaning of the motivation 'need' for women's work as an indicator of strongly held distinctions between the sexes and their appropriate roles was adopted prior to the development of the index of gender differentiation which is reported later in the results section of this study, in Chapter 7. The above question is used in the index of gender differentiation, and in fact the judges who scaled the adolescents' responses for that index were in some disagreement as to the meaning of a response specifying 'need' on this question. Some thought it a strong response in support of existing sexual divisions, but others considered it neutral with respect to this dimension. The judges who scaled the responses to the question for the index of gender differentiation did offer some support for the interpretation of 'need' which we use here, on a question referring to the possibility of work after marriage for women. Girls were asked if they would work after marriage, and boys were asked whether or not their wife would do so. In this instance the judges did consider that 'need' represented a strong response in support of existing sexual divisions.


4 Our analysis of data provided for us by Wells (reported in Chapter 6) which he collected in the context of a large and longitudinal study of young children, indicated that mothers in the fields of production and symbolic control tended to engage in different interactional practices in the family.
CHAPTER 6

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESULTS ON SPECIFIC TOPIC AREAS

1 Introduction

This chapter provides a very short introduction to the concept of classification which is used in the analysis of our data, and describes the results from a piece of research of relevance to this thesis undertaken by G. Wells. In the following chapters the concept of classification is given a more detailed exposition in relation to its specific application in each of the indices we developed. Our study does not directly address the family, but it is the family and its interactional practices which is seen as the basic institution generating the ideological positioning of individuals. Our analysis of Wells' data provides a link between the model which we have developed to allocate individuals to spaces in the social formation, and family interactional practices, as revealed in maternal reports of their behaviour.

In the following four chapters, we will discuss four topics covered by the questionnaire, for three of which indices have been developed in an attempt to capture for each adolescent their modelling of the aspects of social organisation to which each set of questions was addressed. The relevant topics, as outlined in Chapter 4, are:

- (a) gender differentiation;
- (b) the social division of labour;
- (c) educational processes;
- (d) further aspects of social and political organisation.

For the first three an index (or indices) has been derived which encapsulates the adolescents' response on a number of questions from the total set relevant to the topic. Each of these indices, necessarily entailing a different construction, will be discussed in detail, together with the refocussing of our original coding categories which the analysis required. It proved impossible to generate an index which would encapsulate responses on the topic of political processes and we have therefore examined this section on a question by question basis, using the original coding categories. The
results for the topic are presented in a more discursive and descriptive fashion than for the other topics, in Chapter 11.

The indices developed for each of the three topics has been based wholly or in part on Bernstein's concept of classification (Bernstein, 1971: 202; 1980: 12ff).

2 The concepts of classification and framing

Bernstein introduced the concepts of classification and framing in an analysis of curriculum which led to the development of a typology of educational codes (1971: 202; 1977: 85). The concepts were intended to operate at a more general level, however, and to provide a link between the educational system and the dominating principles for the organisation of the social formation, and their realisation in the distribution of power and of the principles of control. Classification was described as referring to the degree of boundary maintenance or insulation between categories, focusing attention on boundary strength or insulation as the critical distinguishing feature in this particular instance of the division of labour of educational knowledge.

In the setting of an analysis of educational knowledge and educational codes, the concept framing referred to the form of the context in which knowledge is transmitted and received, in this instance to the pedagogic relationship between teacher and taught, and specifically to the range of options available to the participants in control over what is transmitted and received in the pedagogic relationship.

Both classification and framing can, in varying degrees, be weak or strong. In the most general formulation, a principle of strong classification exists when there is strong insulation between categories; weak classification is indicated by weak insulation between categories. Strong framing exists when a transmitter controls the selection, pacing, organisation and various physical factors (such as location, dress and posture of the participants) in a communicative context. Weak framing exists when the acquirer has more control over these aspects of communication.
The basic argument relating to the generality of the concepts of classification and framing and the links between education and the social structure in a paper on educational knowledge codes (Bernstein, 1977) is that the nature of classification and framing in the educational context is a realisation of the authority or power structure which controls both the dissemination of knowledge and the form of knowledge actually transmitted. The resulting educational knowledge codes were then seen as a realisation of the principles of power and of social control. According to Bernstein, the distribution of power constructs the principles of classification by regulating the degrees of insulation of the categories; the principles of control regulate framing and so the principles of communicative practice. Thus power relations constitute the classification and control relations the framing. Through the acquisition of educational knowledge codes in the communicative context of the pedagogic relationship, lodged as it is in the total set of social relations and material constraints which comprise a particular educational establishment, these principles enter into individual consciousness. Put at the most general level (Bernstein, 1977: 11):

"... power and control are made substantive in the classification and framing which then generate distinctive forms of social relationships and thus communication, and through the latter initially, but not necessarily finally, shape mental structures."

Insulation between categories, the manifestation of the principle of classification and its strength, performs two basic functions. At the social level, the outer function is to create order - whose order depends on the distribution of power; at the level of the individual, the inner function is to suppress the arbitrariness of the principle of the distribution of power, and of the potential contradictions and dilemmas which might beset the subject should such insulation weaken.

The concepts of classification and framing can be used at a very specific level as analytical tools to describe or typify particular sets of social relations and communicative and interactional practices found for example in the school, the family or in production. The concepts are also, it is clear, meant to operate at the general level adumbrated above, forming linkages both to the dominant cultural category from which the distribution of power and the principle of control are ultimately derived, for Bernstein class
relations, and to the positioning of the subject through the operation of codes. The most elaborated version of the entire theoretical formulation is provided by Bernstein (1980), especially page 29. See also Bernstein (1985).

In attempting to come to grips with what we have termed the adolescents' modelling of various aspects of social organisation, relating specifically to gender differentiation, the social division of labour, and educational processes, as revealed in the responses to specific question areas of our questionnaire, we have used Bernstein's concept of classification. The major reason for the use of this concept, in the particular operationalisations and reformulations which we have made, is in order to be able to utilise the force of the linkages to the structure and realisation of power which Bernstein postulates for this concept. If for example, as we have attempted to do and will detail below, we develop an index of the adolescents' modelling of gender specialisation or differentiation in terms of the strength or weakness of their classification of gender differentiation, this measure will necessarily refer back to the power relations which create and produce distinctions and differentiation on the basis of an individual's gender. In addition to this reference outwards to the power structure of society in which the individual is enmeshed, the concept of classification also refers inwards, to the individual's consciousness and conceptualisation of themselves and the social world, in this context operating as an indicator of their ideological positioning.

In defence of the omission to utilise the twin concept of framing we must refer to the nature of the data with which we are working in this study.

"Framing refers to the principle regulating the communicative practices of the social relations within the reproduction of discursive resources; that is between transmitters and acquirers." (Bernstein, 1980, p. 25)

The principle regulating communicative practices can be recovered by an analysis of the interaction between transmitters and acquirers in a communicative context. Framing is a concept which is applied to a process, and can then give the realisation rules by which the participants in a communicative context produce what they consider to be an acceptable text, or response. The control implicit in strong framing can extend to all aspects
of the communicative context including physical characteristics of the location and dress and disposition of the participants. The type of data generated in the current study, based on responses to a questionnaire, does not allow the recovery of the realisation rules employed by the respondents in order to produce what they considered to be an acceptable text, and it is therefore impossible to employ the concept of framing in this context.

We try to capture, at a global level, with the particular indices described and used in this part of the study, what we have termed the adolescents' modelling of crucial aspects of social organisation. Two of the indices look specifically at relative weakness or strength of classification as applied to gender differentiation and the categories of the social division of labour. In the third instance, when we examine the educational process, two indices are employed which are based closely on Bernstein's analysis of the relationship between education and production (Bernstein 1977: 174). The first makes use of the concept of classification, and the second of what Bernstein has called the systemic relation between education and production, which focusses on education in its role as a reproducer of the labour force and of the relations of production.

It will be seen from the description of each of the indices which have been developed that the scales which underly them vary. In some instances the type of question asked permitted only the coding of the presence or absence of classification, other questions produced a high degree of differentiation of responses which was reflected in greater differentiation in the coding categories employed to capture these responses. In the latter instance it was possible to scale these differentiated responses in terms of the relative strength or weakness of the underlying classificatory principle. It was possible, for example, to create a scale with quite fine degrees of strength and weakness of classification in the case of the index of gender differentiation (although this was not true for all questions used in that index) whereas for the index of the social division of labour fewer distinctions of degree could be made. In each case we have offered a justification for the choices made.

We will describe each of the indices and the specific way in which the concept of classification was operationalised and applied to each in the
relevant topic area in the following three chapters. The method of comparison for our age, gender, class and intra-mc groups is the same for each of the indices. Individuals were allocated scores in the ways described for each topic. For each topic area, the distribution of individuals across the range of scores was obtained for each of the groups. These distributions were collapsed, in the case of the modelling of gender differentiation and the social division of labour, into categories indicating relatively strong or relatively weak classification. The groups were compared on the basis of the collapsed distributions.

We turn first to our analysis of the data provided for us by Wells from his study of the language development of young children. This data, collected for an entirely different study, is in a form which enables us to compare the professed interactional practices of the family on the basis of the mothers' report, with the class and field location of the family in terms of both the fathers' and the mothers' location.

3 Some data on the family derived from Wells' study

Our current study focusses on the two major organising principles of the social formation: patriarchy and class, the cultural and material realisation of these principles in the social division of labour and the sexual division of labour, and the impact on individual consciousness in terms of ideological positioning of individual agents which location in the institutions and practices of these forms of organisation of society produces. The family is located between the broadest structures of the social formation, and the development and experience of the individual, and is a crucial mediating institution. The family is not addressed directly in this work, but is the fundamental hidden variable, since it is the ideological representations of adolescents acquired initially in the primary socialising context of the family to which we turn our attention in the empirical data, trying to identify class and gender similarities and differences in response. We want to relate certain aspects of the family interactional practices and modes of control, to the model of the social division of labour which we have developed.
3.1 Positional and personal families

Bernstein has suggested and elaborated (unpublished mimeo 1962 SRU, 1969, 1971: 152ff, 1977: 125) two ideal family types which he has related to family role systems, social control and patterns of communication: personal and positional families. These family types are described and discussed in the above references as ideal types. They occur in both middle and working class settings although manifested in different ways in these differing locations, especially in respect, for Bernstein, of the use of particular communicative practices or orientations towards different types of control. He argues that there is a historical progression at a general level, from the more positional family type to the more personal. For the middle class this progression is related to the appearance of the new middle class. For the working class, the breaking down of traditional working class subcultural groups and forms of relations through increasing affluence, a certain degree of geographical and social mobility, the gradual assimilation of changing attitudes towards child development, and the general movement from a production to a service economy have contributed to this movement from positional to personal. ² Table 6.1 outlines the properties and characteristics of these ideal types of family.

Although it is clear that these constructs are ideal types and cannot be found in their true form, and that they can exist in tendency in all social class groups, it is also clear from the above discussion that there should be a relationship at a general level between social class location and family type. The expectations are:

(a) for the working class that those in traditional working class occupations and groupings, and those in the lower working class would be more likely than others in the wc to have positional forms of family relations, and that the working class as a whole would be more likely than the middle class to have such forms.

(b) for the middle class, those in the old middle class would be more likely to have positional forms of family relations than those in the new middle class. Or in terms of our model of fractions of the middle class, those
### Outline of ideal types of positional and personal families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Things must be kept apart</strong></td>
<td><strong>Things must be put together</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Differentiation and authority relations based on and legitimised by clear cut, unambiguous publicly sanctioned definitions of familial status: age, sex, age relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assigned roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Decision making invested in members' formal status - father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, age and sex of child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak or closed communication system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex and age related status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties in coping with ambiguity and ambivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unilateral socialisation from parents to child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learns communized role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social control either through power or referring behaviour to universal or particular norms which regulate the status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations are clear and in disputes reference can be made to an 'objective' external system which governs interlocking role relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on social identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong boundary maintenance, things kept apart e.g. the organisation of space, objects, property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the field of production would be more likely to have positional families than those in the field of symbolic control.

This study has not looked at the family directly and no systematic information can be retrieved from our data about the nature of the forms of family relations which our adolescents experience in their own families. Nor have we been able to retrieve the information from the study which specifically looked at positional and personal middle class mothers, and operationalised these concepts (P. Cook, 1977). We have, however, been extremely fortunate in being given access to some data from another empirical study of parents and children, which has enabled us to address the relationship between positional and personal mothers and their social class and within middle class location.

Gordon Wells has been engaged in a longitudinal study of children and language development (Wells, 1982, 1985) and amongst many aspects of this study, Wells had administered to the mothers of his sample of children a schedule which was developed in the Sociological Research Unit (Adlam, 1977). This instrument consisted of a series of forced choice questions designed to indicate whether the respondent had attitudes typical of a positional or personal oriented family. The schedule used by Wells was almost identical to the one used in the SRU (see Adlam, 1977, p. 227 for the SRU schedule) with one or two minor alterations. Wells kindly gave us access to his data on a sample of 116 middle and working class parents of the families he was investigating, providing the occupations and ages of both parents, and the responses of the mothers to the positional/personal schedule. From this we were able to ascertain whether the postulated relationship suggested by Bernstein between class location and positionality in terms of modes of control in the family held.4

4 A test of the hypothesis relating positional and personal families to class and intra class location

The hypothesis we took to this data was that there would be a decreasing likelihood of a high level of positionality in the families of members of the different social class groups, in the ordering: working class >
middle class members of the field of production > middle class members of the field of symbolic control.

We took the 116 sets of parents in the sample and located them on our model of the social division of labour, on the basis of their occupation. Of the 116 pairs, on the basis of the father's occupation, 67 were working class, 28 middle class in the field of production, and 21 middle class in the field of symbolic control. If we include low level white collar work in the field of production of the middle class, the proportions of husbands and wives for each class and intra-class group who were in the same field are: wc = 69%, mc = 47%.

4.1 Procedure

The positional/personal questionnaire was completed by the mothers in this sample. The scoring was simply one for each positional response and 0 for a personal or non response, and so was the number of positional responses given out of a possible 22 forced choice questions. The range for each social class group on these scores was: wc 2-15, mc production 2-10, and mc symbolic control 1-9. We calculated difference between means for a range of groupings of our sample based on social class and within social class location using father's occupation, and on various combinations of mother's and father's occupations.

4.2 Results

4.2.1 Differences between means on positional score: sample located by father's occupation

The difference between the middle class and working class means shown in Table 6.2 are significant at .0005 for a one tailed test. The difference between the groups in the middle class are significant at .005 for a one tailed test (i.e. in the direction of our predictions). Our initial hypothesis on the positionality of these social class and class groups in the ordering wc > mc in production > mc in symbolic control is supported by these results.
Table 6.2

Differences between means on positional scores for social class groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between social class groups</th>
<th>Within middle class group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Some comparisons based on both mother's and father's occupation

Most of the mothers in the field of production were in low level white collar jobs (LLWC), as were some mothers who were wives of working class fathers. Table 6.3 gives numbers (sometimes small or non existent) and means of positional scores for various mother/father combinations.

We can see from this table that for the mc group in all cases for mothers in each of the categories in which subjects are available, a father in the field of symbolic control leads to a lower positional score compared with a father in the field of production. For a father in the field of production, for all categories where cases are available, the mother's location reflects the differences we have found in the total group, with wc mothers having a higher positional score than LLWC mothers, who have a higher mean score than symbolic control mothers. If the father is in the field of symbolic control this relationship does not hold. However, 57% of these fathers are married to women in the field of symbolic control, and the cells for mothers in other categories are small. Fathers in the field of production in this sample, in contrast, are not married to women in the same field and 64% of them are married to women working in low level white collar or manual jobs. (See the discussion of the adolescent sample in these terms in Chapter 4, p. 155. See also Britten and Heath (1983) and McRae (1982) for a discussion of cross-class families.)
Table 6.3
Comparisons between groups based on mothers' and fathers' occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Semi/un-skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>LLWC</td>
<td>LLWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the wc group the skill level of the father's occupation is related to positionality; the lower the skill level, the higher the positionality score whatever the mother's location. This provides support for Bernstein's contention that it is the lower working class who are more likely to have positional families (Bernstein, 1971: 152). The mother's location has some influence, however, in the lower working class, where mothers in low level white collar work have a lower positional score than those in manual work.
4.2.3 Gender differentiation in these families

In addition to the above comparisons, we selected the only five questions from the questionnaire which could be said to reflect positionality on gender issues, or in the terms of our analysis of gender differentiation in our material (Chapter 7), strong classification of gender differentiation.

These questions related to:
(1) whether or not parents encouraged girls and boys to use different toys
(2) whether or not parents applied different standards to boys and girls, and asked for agreement with the following statements:
(3) Men should not do women's work in the house; it doesn't matter who does what so long as it gets done.
(4) The man should be the head of the family; husband and wife should decide most things together.
(5) Both husband and wife should have interests separate from the family, and outside it/married people should share all their interests together and with the family.

We scored these questions in the same way as for the overall measure, one for a positional response, and 0 for a personal or non response. (There were only two non responses out of total possible responses equalling 580 on these questions.) The total possible score for an individual was then five. Table 6.4 gives the mean scores for our groups on positionality on gender differentiation. The results mirror the results on the overall measure and differences in the predicted direction of a decreasing positional score for the groups in the ordering wc > mc production > mc symbolic control (based on father's occupation) can be seen. The differences between mc and wc groups is significant at the .005 level; between production and symbolic control within the mc the difference is significant at .025.

Overview

We find in this data support for our hypothesis of a decreasing level of positional score amongst our class and within class groups in the order wc > mc production > mc symbolic control on both the total positional score and a
subscore developed on five questions dealing with gender differentiation. In general, the mean scores for our groups overall is relatively low, indicating that most of these families are not highly positional, but more likely to have personal forms of family interaction and parental control. As suggested by Bernstein (1971: 160-61), the lower working class group is more likely than other members of the wc to have positional forms of family interaction and control, as we see in our analysis of different skill levels within the wc. Whilst the above comments are based on results in terms of the father's location in the social division of labour, we saw above that in all but one instance the location of the mother has an effect in the predicted direction on the positional score of the group.

We suggest on the basis of this analysis that the interactional practices of the families in our adolescent sample will differ in a similar way to those we have seen in Wells' sample. Relatively positional family interactional practices and modes of control will lead to stronger classification of aspects of the social and sexual division of labour.

We have introduced this data to indicate the linkages which we are trying to make between the family, class and intra class location, and the social structure. They show some of the dynamics of the family and its interactional practices which we consider important for the classification held by family members and the ideological positioning which this reveals. We have seen in this data, and in the case of the index of field differences reported in Chapter 5, that the class and intra class location of the mother in addition to
and in interaction with that of the father, has an important influence on (a) the interactional practices of the family and (b) the ideological positioning of family members. In addition to the effect of the material conditions in which the family exists, through the practices discussed here and the ideological messages which support them, the initial ideological positioning of the individual in class and gender takes place.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1 This was an explicit realisation of the concepts which had been implicit in much of Bernstein's work previously, for example in the discussion of positional and personal families, where boundary maintenance or otherwise was a crucial defining characteristic of these families (1971: 152 ff).

2 Sharp (1980: 44-66), in a general critique of Bernstein arguing that he does not adhere to a Marxist theoretical conception of social and historical processes despite considerable recourse to Marxist terminology, suggests that, whilst the processes which Bernstein describes here may be empirically true, they require explanation. Sharp considers that only a Marxist analysis can provide an adequate explanation of these phenomena and their interrelationships.

3 Bernstein (1962, 1969, 1971, 1977). P. Cook (1977) attempted to operationalise some of these concepts in a study of sibling rivalry and maternal control. Cook was able to identify positional and personal families in her sample of 80 middle class mothers, and to show that positional and personal mothers did differ in their socialisation behaviour in line with the models outlined here. She did not relate her positional and personal families to the precise middle class location of her mothers, and we were unable to retrieve the original data to do so ourselves.

4 Wells has incorporated parts of the description which follows in Wells (1985: 312-314).

5 The few non responses occur since the interviewer in some cases was unable to persuade the mother to endorse either of the options offered as reflecting or close to her own position.
CHAPTER 7

THE ADOLESCENTS' MODELLING OF GENDER DIFFERENTIATION

1 Introduction

For Bernstein, as we have seen, the concept of classification refers to the degree of insulation between categories and he considers that "the principle of the distribution of power is made substantive in the principle of classification"; classification is the realisation of power relations both within and between the social division of labour of education and production. The dominant cultural category, or principle on which the capitalist social formation is based is that of class, and class relations in Bernstein's formulation are defined as constituting "inequalities in the distribution of power and principles of control between social groups which are realized in the creation, organisation, distribution, legitimation and reproduction of material and symbolic values arising out of the social division of labour" (Bernstein, 1977: viii). We have suggested that a further "dominant cultural category" is operating to produce a similar unequal distribution of power, control and material and symbolic values between groups in the society. The principle is patriarchy, and the fundamental division which it creates is a sexual division. We discuss in Chapter 1 both our conception of the interaction between the basic principles of class and patriarchy and their realisations in the practices of the social relations of production and reproduction.

The index developed in this chapter is an attempt to derive from the adolescents' responses to key questions on sexual division what we call their orientation towards the gender classification. That is their degree of acceptance or rejection of the gender categories derived from the principle of patriarchy, which privileges and values the male or masculine in the hierarchical ordering of privilege, power and control. As indicated above, we have co-opted from Bernstein's conceptual armoury both the concept of classification and his elaboration of the operation of classificatory principles in terms of the degree of strength or weakness with which boundaries or insulation between categories is maintained. We categorised the responses to questions on sexual division on a scale from very strongly classified to very
weakly classified: +++C ++C +C 0 -C --C ---C. The differentiation of the responses on the questions enabled us to make these distinctions, but since we were in fact coding actual responses made to the questionnaire, it was not the case that all of the degrees of strength and weakness of classification were represented in the responses to any single question. Some questions for example called forth only strongly classified responses.

What are being classified are gender distinctions and we have defined this in terms of the specialisation of the category gender. A specialised gender category is a culturally defined gender specific object, image, act or practice. For our definition of culturally defined gender categories we draw on the gender categories perceptible in the material and symbolic practices of the society.

Having placed the adolescents' responses in the degrees of strength and weakness of gender classification, we asked a team of twenty judges to make a similar categorisation of the responses. The degree of agreement amongst our judges and ourselves in the ranking of the responses for every question was very high. Using Kendall's coefficient of concordance (Siegel, 1956: 229-238), we noted that $W$ ranged from .62 to .95 and was significant at the .001 level in all cases. Siegel (following Kendall, 1948: 87) argues that the best estimate of the 'true' ranking of a series of entities according to some criterion is provided by the order of the sums of ranks. We took this summary ordering of ranks from our judges as the order for the responses scaled in this measure. The actual position on the scale was derived by averaging the score for each response (item) across our judges. We will describe in the next section the questions used and the arguments which we developed for scaling specific responses on a scale from weak to strong classification of gender differentiation.

We are arguing, in this instance, that weak classification of gender differentiation involves some questioning of the gender based distinctions of the hierarchical ordering of privilege and power in which women are subordinate to men. Strong classification in this instance indicates greater acceptance of such distinctions and of the power structure which produces and reproduces inequalities based on gender.
2 The index of gender classification

2.1 Questions used, refocussing of the coding and examples of recoded responses

In the original construction of the questionnaire we included a series of questions on gender differentiation at school, at work and in relation to domestic labour. In our view these questions formed a nucleus around which the issues of gender differentiation could be addressed, and from which the adolescents' modelling of this differentiation could be derived. As we have noted earlier (Chapter 5), in one of our analyses of data we created a three point scale of the adolescents' responses to questions which could be described briefly as (1) support for, or (2) opposition to, prevailing societal values and practices on any given issue which formed the focus for the question, or (3) responses which could not be assigned in this way. On the basis of this scale we factor analysed the data and the procedure produced some evidence for the underlying cohesion of the topic area related to gender differentiation.

Two other criteria were used in the selection of suitable questions for this present index: (1) that the responses of the adolescents could in fact be categorised into a scale of strength of gender classification; (2) that the responses represented not merely a recognition of the classification of gender relations, which could therefore be seen as descriptive of those relations, but revealed at some level the respondent's own position with respect to gender divisions. It could then be legitimately considered to represent a measure of the individual respondent's orientation to gender classification. The use of these criteria resulted in the exclusion from the index of some questions which were part of the topic area on gender described in Chapter 4 above.

Our initial coding system for the adolescents' responses was derived from two sources: (a) our theoretical presuppositions about the content of ideological messages, and dominant cultural values relating broadly to the sexual and social divisions of labour, and (b) an inspection of the responses. We refocussed our initial coding in order to take into account qualifications of the response where appropriate which would permit us to infer degrees of
strength of gender classification. Our method for refocussing was to look at the categories of response to each of the questions to be included in the index (selected on the criteria outlined above) and to allocate them on a scale of strength and weakness of the classification, from +++C through 0 to ---C.

For some questions the responses were sufficiently differentiated to be allocated to most if not all of the points on the scale; for others only a dichotomy between relatively strong and relatively weak classification could be made. In general we found that the highest scores were allocated to strongly assertive statements in favour of or rejecting gender differentiation. Comments which could not be judged as indicating either weak or strong classification on the issue were scored 0. The arguments which we used for placing responses at particular points on the scale are given in the following description of the refocussing of the original coding used for this index. For the first four questions below we had originally considered that we could only create a dichotomy, but in some instances our judges were able to provide more differentiation of the scale.

2.1.1 The questions and recoding

Q1 Do you think that people should be paid for doing housework?

The issue of pay for housework is addressed directly, and a distinction is made between those who consider that it should be paid work and those who consider that it should not, without reference to the types of reasons which they give to justify their responses.

Recoded:

+ C No
- C Yes

Q2 Who is responsible for looking after the home and family?

The basic distinction made in this and the following question was between the mother or woman being responsible for or performing domestic labour, in contrast to a situation where fathers and/or other
members of the household were involved. When the first question was interpreted at a more general level and the father was mentioned, this was also considered to be an indication of relatively strong gender differentiation. The justification for this interpretation came initially from experience of responses to this question in the pilot interviews. The response is related to the notion of the male as breadwinner and responsible for a family. Other indications that both girls and boys in this study are aware of or adhere to this model of male behaviour occur elsewhere in our results (see for example p. 254 below for a discussion of Connell et al (1982) on this point). The judges took the same view.

Recoded:
+++C Mother
+C Father
-C Parents, the whole family
--C The household, those who live in the house

Q3 Who usually does housework?

Recoded:
+++C Mother, wife, woman (with or without support)
-C Both parents
--C Father, the whole family, or household

Q4 If you got married and your husband was earning less/wife was earning more/ than you, would it bother you?

The question seeks a reaction to a reversal of the common pattern of male and female earnings, and distinguishes between those who feel uncomfortable about it, and those who feel that they could accept it, with differentiation of their reasons.
Recoded:

+++C Yes, with a reason based on traditional male and female roles, for example that the man is or should be the breadwinner, that it should be possible to rely on the man earning more.

++C Yes, the respondent would not like the dependence of the man on the woman.

+C (A response given by girls) No, but I would prefer him to get a better job.

-C No, with minimal qualification, for example, provided we have enough to live on, as long as we are happy. No, if it is justified, if for example the spouse earning more works harder, or is more qualified or experienced.

Q5 Are some jobs mainly done by men and others mainly done by women? Give reasons for your answer.

The reasons given for gender differentiation in work were seen as indicating degrees of acceptance of male and female differentiation in the labour market. The argument that type of physique or strength dictates the types of work done by men and women is judged as a strong gender classification for several reasons:

(1) It must literally apply to few jobs;

(2) It ignores the fact that many of the jobs that women do are or can be physically strenuous and demanding (e.g. waitress, barmaid, nurse, housework and childcare);

(3) An indication that it is a social definition of acceptable male and female differentiation lies in the fact that it is culturally specific, women in other cultures undertake work which would be considered suitable only for men on the grounds of strength in this country;

(4) Physical strength can hardly be considered crucial in the allocation of men and women to white collar work, and particularly to jobs near the top of the occupational hierarchy.²

Recoded:

+++C Physique or strength dictates the types of jobs undertaken by women and men.
Differentiation in types of work done by men and women is seen as traditional, implicitly accepted or acceptable, men and women would find other arrangements strange or unacceptable. Men and women prefer to do different work - an acceptance of freedom of choice where choice does not necessarily exist. Male and female differentiated work is the result of prejudice and discrimination against women. A statement of equality between the sexes, disapproval expressed for distinctions in work based on gender.

Q6 Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls? Reasons elicited.

Recoded:

+++C Differentiation of school subjects suitable for males and females is appropriate because the subjects taken will fit sex differentiated roles in future life or work.

++C A negative comment specifying particular attributes of (usually) the opposite sex which render certain subjects unsuitable. Boys and girls prefer different subjects; whether or not a real choice exists for both girls and boys is ignored.

-C A prescriptive statement about school subjects for boys and girls - e.g. "should be the same".

--C A reference to discrimination or prejudice being at the root of gender differentiated school subjects. A statement of equality between the sexes, or a positive statement about the value of counter sex-role education.

Q7 Do you think you will get married?

Although the general response to this question is an expectation of marriage, and this is realistic in the light of the marriage rate in the UK, a less definite response, or a negative response, gives an indication of some questioning of this basic institution of gender specialisation.
A lot of women do housework and also have a job outside the home. For what kinds of reasons do they have jobs outside the home?

We had originally allocated a response which referred to 'need' as a motivation for women working outside the home to a category of strong gender classification, arguing that only such a strong motivation would counter the more acceptable domestic norm of the woman remaining at home. Our judges, however, were not in accord in this issue and ultimately, on this question, the average position for the category 'need' was 0 - or not assignable to strong or weak gender classification. 'Need' or 'necessity' might be seen as a motivating factor for work outside the home for the wc to a greater extent than for the mc woman, and in this context such a response could indicate a recognition of the significance of the woman's wage to the maintenance of the standard of living of the family. On a more personalised question about work after marriage (see below questions 10 and 11) 'need' was perceived as a strongly classified position. The argument here is that in the context of the individual's own marriage, a reference to need would imply an acceptance of the division of domestic and financial responsibility which could only be overcome by such a strong motivation.

Recoded:

++C Pin, or extra money, subordinate to the main domestic specialisation, and implicitly to the male wage earner.

+C Personal money, still viewed as subordinate to the male wage earner, but slightly less strongly.

0 Need

--C A positive comment about waged work outside the home.
Q9  If a husband and wife both work outside the home, who should do the housework? Who should look after the children if there are children?

The response here indicates the individual's prescription for gender differentiation in domestic roles.

Recoded:
+++C The mother, the woman, the one whose job fits in with domestic requirements (which includes a hidden assumption about female waged labour).
+C There should be unpaid help from other family members, children, grandparents. Other female members of the family required to help.
--C Male and female should share; there should be a reorganisation of waged labour (by both) to meet domestic requirements.

Q10  If you do get married, what work do you think your wife will do, if any?

This is a question for boys but parallel to the following question aimed at girls, and scored in the same way. Certain responses were seen as indicating the power of the public/private, waged labour/domestic labour distinction between men and women, and specifically the questions considered to reveal the recognition of the specialisation of gender categories within the individual's own projected marriage.

Recoded:
+++C His wife will not work outside the home - clear allocation of the woman to the domestic role.
++C His wife will work if need dictates. Need would be considered a strong enough motivation to counter the domestic role for women; a reference to his wife's work fitting in with, or being involved with his own work.
+C The respondent offers a job which his future wife will have, of a stereotyped nature, accepting that his wife will work, but moving gender specialisation over to the labour market.

--C The respondent offers a job for his future wife which is of a non-stereotyped nature. In this instance the individual has moved away from gender specialisation of the domestic role, and can envisage non-stereotyped work for his wife in the labour market. A further response in this category is to suggest that the work done by his wife will be her own choice.

Q11 If you do get married, will you work after your marriage?

Recoded:

+++C The respondent will not work, or makes a reference to domestic labour only.

++C The respondent will work if need dictates. Her work will be dependent on her husband's job or approval.

0 The respondent will work except when her children are young.

-C The respondent will work, without any qualifications. She either intends to work, or recognises that she most probably will work after her marriage.

Q12 Do you think you would be happy working for a woman boss or supervisor?

Recoded:

+++C An assertive negative response.

++C A negative response with reference to characteristics of males which are viewed positively, or of females which are viewed negatively.

+C The respondent would not object if the woman had certain specific desirable qualities.

-C The respondent is not bothered by the idea at all.

--C A reference to positive female characteristics.

---C An assertive positive response, e.g. "Why not, women are just as good as men, if not better."
Table 7.1:
Types of responses generated by each question on gender differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+++C</th>
<th>++C</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>--C</th>
<th>---C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 A note on strength and weakness of classification in the answers

As was pointed out above, and as will have been noted from the above refocussing of the questions, there is an imbalance in the degree to which questions can be coded into the strongest classification category (+++C) and the weakest (---C). This is detailed in Table 7.1. This occurs because our categories were drawn not only from our theoretical presuppositions, but from the actual responses of the adolescents. This series of questions generated more types of response which could be categorised as very strong gender classification than those which could (and indeed were by our judges) judged to be very weak gender classification, and reflect the existence of these views in our adolescent sample.
Construction of the index of gender classification

Responses on the above twelve questions were coded onto a scale of strength and weakness of gender classification and scored in the following way:

```
+++C  ++C  +C  0  -C  --C  ---C
3    2    1    0   -1   -2   -3
```

The neutral point on the scale represents all coded responses which could not be allocated to the scale and also non responses. For each individual a cumulative score or index of the strength or weakness of her/his gender classification was derived by summing the scores generated by her/his responses over the set of questions used. A positive score indicated relatively strong classification of gender differentiation, the higher the score the more strongly classified; a negative score indicated relatively weak gender classification. The actual range on this score overall was -14 to +25. In essence the index of classificatory strength which the individual received did not represent a coding of her/his responses on the set of questions, but a count of the number of endorsements of weak or strong classificatory statements, weighted by the degree of strength or weakness of the statements, made when responding to the questions.

Results on the index of gender classification

To make comparisons between the class, intra-class, age and gender groups for the index of strength of classification of gender differentiation, we obtained the distributions of individuals in each group across the range of scores obtained. The distributions were collapsed into three categories: The first contained those who obtained a positive score, and who were considered to have relatively strong classification of gender differentiation over all; the second contained those whose cumulative score was zero, falling into neither the positive nor the negative category and showing no bias in either direction; and the third contained those who obtained a negative score and who were considered to have relatively weak classification of gender differentiation. The groups were compared on the basis of the collapsed distributions, and chi
square tests were performed when the differences appeared to be of some magnitude, and the levels of significance of the difference in these cases is indicated in the text.

4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

Class differences

From Table 7.2 we see that in general, in most instances, the mc adolescents have a greater tendency than the working class adolescents to fall into the category indicating weak classification of gender differentiation, although the differences are small. The only group for which this difference between the mc and the wc reaches any level of significance are 12+ year old girls at the .05 level.

Gender differences

A more important difference emerges between the gender groups. For each class group, and at each age level, girls are more likely than boys to indicate weak classification of gender differentiation, and the tendency increases with age. At 15+ for both mc and wc groups the difference between boys and girls is significant, for the mc at .001, and for the wc at .02. In addition, mc girls at 15+ have less strongly classified gender differentiation than any other group, barely half of them falling into this category. Apart from these girls, however, we can see that in all other groups a majority of individuals have strong classification of gender differentiation. There is a movement into weak classification of gender differentiation with age for all groups. For girls in both the mc and wc the difference in the distribution between weak and strong classification is significantly different (at .01) at 15+ from that at 12+.

4.2 Intra-mc comparison

For our within middle class group comparison we would predict from our basic model that there would be differences in the strength or weakness of gender classification depending on the field location of the individual; that those in the field of production would be more likely to have strong gender
Table 7.2

Comparison between MC and WC groups on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N MC</th>
<th>N WC</th>
<th>% differences MC</th>
<th>% differences WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This subsample includes all those in each overall class group (MC and WC) for whom we have a field location for the father.
classification, and those in the field of symbolic control to have weak gender classification.

For this comparison, from Table 7.3 we can see clear effects of the field location of the father, although none of the differences reaches significance:

(i) Boys with fathers in the field of symbolic control are more likely to be in the category indicating weak classification of gender differentiation than those with fathers in production.

(ii) Girls with fathers in the field of symbolic control are also more likely to fall overall into the category indicating weak classification of gender differentiation, than those in the field of production, and the difference is more marked than for the boys.

All groups, with the exception of boys from the field of production, show some movement into weak classification of gender differentiation with age.

4.2.1 Gender comparison within the mc groups

We now change focus and look at boys and girls within each of our mc groups located in the different fields:

(i) At 12+ girls are more likely than boys to be in the category indicating weak classification of gender differentiation, with the difference more marked for those in symbolic control.

(ii) At 15+ the differences between boys and girls, with girls more frequently exhibiting weak gender classification than boys, reaches significance at .01 for those in the field of production and at .02 for those in symbolic control. Girls in the field of production move into weak classification with age to a greater extent than any other group, the difference in their distribution between strong and weak classification is significantly different (at .02) at 15+ from that at 12+. 
Table 7.3
Comparison within the MC on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification: the field of production and the field of symbolic control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison between Tables 7.2 and 7.3 indicates that it is girls in symbolic control at both 12+ and 15+ who make the largest contribution to the tendency for mc girls to have weak gender classification. From this and other inspections of the data we have seen that many of the girls in the field of symbolic control, especially at the older age level, reject patterns of behaviour expected of men and women, and often take a strong position on equality between the sexes.

4.2.2 Comparison between the 'ideal typical' groups within the middle class

A brief comparison with Table 7.3 indicates that the total mc group separated by field location was a good predictor of the responses of our more precisely located mc groups. We still find
(1) that at each age level adolescents in the field of symbolic control are more likely than those in production to have weak classification of gender differentiation;
(2) that with the exception of boys in the field of production, all groups move into the category indicating weak gender classification to a greater extent with age;
(3) that within each ideal typical field group, girls are more likely than boys to have weak classification of gender differentiation. For 15+ adolescents in the field of production this difference between boys and girls reaches significance at the .02 level.

4.2.3 Comparison between groups with both mother and father in the same field

The final comparison we have made on strength and weakness of gender classification in our adolescents examines those middle class adolescents who are located in the field of production or symbolic control on the basis of both their mother's and their father's occupation. Our expectation is that if both parents are located in the same field, the impact of that field will be reinforced.

The familiar pattern that we have noted in the various subgroups within our mc sample emerges once again. If we compare this table with Table 7.3,
Table 7.4

Comparison between 'ideal typical' groups within the MC on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4  7  6  14</td>
<td>12  18  18  26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>1  3  1  3</td>
<td>3  8  3  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29  29  27  36</td>
<td>85  74  79  68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>34  39  34  53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>5  11  11  21</td>
<td>12  34  28  47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 0</td>
<td>0  4  0  4</td>
<td>0  13  0  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>38  17  28  20</td>
<td>88  53  72  44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>43  32  39  45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.5

Comparison within the MC on the degree of strength and weakness of their gender classification: those with both mother and father in the same field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which gave the total mc sample based on field location, can we discern an impact of the mothers who share the same location as the father? It seems that the only group for which this is the case is 15+ boys in the field of symbolic control, who are more likely to have weak gender classification when both mother and father are in the field of symbolic control.

We can see from the above results that one general conclusion can be drawn from the comparisons we have made amongst our groups - strong classification of gender categories typifies all of our groups. The majority of the members of each of our age, gender, class and intra-mc groups have relatively strong gender classification. The only exception to this general conclusion are 15+ girls in the field of symbolic control. We have noted in other analyses that many of these girls take a less traditional position on the issues covered in this study. There is also, however, an age difference for all groups except boys in the field of production - a weakening of gender classification with age. Table 7.6 shows the percentage movement with age into weak classification on the index of gender differentiation for our major groups.

When the unit is an item in the topic area

We can supplement our general findings on the adolescents' modelling of gender differentiation by looking at a number of questions which we were unable to include in the index discussed above. Four questions were omitted from this section since we found it impossible to create a meaningful index of the degree of strength or weakness of classification of gender differentiation for these questions. One question asked the adolescents what they thought was the difference between housework and other types of work. The remaining three were projective questions which sought to ascertain what the student saw as being the most important thing in her/his life; what they considered to be the most important thing for other members of their own sex; and what would be important for members of the opposite sex. We also asked at what age the adolescents expected to marry.

The results reported here are of the three types distinguished earlier:

(i) significant differences
Table 7.6
Percentage change with age on the index of gender classification:
movement into weak classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class comparison</th>
<th>Field comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) non significant differences, or similarities which reveal an overall trend for any group
(iii) selected illustrative or interesting quotations from the adolescents' responses.

We will present the results in terms of two comparisons, (a) between the two class groups, and (b) between the two groups within the mc. Overall similarities or differences, and those related to gender or age, will be discussed within the above comparisons.

5.1 Domestic labour

Question:
(1) Is housework different from other kinds of work? If yes, in what ways?
(2) Do you think that people should be paid for doing housework? If yes, why? If no, why not?

5.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The intention behind the first question here was to see whether housework was regarded as work and especially as unpaid work by the
adolescents. The question on pay for housework was included in the index for gender differentiation, but it is discussed here since the results are both related and supplementary to the question under discussion.

One fifth of our total adolescent group in fact consider that housework is no different from any other kind of work and a further similar proportion consider that the primary difference from other work is that it is not paid. There are variations within this substantial minority (36%) who appear to have at least potentially radical views about the nature of domestic labour. For example the wc students mention the fact that it is not paid less than the mc students, and for both class groups the proportion referring to pay decreases with increasing age. Not all of these potential radicals, however, consider that housework should receive payment, as we see from the question addressed directly to this issue, where overall only 23% of the adolescents agree with the proposition that housework should be paid work. Table 7.7 at the end of this section draws together the results discussed here.

In suggesting ways in which housework differs from other work, negative statements about housework became frequent amongst the mc groups at the older age level, particularly the girls. Table 7.9 (p. 253) gives the percentage movement with age for class and field groups on selected issues related to domestic labour.

The suggestion that it was in the individual's own interest to perform domestic labour appeared in the responses of the older groups more than the younger and particularly for wc girls at 15+. This type of response emerged as the major reason for all groups when they considered that housework should not be paid work. Within this overall picture on payment for housework, the wc and especially girls, give the reason that it is in the individual's own interest to a greater extent than the other groups. As is apparent in this society in general, and as clearly emerges from the answers in this study, it is women, mothers, who perform domestic labour in most homes. At the level of the home, this work, however, far from being in the interest of the person who usually does it, is in the interest of other family or household members, and in particular in the interest of men, on whom this burden rarely falls. We could argue that to talk about domestic labour being in the interest of the individual who does it is a mystification of the actual situation in which a
woman performs domestic labour, and services the rest of her household. We see that the wc, and particularly girls, accept this mystification of domestic labour when talking about payment for domestic work. At the older age level 18% of both mc and wc girls suggest that it is the woman's duty to do the housework. A majority of 15+ year old wc girls (52%) think that housework should receive no payment since it is in the domestic labourer's own interest or is their duty to perform it. A further clarification of the ways in which the older wc girls in our sample legitimise and accept their traditional role in the home can be found by re-examining the question asking if and how housework differs from other work. The self interest argument is given by 20% of these girls, and although the suggestion that housework is a woman's duty is an option rarely taken by the adolescents on this particular question, 9% of these 15+ year old wc girls do so. An additional 10% of this group make positive statements about housework. These girls already undertake domestic labour in their family homes as we see from the question which asks who usually does the housework. In response to this question the older wc girls refer to themselves alone or in conjunction with their mother to a significantly greater extent than any other of our groups of similar age. The ordering of our older groups in terms of proportions indicating that they do housework are wc girls 37%, mc girls 14%, mc boys 5%, wc boys 5%.14 In addition these wc girls, who expect to marry at a younger age than the mc girls, can also expect to be performing domestic labour in their own homes in the near future. These girls produce more legitimising statements about housework, accepting and justifying their current and future domestic role; as we see, 38% of them refer to self interest, duty, or make a positive statement about housework.15

We should note in this connection that on a question asking what should be done about housework and childcare if both husband and wife work, mc girls suggest shared responsibility for and performance of housework more than any other groups (16% of this group at 12+ and 38% at 15+). It is also the case that 22% of wc girls make a similar suggestion on this question, and of the girls who think that housework should be shared, most recognise that this is not what usually happens.
Table 7.7
Selected responses on domestic labour: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housework
- It is not different from other work
  - 12+: 23 M, 14 F, 23 M, 19 F
  - 15+: 19 M, 15 F, 18 M, 17 F
- It is unpaid
  - 12+: 26 M, 30 F, 19 M, 15 F
  - 15+: 22 M, 22 F, 14 M, 11 F
- Negative comment
  - 12+: 12 M, 14 F, 3 M, 14 F
- Positive comment
  - 12+: 5 M, 8 F, 13 M, 6 F
  - 15+: 7 M, 8 F, 6 M, 10 F
- 'Self interest' on 'is housework different?'
  - 12+: 5 M, 11 F, 4 M, 9 F
  - 15+: 12 M, 13 F, 15 M, 20 F
- Housework should be paid
  - 12+: 26 M, 16 F, 29 M, 31 F
  - 15+: 22 M, 23 F, 20 M, 16 F
- Housework should not be paid because:
  - Duty
    - 12+: 5 M, 13 F, 6 M, 3 F
    - 15+: 6 M, 18 F, 14 M, 19 F
  - Self interest
    - 12+: 26 M, 23 F, 30 M, 41 F
    - 15+: 17 M, 25 F, 30 M, 33 F
  - Mother/woman/wife usually does housework
    - 12+: 75 M, 53 F, 79 M, 77 F
    - 15+: 81 M, 60 F, 66 M, 55 F
  - Respondent usually does housework, with or without others
    - 12+: 4 M, 20 F, 16 M, 2 F, 14 M
    - 15+: 5 M, 14 F, 5 M, 37 F
  - Parents should share housework when both work
    - 12+: 6 M, 16 F, 4 M, 6 F
    - 15+: 14 M, 38 F, 11 M, 22 F
  - Respondents' suggested solution does not usually occur
    - 12+: 13 M, 25 F, 6 M, 15 F
    - 15+: 19 M, 38 F, 7 M, 15 F
5.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

As we noted above, the mc groups were more likely to make negative statements about housework than the wc groups. When we combine age and gender groups within the mc there is a difference in emphasis in the type of negative comment made. Those with parents in the field of production referred to extrinsic factors associated with housework, comparing it with other work and writing about long hours, hard work and no holidays; those in the field of symbolic control referred to intrinsic factors, saying that housework is monotonous, boring and gives no pleasure.

When we examine the responses on these two questions, the proportions of each group who consider that housework should receive payment is consistent with the proportions who mentioned that it is unpaid work when describing differences compared with other types of work. There is, however, a rather dramatic exception in the case of younger girls in the field of production. For this group the proportion who consider that housework should receive pay is considerably lower than the proportion recognising that domestic labour is in fact unpaid. Only 12% of these girls think that domestic labour should receive payment (lower than all other groups) whereas 35% actually mentioned that it is unpaid (higher than for all other groups). The girls from the field of symbolic control show a similar pattern, but the gap is not so wide - 30% note that housework is unpaid, but only 17% think it should be paid. Are these girls struggling with the legitimation of the exploitative nature of domestic labour? What reasons do they give when saying that housework should receive no payment? The major reasons given are self interest and duty. Are these younger mc girls implicitly accepting the nature of the bargain struck by the wife; in return for performing the functions required of domestic labour she is economically supported by her husband? One older wc male drew attention to this implicit contract assertively - "It's their bloody duty". In general it is girls who recognise the aspect of obligation to do domestic labour, and refer to duty to a greater extent than boys, although 14% of 15+ wc boys also mention duty. Fewer of the older mc girls from both fields draw attention to the unpaid nature of domestic labour than at the younger age level, and as we noted in the comparison between the mc and wc groups, the legitimising arguments about self interest and duty are those most frequently advanced.17
Some illustrative examples of the types of statement made on these two questions about differences between housework and other types of work, and payment for housework, indicates the tenor of the responses we have discussed so far.

5.1.3 Some examples of responses to the questions on domestic labour

"Is housework different?"

1. "No it is not. It is just as important as any other job. It may not be a job one pays for but it is definitely important to society" (12+ mc girl).
2. "When you think about it, it is not different. It is just more tedious. You don't get paid for it, work seven days" (12+ mc girl).
3. "Yeh, you do it out of your own pleasure. Only you gain from it not the world or company you work for" (15+ wc girl).
4. "Yes, because housework, if you are married, you do for love and pride, not money" (12+ mc girl).

"Pay for housework?"

1. "No because it is a responsibility taken on with marriage" (12+ mc girl).
2. "No women have to suffer now and again" (15+ boy).
3. "According to the BBC my mother should be paid £115 per week for her work. Dad cannot afford it" (15+ mc boy).
4. "Yes, it is just as hard as 'work' and prevents other earning" (15+ mc boy).
5. "Hard one, not necessarily paid, but sort of treated often; the partner who doesn't do it should appreciate how hard it is. Anyway, if they were to be paid, who would put up the money?" (15+ mc boy).

There was overall a general tendency when discussing the issue of domestic labour, for those in the field of production to take a more traditional position than those in the field of symbolic control, whether prescribing action or describing their own experience. For example, when apportioning responsibility for looking after the home and family, those in the field of production were more likely to mention the mother, whereas those in symbolic control were more likely to mention both parents or the family as a whole. On a more direct question which asked who actually does
the housework, there is once again some indication of a more traditional arrangement in families in the field of production than for those families in the field of symbolic control. For each age and gender group those in production refer to the woman, wife or mother doing the housework more than those in symbolic control, and girls in the field of production at each age level refer to helping their mothers to a greater extent than girls in symbolic control.

Shared responsibility for domestic labour when both parents work was a suggestion which appeared more frequently in the responses of our adolescents in the older than in the younger age group. This response was also made more frequently by girls than boys, and particularly by mc girls. Within the mc it was girls in the field of symbolic control who favoured this solution and who moved towards it most spectacularly with age (see Table 7.9, p. 253).

An extensive debate on the nature of domestic labour has recently developed, emerging from a Marxist problematic and centring on the validity of applying concepts such as surplus value and productive or unproductive labour to domestic work. It general one could conclude that the debate has focussed attention on the contradictions inherent in women's position in society arising from their relation to both production and reproduction, and has provided a possible starting point for understanding the problem of women's subordination both in the home and in the labour market. We could argue that a substantial minority of our adolescents show an awareness at some level of the contradictions implicit in the situation of women in relation to their function as domestic labourers. This is indicated by their assertions that housework is no different from other types of work, that it is unpaid, and by their negative evaluation of housework which they compared unfavourably with paid work in the labour market. These adolescents emphasise that hard work and effort are rewarded in the labour market, and imply that similar effort in the home goes unrewarded. As we have seen, however, this does not lead them to take a radical position on payment for domestic labour, nor does it influence the overall conservative position on gender differences, which is revealed in the analysis based on the index of gender differentiation. Tables 7.8 and 7.9 give (a) selected responses from the domestic labour questions for the comparison of the two groups within the mc, and (b) the percentage change with age on these questions for both the class and field groups.
Table 7.8
Selected responses on domestic labour: comparison within the MC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housework
- It is not different from other work
  - 12+: 31 14 19 11
  - 15+: 19 10 17 18
- It is unpaid
  - 12+: 26 35 25 30
  - 15+: 21 24 23 20
- Negative comment
  - 12+: 9 14 19 17
  - 15+: 26 32 17 21
- Positive comment
  - 12+: 2 9 6 6
  - 15+: 4 2 9 3
- 'Self interest' on 'is housework different?'
  - 12+: 7 12 2 13
  - 15+: 12 6 13 18
- Housework should be paid
  - 12+: 29 12 23 17
  - 15+: 26 26 17 20
- Housework should not be paid because:
  - Self interest
    - 12+: 22 32 33 17
    - 15+: 19 24 21 26
  - Duty
    - 12+: 3 8 4 18
    - 15+: 7 16 8 20
- Mother/woman/wife usually does housework
  - 12+: 81 68 73 44
  - 15+: 86 54 75 57
- Respondent usually does housework, with or without others
  - 12+: 3 24 6 24
  - 15+: 2 22 8 13
- Parents should share housework when both work
  - 12+: 5 18 8 14
  - 15+: 16 34 13 44
- Respondents' suggested solution does not usually occur
  - 12+: 16 18 10 20
  - 15+: 18 30 19 38
### Table 7.9:
Percentage change with age on selected questions on domestic labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class comparison</th>
<th>Field comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ to 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework should receive payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Self interest' makes housework different from other work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework should not receive payment because it is in the self interest of the one who does it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework should not receive payment because it is the housewife's duty to do it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment re housework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent usually does housework, with or without others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When both work, parents should share housework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 What is important in life?

Question:

For girls:
What would you say will be the most important thing in your life?
For women in general what would you say was the most important thing?
What about for men? What would you say was the most important thing for men?

For boys:
What would you say will be the most important thing in your life?
For men in general what would you say was the most important thing?
What about for women? What would you say was the most important thing for women?

5.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The largest proportion of all of our social class, age and gender groups consider that the family, children and marriage will be the most important thing in their lives. The range is from 34% of wc males to 52% of mc females. Whilst this emphasis on the family might be expected from girls, indicating that to a large extent they have accepted the traditional model of the female role, this type of response might not have been expected for boys. Other authors, however, have found related similar responses, particularly from working class males. For example, in a recent survey of unqualified male manual workers in a variety of jobs, Blackburn and Mann (1979; 145) found that 90% of married respondents rated "a good family life at home" above enjoyment of their work life. Connell et al (1982) develop an argument stressing the dynamic process of the construction of gender roles. This study focussed specifically on the context of the school. They suggest that adolescents try out various roles, and that there is an ideology of masculinity which has as a component the notion of the man as breadwinner, and responsible for a family, which enables boys to prepare themselves for the actual role of male provider for a family. We can see in the responses to our projective question on the most important thing in the individual's own future life that over a third of our adolescent boys, at each age level and in each class, appear to have endorsed this aspect of the male role, and to have accepted the role for themselves. There is further support for this interpretation in the responses to a question asking "Who is responsible for looking after the home and family?". We had thought that this
question might be taken as referring to responsibility for domestic labour, but it was taken at a more general level by our respondents and the largest proportion of each of our groups said that the parents had this responsibility. Boys, however, particularly at the younger age level, and particularly the mc boys, suggested that the father had this responsibility.

In response to the question about the most important thing in their own future lives, abstract, or general aspects of life such as health, freedom, love and happiness were mentioned by the older mc girls almost as frequently as family and home, and such responses were more common amongst girls than boys in the older group. Surprisingly, work was rarely mentioned as important; the only group who did so to any extent was the younger wc boys, 26% of whom gave this response.

When the adolescents were asked what they considered to be the most important thing in the lives of other members of their own sex, and of the opposite sex, as they were required to make generalisations further removed from their own experience and knowledge, they were increasingly less able to respond and the responses they did make became more stereotyped. These stereotypical answers were related to traditional male and female roles, with the woman seen largely as wife and mother, located in the home, and the man as worker, located in the labour market. Girls, for example, were even more likely to point to the family as important when considering women in general than they were in their own case. They were also more likely to point to work as important for men than the boys ever stated it to be for themselves or for men in general. Boys thought the family and marriage less important and work more important for men in general than in their own case. In all groups very few identified work as the most important thing for women in general, but even so the proportions of girls endorsing this view were smaller than amongst girls responding for themselves. It is perhaps interesting to note that about one fifth of the mc boys at each age level mention sex or the opposite sex as being important for men in general, although only half as many mention it as being important for themselves. Working class boys do make this type of comment, but not to the same extent. Middle class boys were also more inclined to ascribe importance to this aspect of life for women in general than they were in the case of statements about themselves. Table 7.11 gives the percentage response for our class groups in the major categories discussed above.
Table 7.10:
Proportions of the MC and WC groups suggesting that the father has responsibility for looking after the home and family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.11

Selected responses on the most important thing in the adolescents' lives: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Important for self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important for men**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important for women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

If we look within the mc group we find at 12+ both boys in the field of production and those in symbolic control endorsing the family as the most important thing in their future lives to the same extent - 31% of each of them. There is a difference, however, with respect to the importance of work - those in symbolic control refer to work as important much more frequently than 12+ boys from the field of production, 25% of them compared with 9% of the latter. Within the importance placed on the family and marriage by the younger girls, there are differences between girls in the different fields. Girls in the field of production refer to the family and marriage to a greater extent than those in symbolic control. Younger girls in the latter field mention abstract attributes of life to a greater extent. The proportions of each group giving these contrasting responses are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12+ girls</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symbolic control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and marriage</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract attributes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the difference in emphasis is significant at the .02 level. At the older age level we find the girls from the two fields more or less equally divided between the family and abstract attributes of life. There is a general movement with age for girls from the field of production into abstract attributes as the most important aspects of life; for the 15+ year olds this is the case when they discuss this question in relation to themselves, and in relation to men and women in general.

The response of the boys at the older level of similar to that of the younger girls; boys in the field of production refer to the family and marriage to a greater extent, and boys in symbolic control refer to abstract attributes of life. The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15+ boys</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symbolic control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and marriage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract attributes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall these results can be seen as some further indication of a more traditional bias in the children of families located in the field of production, compared with those in the field of symbolic control.

Tables 7.12 and 7.13 give (a) selected responses to the questions on the most important thing in life, for the comparison within fields of the mc, and (b) the percentage change with age on these questions for both class and field groups.

5.2.3 Some examples of responses on the questions on what is important in life

Some examples of the types of responses given to this question will illustrate the aspects of life which our adolescents consider important; each three part response refers to what is important for (i) the individual, (ii) those of the same sex, and (iii) the opposite sex. Three younger mc boys made the following suggestions:

1. (i) "Happiness of my wife and children
   (ii) money unfortunately,
   (iii) money";
2. (i) "To have a job and a wife and a family,
   (ii) women and the pride of having a job,
   (iii) men and the pride of having a family";
3. (i) "Success
   (ii) to be a success,
   (iii) to be loved by a husband";

One more 12+ mc boy speaks only for himself - "My birth and death". Three older wc girls offer:

1. (i) "Husband and children, but before these a career,
   (ii) home and husband,
   (iii) Home, wife, career";
2. (i) "That I have the choice and chance to do what I want to do,
   (ii) That they fight to become equal citizens and do what would forfill them most,
   (iii) That they do what they would like to do".
Table 7.12

Selected responses on the most important thing in the adolescents' lives:
comparison within the MC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+ Prod</th>
<th>12+ SC</th>
<th>15+ Prod</th>
<th>15+ SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important for self</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important for men**

| Marriage | 3   | 4   |
| Family   | 14  | 14  |
| Work     | 12  | 16  |
| Health, freedom, love, happiness | 21 | 9 |

**Important for women**

| Marriage | 7   | 9   |
| Family   | 26  | 33  |
| Work     | 3   | 2   |
| Health, freedom, love, happiness | 21 | 16 |
Table 7.13:
What is important in life? Percentage changes with age for selected responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class comparison</th>
<th>Field comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12+ to 15+

Family is the most important thing for self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family is important for women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work is important for men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstract attributes are important for:

Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and finally a concern with shotgun marriage -

3.  (i) "How my children are educated if I have any,
     (ii) to behave themselves before they get married,
     (iii) Not to get involved with a girl and have to get married".

Three older wc boys suggest:

1.  (i) "Getting a job in which I will be happy, getting married,
     (ii) To be regarded as a good respectable citizen,
     (iii) To get married and to have a good career and husband;"
2.  (i) "School, education, happiness and my job,
     (ii) Their job and family, love life,
     (iii) Their home and family;"

and lastly,

3.  (i) "Survival,
     (ii) enjoyment,
     (iii) life".

The response on one further question which was incorporated into the index of gender classification repays closer consideration. The adolescents were asked whether there was sex segregation in occupations and if so why they thought that was the case. One reason which emerged for sexual divisions in work was physical strength, and we have rehearsed our arguments for seeing this as strong classification of gender differentiation on page 230 above. All of our groups based on class, within class location and gender, mention physique or strength as a reason for differences in female and male occupational patterns much more as they get older. The most dramatic increase is for girls in the field of symbolic control, with 50% more of the 15+ year old group giving this response than of the 12+ group. Table 7.14 gives the proportions in our class and field groups using this argument at each age level, and the percentage change with age.

The wc children, for whom manual jobs are probably more strongly in mind from their own experience, do not use this argument as much as the mc groups, which suggests that it is the mental/manual division which is of salience for the mc
Table 7.14:

Strength as a reason for the distribution of women and men in the labour force

(i) Proportion arguing that female and male differences in types of work are due to differences in physique or strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physique</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physique</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Percentage change with age in those arguing that female and male differences in types of work are due to differences in physique or strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class comparison</th>
<th>Field comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups in this instance. This seems to be supported by the fact that it is those members of the mc for whom physical strength would be least relevant in terms of their experience of their parents' work and their own aspirations, who use this argument most — that is 15+ year old girls from the field of symbolic control. Seventy-one percent of these girls refer to strength as a reason for male and female differentiated work, and 75% of them aspire to work in the field of symbolic control themselves. Since, however, these girls are in general the most radical of our groups in terms of gender classification, we can hazard an interpretation that the class dimension enters the picture at this point, and when they think of men's work the mental/manual division registers strongly for them. One girl explicitly recognises that the mental/manual division is operating in her choice of examples of female and male work, but is rather optimistic about "higher levels of work" for women: "My yes only really applies to manual labour — men are mainly road workers and lorry drivers etc., women always do char work or work in shops or as secretaries. However, at higher levels of work, I don't think this is nearly so true (male and female lawyers, doctors, administrators)" (15+ mc girl (SC)).

6 Overview

6.1 The general picture

The index of gender differentiation based on the concept of classification of gender relations has shown that patriarchal power is a strong and dominant category for these adolescents. All class and gender groups, with the exception of 15+ year old mc girls, fall largely into the category indicating strong classification of gender relations in their responses, suggesting a recognition and acceptance of patriarchal power. This is a reflection of real power relations between men and women, and an indication of the hegemonic control of patriarchal ideology in the degree to which these relations are accepted and in some cases justified.

In our class comparison on this index we found, as predicted, that mc girls and boys had weaker classification of gender differentiation; they were less likely to accept and justify gender hierarchy than were the wc
adolescents. For the groups based on field location within the mc we found, as we had predicted from our model, that those in the field of symbolic control were more likely to have weak gender classification in all cases than those in the field of production, although the differences were small.

The greatest difference to emerge on this index within the overall pattern, however, was that between girls and boys. Girls had weaker classification of gender relations than boys, significantly so in the class comparison at 15+, and more marked in those from the field of symbolic control in the comparison between fields in the mc.

Boys then are more persuaded of patriarchal power and of the legitimacy of gender hierarchy than girls, not surprisingly and reflecting the fact that patriarchal power is in the interest of men. We found that wc boys have stronger classification of gender relations than mc boys. We can link this finding with that relating to the adolescents' occupational choice as a member of the opposite sex (reported in Ch. 12, p. 423 below), where wc boys find it difficult to identify with, or think of themselves as wc girls. We suggest that both of these responses are related to the fact that gender relations represent the only area of hierarchical superiority, or dominance for these boys, and that their self interest is more overtly involved in patriarchal power than is the case for mc boys who can experience class relations as an area of hierarchical superiority.

The girls accept patriarchal values less than the boys, but there is still a high level of acceptance amongst the girls. We asked two questions about domestic labour (is it different from other work, and should there be payment for performing these tasks?) and saw here some evidence that the girls are in the process of taking on the idea of their responsibility for these tasks as women and wives in the future. It was not surprising to find that an argument which suggested that the person who performs domestic labour does so in their own interest was used widely by the boys. Most of the boys also aver that housework is usually done by women, wives or mothers. What is more surprising is to find that the girls accept this mystification of domestic labour to an even greater extent, supplementing it with the notion of duty. The older wc girls are the group of girls most convinced by this range of arguments, demonstrated by the extent to which they use them in their answers to these
questions. The younger mc girls mention that housework is unpaid labour to a
greater extent than any other group, but compared with this awareness, the
numbers who think it should receive payment are dramatically low, especially
for girls in the field of production. We see this, coupled with arguments about
self interest and duty, as an indication of the acceptance of the implicit
contract between husband and wife, breadwinner and domestic labourer. It
also emerged in these questions, as we had predicted from our model, that
girls and boys from the field of production had more traditional views on
domestic labour than those in the field of symbolic control in general, and as
far as can be judged from our data, had more traditional arrangements in
their own homes.

On a series of projective questions about what would be important in
the life of the individual respondent, and for men and women in general, we
discovered that the family, marriage and children were going to be the most
important thing for the largest proportion of each of our groups. About a
third of the boys in each of the groups endorsed this view. Linking this with
their position when asked who has the responsibility for looking after the
home and family, where boys had a tendency to suggest the father, we saw
this response as an indication of the boys' acceptance of the role of
breadwinner. We see here a male endorsement of the breadwinner/domestic
labourer contract which the girls endorse from their perspective. The
differences which we have seen between those in the field of symbolic control
and of production, with the former taking a less traditional stance, were
repeated on this question. There was also a tendency for those in the field of
production to mention marriage and the family as being important to them to
a greater extent than those in the field of symbolic control. This was
especially true of the younger girls.

As the generalisations which the adolescents were being asked to make
(about the most important thing in the life of members of their own and he
opposite sex) became more removed from their sphere of knowledge and
experience, the adolescents were increasingly less able to respond and their
responses became more stereotyped, with the woman largely seen as wife and
mother and located in the home, and the man as worker located outside the
home.
For the index of gender relations the hypotheses we generated from our model have been borne out. In some instances the differences we have found have proved significant.

1. The wc groups have stronger classification of gender differentiation than the mc groups.
2. Within the mc, those from the field of symbolic control have weaker classification of gender differentiation than those from the field of production.
3. In most instances these findings are repeated in the issues and questions which we have reviewed individually, separately from the index of gender classification.

Gender division and the effects of patriarchal hierarchy do appear to be more apparent in the representations of wc children rather than mc children in the sample, and thus the reproduction of gender relations are more firmly rooted in this group; within the mc this is true of those adolescents from the field of production rather than those in the field of symbolic control.

As far as the sexes are concerned, however, none of the girls in this study are convinced of the validity of sexual division to the extent that the boys are, and the group least convinced and most radical on this issue are girls in the field of symbolic control.

6.2 Dynamic patterns in the data

Although our data are cross-sectional, comparisons between the two age groups can supplement the static picture by providing an indication of the ways in which adolescents' views change over time. We are talking here about relative movements within each of our groups with age; the general picture given above has indicated similarities or differences between the groups at each age level.

With the exception of boys in the field of production, all of the groups move into weak classification of gender relations to varying degrees with age,
but the age changes are greatest for girls. In our sample, over this age period of adolescence, the girls have become less accepting of patriarchal power and its realisation in gender hierarchy. The greatest movement is shown by girls in the wc and those in the field of production within the mc. Girls in the field of symbolic control start from an initial position of weaker classification of gender relations than these two groups. Girls in the field of production are moving in opposition to their male compatriots who continue to endorse relatively strong classification of gender relations.

Corresponding to the tendency for movement into weak classification of gender relations with age, we found that all of our groups were more likely to suggest that housework should be shared when both partners (specifically parents) work outside the home. The movement once again was greater for girls than for boys; wc girls and those in the field of production had moved in similar proportions to this position between 12+ and 15+, but girls from the field of symbolic control moved massively into this position.

Despite the increased size of the group with weak gender classification amongst our older wc girls, there is considerable indication in the material we have investigated here that they are in fact being successfully socialised into the wife and mother role with age. Marriage and the family remain the most important elements in their future life for almost half of this group at 15+; they make less negative and more positive comments about housework; they reject payment for housework, moving into the stronger argument involving the woman's duty to perform these tasks whilst still endorsing hugely the mystificatory "self interest" argument; and they overwhelmingly more than their younger compatriots (and any other 15+ year old group) actually do housework.

There is little indication of change in the extent to which adolescents from each of the fields within the mc are involved in doing housework, apart from a reduction in the number of girls in the field of symbolic control doing so. This reduction could be related to their greater involvement in school work.

Amongst the younger girls in the sample there was a great emphasis on marriage, children and the family, but the older groups have come to consider
what we have called abstract attributes of life to be important in their own lives and those of other women. The desired qualities of life proposed by the girls as they grow older are "health, freedom, love and happiness". We regard this change amongst the girls with age as of some importance, and tentatively suggest that it could be seen as an indication at a surface level of a deep contradiction. This contradiction underlies what we have discussed in Chapter 1 and have found in our girls' responses to questions on gender relations; the contradiction between women's role in production and reproduction. The move into abstraction may well remove the need for a resolution of the competing demands of home and family and work, or a career, on women.

One interesting result on a question which is used in the index of gender classification and discussed briefly above, suggests an intersection of class with gender. The adolescents were asked whether men and women do different kinds of work, and if so what kinds of work and for what reasons the differences exist. A response which becomes increasingly important for all groups with age is physical strength; men and women do different jobs because there are requirements of strength for the adequate performance of certain work. We have suggested that this argument has a large ideological component. As we indicated in support of our position, in the text above, the need for physical strength applies literally to very few jobs; the physically demanding nature of much of the work which women actually do is ignored by this argument; gender appropriate work on the basis of strength is culturally specific; and differences in physical strength are certainly irrelevant to the allocation of jobs at the top of the occupational heirarchy - i.e. the physical strength argument is class specific. It seems from our results that class, and in particular the mental/manual distinction, is at the base of the responses given by the adolescents. We find that the wc, for whom manual labour and its association with strength might be closer to their experience or knowledge of work, use this argument less than the mc adolescents. Indeed it is the group for whom manual work might be considered to be least relevant, and who in other respects are our most radical group, girls from the field of symbolic control, who use the argument of differences based on physique most. The salience of the mental/manual distinction for the mc groups also emerges on a question asking for high and low earners (reported in Ch. 8)
where the mc groups are more likely than the wc to suggest non manual work as earning high incomes and manual work low.

For the middle class children, class as indicated by the mental/manual division is a highly salient dimension and emerges as such on an issue more directly related to gender - women's and men's work. We will be examining the degree of support given by our groups to aspects of class relations exemplified by the division of labour in the next chapter.

The girls in the field of symbolic control are our most radical group on gender issues and have considerably weaker classification of gender relations at both ages than any other group. As we have noted, this leads to a divergence between the girls and boys in the field of symbolic control on gender issues. It is interesting to observe, however, that girls and boys in the field of production, who are relatively similar in the strength of their classification of gender relations at 12+, grow very far apart by the time they are 15+; there is a divergence between the sexes in the field of production. It is arguable that these differences, if sustained, will have some implications for the reproduction of gender relations in future families in both fields of the mc. We have seen from the data in this study that families in the field of production are more conservative than those in the field of symbolic control in both the ideas and practice of gender relations. The greater divergence between girls and boys in the field of production should have a considerable influence for change in the familial reproduction of gender relations.
1 Women and men and members of the mc and wc were represented amongst the twenty judges.

2 For further discussion of this issue see p. 262 below.

3 See Holland (1981) for a discussion of female occupational choice as a misnomer.

4 The authors of a DES survey (1975) which looked at the extent to which curricular differences and customs and practices contributed to inequality of opportunity for boys and girls in primary, secondary and further education, concluded that girls' choices of curriculum at 13 plus are Hobson's choice because of the prescriptive prior patterning of the curriculum which eliminates certain possibilities for them.

5 See Land (1975a, 1975b, 1976), Griffiths (1976: 9), the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Income and Wealth (1978) for details of the contribution which women's wages make to keeping families out of poverty. See also Ehrenreich (1983: 172) for another perspective on the poor - she argues that mc divorced women are the new poor in the USA.

6 See Whitehead (1981: 102ff) for a discussion of the disposition of income in wc families, and review of studies in this area. She points out that the notion of 'pin money' "supports the model of wifely dependence" (p. 106).

7 Many of the girls in this study, even when relatively non-traditional in their approach towards gender roles, recognised and accepted the part of the female role related to the care and nurture of young children. This emerged on this question and on one about the child-care function in marriage where both parents work outside the home.

8 Table 7.6 (p. 245) gives the percentage change with age on the index of gender differentiation for class and within mc groups.

9 The subgroups used here are the 'ideal typical' subgroups from within the broad field location based on the distinction between entrepreneurial and managerial/administrative functions in production, and professional functions in the field of symbolic control. See the description of this subsample on p. 151, Chapter 4.

10 There is a significant difference at the .01 level between 12+ and 15+ girls in both mc and wc in their endorsement of weak or strong gender classification.

11 There is a significant difference at the .02 level between 12+ and 15+ year old girls in the field of production in their endorsement of weak or strong gender classification.

12 The type of responses included in this category was: "it is voluntary; you do it for your own sake; if you want a clean, nice, neat house or home it must be done; it is your own property".
Survey evidence indicates that when both partners in a marriage work, men still do little housework (Oakley, 1974: Chapter 8). Ginsberg (1976: 80) found that only 15% of husbands of working wives in her sample had a high level of participation in housework. Ginsberg also found that two thirds of the men in her sample objected to their wives working outside the home and considered that if she did so for her own benefit, she should not expect help with the housework. Rapoport and Rapoport (1976), amongst others, suggest that husbands regard any housework they do as 'helping' their wife. The wife retains responsibility for domestic labour. On the issue of childcare, Land (1978) suggests that even when husbands help with childcare, this does not mean that wives/mothers spend less time on this activity.

Twelve percent of the wc 15+ boys agreed that sisters and girls in the family helped the mother with housework. The differences between the wc and mc girls, and that between the wc girls and boys are both significant at the .001 level, as is that between 12+ boys and girls in the mc.

Oakley (1976: 92) found that 28 of her sample of 40 housewives valued the theoretical autonomy of their role, although she regards this autonomy as being more fictional than real. This chapter in her book also includes a discussion of other aspects of the housewife's role and ways in which women legitimise their work in the home. Porter (1982) discusses the acceptance of the wc women in her sample of their role in performing housework as their duty, and their rejection of the idea of pay for housework.

This response is largely made up of girls saying that the children help with the housework.

See Oakley (1980: iv-vi) for a discussion of this implicit contract and the reinforcement of marriage as a relationship of economic inequality through legal and social policy measures which perpetuate the subordinate roles of women in the labour market and the home.

Most of the mothers in our sample work. See Chapter 3 (Table 3.2, p. 132) for some details on mothers' work.

This emerged clearly on questions on income distribution.

For girls in the field of symbolic control who specifically mention housework being shared, or some other solution when both parents work, the numbers who mention sharing housework at 15+ is significantly different at the .001 level from those mentioning it at 12+.

Table 7.11 (p. 257) gives percentage figures for the results discussed in this section.

Table 7.12 (p. 260) gives percentage figures for the results discussed in this section.

Connell et al (1982), in a study of 'ruling class' girls and boys, a category which would coincide with those in our sample whose fathers
are at the higher levels of both fields, found a similar divergence in male and female views on gender relations.

24 Sixteen percent more WC girls and girls in the field of production suggested shared domestic labour at age 15+ than at age 12+; thirty percent more girls from the field of symbolic control. It seems from the relationship between these responses, and those on the following question, which asked whether the solution favoured by the respondent to the problem of domestic labour when both parents work usually occurred, that this solution was not seen to occur frequently.

25 Although health itself is deeply rooted in the concrete, we suggest that the desire to have good health in the future is an abstraction not necessarily grounded in current real experiences of ill health. This response usually appears in combination with some other abstract quality.
CHAPTER 8

THE ADOLESCENTS' MODELLING OF THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

1 Introduction

We have distinguished two fields within the social division of labour, those of production and of symbolic control. These fields each stand in a different relation to the material base of society which is constituted by the mode of production and the distribution of power at this level of economic organisation. In this formulation the social relations of those in the field of production derive relatively directly from the material base. For those in the field of symbolic control, the relationship to the material base is more attenuated and indirect. This theoretical formulation would lead to the expectation that the forms and categories of the social division of labour deriving from the material base of the society and the resultant power relations would be more strongly embedded in the consciousness of those in the field of production. This should lead those so located to hold stronger classification of the categories of the social division of labour.

We have discussed in Chapter 3 above the factors which affect the clarity of this theoretical model, and the complexities of the relationships within and between the fields of production, symbolic control and the state. In the light of these complicating factors, the model becomes essentially a generative device for posing questions about the social relations and ideological positioning of those in the fields of production and of symbolic control. We did, however, outline in Chapter 3 some tentative hypotheses related to the positions which might be taken by individuals located within the two fields which we have taken to the data.

We are investigating the ideological positioning of adolescents, who are located in a field of the social division of labour by virtue of being in a particular family; we therefore regard the family as a major site for the reproduction of both class and gender relations. The material conditions, and the interactional practices of a family create the conditions for the reproduction (or interruption) of particular sets of relations in connection with both gender and class. We postulate a tendency towards a particular
family type in the different social class groups we are examining. The issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 6, where data from a study conducted by Wells is analysed in terms of our model of the social division of labour. The argument is that there are families which tend towards either a positional or a personal mode of interaction, and that more positional families are associated with strong classification and personal families tend to generate weak classification through their interactional practices. We suggest that there is a tendency for families to be more positional in the wc than in the mc, and within the mc, in the field of production rather than in the field of symbolic control.

The theoretical model on which the study is based could in principle generate a range of ideal typical positions which could be taken under specified conditions by members of the fields of production and symbolic control and test these against the practices and ideological positions of groups identified in these fields. The current exploratory and investigative study approaches the problem at a more general level, and looks for broad similarities and differences in the ideological positioning of our groups as demonstrated by their responses to questions which we have considered crucial to an understanding of their modelling of the social and sexual division of labour.

In this section we use the concept of classification to indicate the adolescent's position on the hierarchical ordering of privilege exemplified by the social division of labour, realised through the unequal income distribution over the occupational hierarchy, and by the non-manual/manual (mental/manual) division. In the case of strong classification the categories of the social division of labour would be distinctly separate and specialised and supporting arguments would be produced for this specialisation. In principle weak classification would be indicated by the adoption of an opposing position towards the principles of hierarchical specialisation of the social division of labour. We did not necessarily expect that such an oppositional model would appear to any great extent, and considered a compensatory model, where the individual is rewarded for the hard, unpleasant or risky nature of the work s/he is engaged in, as also indicating a degree of weak classification. We suggest that the greater the number of legitimising arguments produced by the individual in responding to questions about the occupational hierarchy, the
more unqualified is her/his position with respect to the occupational hierarchy, and so the stronger the classification of the categories of the social division of labour held. A position of weak classification is indicated by the use of oppositional or compensatory arguments.

2 The index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour

2.1 Questions used, refocussing of the original coding, and examples of recoded responses

2.1.1 The questions used in the index

We will discuss in this section the three questions which were designed to ascertain the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour, although the index we have generated incorporates responses made on only two of the questions.

The questions used for this index appeared originally in the study of eight year old children from which the parts of the current study relating to the social division of labour was derived. The questions, through asking about income differentials, addressed the structure of the occupational hierarchy and the division of mental and manual labour. The adolescents were asked which type of work was associated with high and low incomes, and for reasons and justifications for income differentials. The reasons and justifications for income differentials, or oppositional statements made about such differentials, are included in the index. Two other elements which were part of these questions, whether or not income differentials were fair or unfair, and the types of work receiving high or low incomes, are also reported and discussed in this section, although they are not included in the index. The adolescents' responses on these two issues were taken to represent their modelling of the social division of labour, provide the background position for each of our groups, and the context within which the types of argument they used are discussed.

The original coding categories were scrutinised to examine the extent to which the statements allocated to these categories could be judged as
indicating a qualified or an unqualified acceptance of the existing social division of labour, as exemplified by the income distribution in the occupational hierarchy. Arguments or statements which were seen as unqualified, indicated acceptance or legitimation of the existing income distribution, and the statements often included meritocratic rationales. The statements which revealed a qualified acceptance of existing arrangements employed some notion of compensation, or were in fact more clearly oppositional.

We interpreted unqualified acceptance or legitimation of the existing structure of the income distribution as indicating strong classification, and implied acceptance of the power relations regulating the principles of the social division of labour. Those who had a qualified acceptance were taken to hold a position of relatively weak classification. The diagram below indicates the distinctions made in the responses and the degree of strength or weakness of classification of different types of response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong classification</th>
<th>Weak classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unqualified responses</td>
<td>qualified responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Explicit meritocratic arguments</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Compensatory arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Scored ++C</td>
<td>Scored -C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Other legitimation</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Oppositional arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit meritocratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scored +C</td>
<td>Scored --C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following scores were allocated to responses which fell into the quadrants on this diagram:

Strong classification: Quadrant A = 2 ++C
Quadrant B = +C
Weak classification:
Quadrant C = -C
Quadrant D = -C

2.1.2 Refocussing the coding

Q1 People get different amounts of money for the work that they do. Why do you think this happens?

The arguments we describe as indicating strong classification imply an acceptance of the distinctions between types of occupations in the social division of labour, and a justification or legitimation of differences in income associated with the occupational hierarchy. We argue that these responses can also be seen as deriving from certain dominant legitimising ideological formulations. The qualified arguments can be seen as deriving from a position which considers high income a compensation for some negative characteristic of the work, or a compensation for positive input to the work on the part of the worker. In principle these arguments could apply to any work in the occupational hierarchy: a North Sea diver receives high pay in compensation for danger and risk, a miner for hard work and risk, and a similar assessment could be made of the work of a company director. The strength of commitment to the principles of the categories of work in the occupational hierarchy is not necessarily implied by such arguments. The intention of this analysis, and the use of the index described here, was to try to derive some overall indication of acceptance or rejection of the principles of relationships between the categories of the social division of labour, and the grounds put forward by our adolescents for these relations. It is important to note that information is lost in this approach, and as a consequence only broad indications of trends can be realised by this index. We could argue, for example, that identical statements from individuals located in different social and field positions in the social division of labour could have different meanings, and only a closer inspection of the specific juxtaposition of arguments of an individual responding to these questions can reveal their significance.
Recoded:

++C We include here meritocratic responses, any reference to education, training, skill, IQ, intelligence, or qualifications. For example "Depends on how you worked at school, whether you were determined or not" (12+ mc boy).

+C This category includes other types of legitimisation which refer to the importance, responsibility or quality of either the work or the individual performing the work, and any direct reference to hierarchy. Some examples include "top jobs", "better jobs", "a higher standard of work", "People at the top of the job are seen to be more important".

-C Compensatory arguments fall into this category. In this instance reference is made to hard work on the part of the individual, or in the nature of the work. Also included are statements about the work being difficult, involving risks or being relatively undesirable, and comments suggesting that those who work long hours and full time rather than part time are (or should be) compensated with a higher level of pay. An example: "People who work harder than others get better jobs with more pay" (12+ wc boy).

Q2 Do you think it is fair or unfair that some people earn more money than others for the work they do? Give reasons for your view.

This question asked directly for the respondents' legitimisation or otherwise of income differentials, and provides an opportunity for them to justify or qualify such legitimisation. Only the qualifications or justifications are included in the index.

Recoded:

++C Once again meritocratic arguments are included here, references to IQ, intelligence, effort associated with education, skill, or training.

+C Other forms of legitimisation find their place here: importance, responsibility, references to the high standard or quality of the
work or the individual undertaking it. We also include references to the fact that the individual has freedom of choice over which work to undertake.

This category included comments which suggested that the level of income was dependant on any of the following factors: whether the work was hard or difficult, whether there was danger or risk involved, whether it was full or part time or involved long hours, or whether the individual offered considerable length of service or experience. A somewhat poetic example here is "Unfair, because some people have to work in deep, dirty, dangerous places, and others work in office and get the same money" (12+ wc boy)

Oppositional statements fall into this category. These include statements suggesting that everyone should earn the same amount, that income should be associated with needs, that differences lead to dissatisfaction, that some deserve more money than they get for the work they do, and that there is no real freedom of choice about what work an individual does. Examples are: "If everybody earned the same amount we would have equal living standards and lifestyles" (12+ mc girl); "Why should people get more money for say sitting in an office than people e.g. firemen, miners etc. Oh you need more brains to run the country but these jobs stated above are jobs that none of us would like to do but people do them. Miners are facing death every day and not a hope of a comfortable retirement so we've got our priorities fucked up" (15+ mc gir 1); "The badly paid jobs are boring, unsatisfying, often physically strenuous and wearing. The well paid jobs offer power (snatched up by the ambitious people...) interest, satisfaction and sometimes creativity. Why should the most unpleasant jobs be paid least?" (15+ mc girl); "It is unfair that one person should earn less money than another person just because his job is less skilled. He has got to support a family and his needs are just as important as a highly paid persons" (15+ mc girl).
Q3 Some jobs are highly paid and some are not. Can you think of a few jobs that get the highest pay and a few that get the lowest pay and list them under the headings below?

This question is not included in the index, but in discussing the results we have regarded the following types of answers to represent strongly or weakly classified positions. To refocus the original coding we have applied a relatively strict interpretation of what counts as an unqualified, strong classification, and a qualified, weak classification.

Unqualified responses (+C)
Recognition of the non-manual/manual division is indicated by giving only non-manual jobs as examples in the high earning category and manual jobs as examples in the low earning category. We also include a response from within either of the two categories, manual or non-manual, by giving (i) non-manual work only for both high and low earners, and (ii) manual work only for both high and low earners.

Qualified responses (-C)
Positions reflecting weak classification permit a mix of non-manual and manual work in either or both of the high and low earning categories, thus blurring boundaries between manual and non-manual work.

3 Construction of the index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour

In contrast to the previous index on gender differentiation, which incorporated specific types of responses wherever they occurred over twelve questions crucial to our understanding of the adolescents' conception of gender differentiation, the present index is based on only two questions. We have incorporated virtually all statements made by students when answering these questions. The procedure was as follows: the individual was allocated a score for each of the reasons given for income differentials on the basis of the refocussed coding described above. The scores on the set of arguments used were then summed to produce a score for the individual. The actual scores obtained ranged from -10 to +10. Anyone whose resulting score was
negative was seen on balance as having relatively weak classification or a qualified position; anyone with a positive score was seen overall as having strong classification, or an unqualified position. The groups designated by our basic variables of class, within class location, gender and age were compared in terms of the distribution of individuals within the groups into strongly classified, neutral, or weakly classified positions.

4 Results

4.1 Background to the index: income differentials

When the adolescents were asked whether they thought that the existing income differentials in the occupational hierarchy were fair or unfair, a majority of all groups considered that they were fair. There were differences amongst them, however, in the degree to which income differentials were accepted, considered unfair, or some ambivalence was expressed.3

4.1.1 Comparison between the mc and wc groups

Middle class girls differ from the rest of the groups in their degree of acceptance of the fairness of income differentials. They express more ambivalence and disagreement. At 15+ this difference between the mc girls and the other groups reaches significance; compared with mc boys at .05, with wc boys at .02 and with wc girls at .01.

4.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

From Table 8.2 we can see that at 12+ it is girls in the field of symbolic control who contribute largely to the tendency for mc girls to consider that the income distribution is unfair or to express ambivalence about it. This group differs from each of the others, and the difference between these girls in the field of symbolic control and boys in the field of production reaches significance at .02. At the older age level girls in both production and symbolic control are similar in the extent to which they consider income differentials fair, or are ambivalent on the topic, and as we
Table 8.1
Are income differentials fair or unfair? Comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% (of total relevant sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income differentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2
Are income differentials fair or unfair? Intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M F M F</td>
<td>M F M F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12+
Income differentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15+
Income differentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
saw in the comparison between class groups, the girls are less accepting of the existing income distribution than the boys.

4.2 Background to the index: strength of classification of high and low earners

4.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The question asking for examples of high and low earners reveals the degrees of strong and weak classification between our class groups shown in Table 8.3.

The mc are more likely to hold a strong classification on this issue than the wc groups. This difference is largely made up of the representation in their examples of the mental/manual division. Middle class adolescents give non-manual jobs as high earners and manual jobs as low earners to a greater extent than the wc groups.5 The majority of most groups, however, see some blurring of the mental/manual division in terms of income levels.6

4.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

From Table 8.4 we can see that, for the groups within the mc, there is a tendency for those in the field of production rather than those in symbolic control to have strong classification at each age level, although the differences are small amongst the older adolescents.

In general our groups consider income differentials fair, although mc girls are less likely than the rest to endorse this view, and, from our intra-mc comparison, we see that it is girls from the field of symbolic control who make the largest contribution to this difference between mc girls and the rest of the adolescent groups.

All of our groups are also aware of, and represent in their answers, the blurring of the mental/manual division in terms of income levels. In this instance, however, the mc groups are more likely than those in the wc to have strong classification, particularly in giving only non-manual work as
Table 8.3

Strength of classification of the income distribution in terms of high and low earners: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.4

Strength of classification of the income distribution in terms of high and low earners: the intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
examples of highly paid work, and manual jobs as examples of low paid work. Within the mc, it is those from the field of production who are more likely to have strong classification than those in symbolic control.

4.3 Results on the index

4.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

Table 8.5 shows the strength and weakness of the classification of the social division of labour held by our class groups in terms of the index we have developed.

At the younger age level the greatest proportion of each of our groups in the class comparison give predominantly weakly classified arguments with respect to the justification or otherwise of income differentials. They are using a compensatory or oppositional model of the social division of labour in producing their arguments. This is particularly true of wc girls. At 15+ the majority of the wc girls maintain this stance, although there is a slight movement into strong classification amongst them. The rest of the groups all move into strong classification with age, employing essentially meritocratic or other legitimising arguments. Table 8.7 on p. 294 indicates the pattern of classification strength on the index of the social division of labour and the background information for each of the groups, and Table 8.8 on p. 296 shows the movement with age on each of these items.

4.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

Table 8.6 compares the intra-mc groups in our sample on the strength of their classification of the social division of labour on the index.

At 12+ both boys and girls from the field of production are more likely than those from the field of symbolic control to hold a weak classification, compensatory or oppositional model. The difference for boys is larger than that for girls. In this, the adolescents from the field of production are more similar to the wc adolescents than are those from the field of symbolic control. In the case of both boys in production and those in the wc, however,
### Table 8.5

The index for classification of the social division of labour: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.6
The index for classification of the social division of labour: the intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral 0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong C</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is a pronounced movement into strong classification with age. At the older age level the position is reversed, and those from the field of symbolic control are more likely to have weak classification on this index, with those from production employing meritocratic or other legitimising models to a greater extent. For the boys, once again, there is a similarity between the wc adolescents and those in the field of production.

The pattern for the 'ideal typical' groups within the fields of production and symbolic control, and for those with both mother and father in the same field, is similar to that for the total group allocated to the two fields. The figures for the 'ideal typical' groups are given in Appendix 5.

4.3.3 Summary of the results of the index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour and background questions

In this section we have discussed the index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour, and two background questions associated with it: (1) whether or not income differences were seen as fair or unfair, and (2) whether or not the adolescent had strong classification of the mental/manual division in terms of income differentials. To draw together the threads from this first section on the social division of labour, we can say for each of our groups that:

(1) At 12+ mc girls are less likely than other groups to consider income differentials fair (although a majority of them still do so), they are likely to have weak classification of the mental/manual division, and to use arguments indicating weak classification when discussing or justifying income differentials. If we look within the mc groups we see that it is girls in the field of symbolic control who contribute to the first two tendencies to a greater extent than those in the field of production, although the two groups are relatively similar in their use of weak or strong arguments about income differentials.

(2) Fifteen year old mc girls in our sample are significantly less likely than all other groups to consider income differentials fair (although a majority still do so) are likely to have weak classification of the mental/manual
division but move into predominantly strong classification on reasons for income differences. There is still a gender difference here, however, with girls more likely than boys to give weak classificatory arguments. Within the mc, girls from the field of symbolic control are more likely than those in production to consider income differentials unfair, to have weak classification of the mental/manual division, and to give weak classificatory arguments on reasons for income differentials. The latter finding supports our hypothesis of relatively weaker classification from those in the field of symbolic control. The mc girls in our sample, and particularly those in the field of symbolic control, express opposition to the hierarchical ordering associated with class divisions, as they do in the case of gender divisions which we noted in Chapter 7.

(3) Whilst 79% of 12+ year old mc boys consider income inequalities to be fair, half of them have a weak classification on the mental/manual division, and almost half give predominantly weak classification arguments when discussing reasons for income differentials. Within the mc group, boys from the field of symbolic control are slightly more likely to have weak classification of the mental/manual division, but boys from production are more likely to give weak classification arguments when giving reasons for income differentials (largely compensatory arguments). The latter finding within the mc is counter to our prediction of relatively stronger classification by those in the field of production. It means, however, that the younger boys in the field of production are responding similarly to the boys in the wc and using largely compensatory arguments. We can see from point (4) below that by the age of 15+, the boys in the field of production are responding in the way which we would have expected.

(4) Middle class boys at 15+ still largely consider income differentials fair, but slightly less so than at 12+, they are equally divided between strong and weak classification of the mental/manual division, and move into strong classification on reasons for income differentials. Within the mc, boys in the field of production are more likely to consider income differentials fair, slightly more likely to have strong classification of the mental/manual division, and much more likely than those in the field of symbolic control to give strong classification arguments justifying income differentials. The 15+ year old boys respond in accordance with our hypothesis in that those in the
field of production have stronger classification of the social division of labour than those in the field of symbolic control.

(5) The younger wc girls are slightly more likely than boys in both mc and wc to question the fairness of income differentials but not to the same extent as mc girls. They are more likely than those in the mc to have weak classification of the mental/manual division, and considerably more likely than all other groups to give weak classification arguments on reasons for income differentials.

(6) At 15+ the wc girls are slightly less likely to question the fairness of income differentials than at 12+, to accept them to the same extent as all other groups, and to hold generally weak classification of the mental/manual division as do their younger compatriots. They also give weak classificatory arguments for reasons for income differentials to a greater extent than any other group.

(7) The 12+ year old wc boys express similar acceptance of the fairness of income differentials as mc boys, but are as likely as wc girls to have weak classification of the mental/manual division, and as likely as the mc to give weak classification arguments on reasons for income differentials.

(8) Working class boys at 15+ still consider income differentials fair, and to the same extent as all groups (except mc girls) are less likely than the mc to have strong classification of the mental/manual division, and to have moved into strong classification in their arguments relating to the reasons for differences in income.

The patterns for the ideal typical groups in symbolic control and production and for those with both parents in the same field, are broadly similar to the patterns outlined above for the total groups allocated by field in the mc.

These results are encapsulated in Table 8.7 which shows the patterns of response on the questions providing background to the index and the index for the arguments used in discussing issues related to the social division of labour. This table shows the categories into which the largest proportion of
Table 8.7

The largest proportion of each group falling into combined categories on questions on the social division of labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th></th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair = F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair = U</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental/Manual division</th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>+C</th>
<th>+C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of social division of labour</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within MC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each of the groups fall. Table 8.8 shows the size of these age movements into
and out of strong and weak classification.

We can see a movement into stronger classification with age for all
groups except wc girls and girls and boys in the field of symbolic control. We
can see for the groups within the mc, that those most likely to have strong
classification of the mental/manual division are in the field of production
(boys at 15+ and girls at 12+). Those most likely to have strong classification
in terms of legitimising arguments used are also from the field of production
(boys and girls at 15+). These results are consistent with our hypothesis of
stronger classification from those in the field of production. Boys from the
field of symbolic control are also likely to give strongly classified legitimising
arguments at 12+ which is counter to our prediction. But the rest of the
groups from the field of symbolic control give largely weak classificatory
responses on both the mental/manual division, and on legitimising or
non-legitimising arguments for income differentials. Once again, as with the
index of gender differentiation, there is a tendency for those in the field of
symbolic control to give more weak classificatory responses and in most
instances for those in the field of production to give more strong
classificatory responses.

We also see from this table that, apart from 15+ boys, the wc
adolescents give largely weak classificatory arguments and have weak
classification of the mental/manual division. Compensatory arguments about
economic rewards which suggest that hard, difficult or dangerous work
receives higher payment in compensation for these characteristics leads to
weak classification of the social division of labour. When this type of
argument is combined with weak classification of the mental/manual division,
where the child suggests that manual work is highly paid, and with the
judgement that income differentials are fair, it may indicate that the wc
children who have this pattern of response think that manual work is valued
and receives adequate compensation.
Table 8.8

Age movements between 12+ and 15+ on issues related to the social division of labour in terms of percentage point differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mental/manual division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak classification (-C)</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong classification (+C)</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social division of labour index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the unit is an item in the topic area

The questions we will consider here are those from the topic area in
the questionnaire covering issues related to the social division of labour,
which we have not included in the index for this area. These questions were
omitted from the index since we were unable to use the concept of
classification in evaluating the responses. As in all of the empirical chapters,
we will report three types of result: significant differences, non significant
differences or similarities which reveal an overall trend for any group, and
selected illustrative quotations. Supplementary information from other
questions will be included where relevant, and the basic comparisons will be
between the mc and wc groups, and between those in the fields of production
and of symbolic control within the mc. Where questions are interrelated the
results will be presented together.

5.1 Why do people work?

Question: What are some of the reasons for which people work?

5.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

We were looking here for motivations other than financial for working,
and since we expected that income would be the major initial response, we
coded and considered three responses for each individual in this instance. We
made a distinction within responses which mentioned income, between those
referring to need and those who referred to money in other ways. The latter
type of response might suggest that people worked "for the cash", to get
"good money", or "to earn money". In the case of need, the adolescent might
specify basic items for which money earned at work is needed, or merely
state that need is the reason for working. For all groups except 15+ girls, it
was the wc who specified need to the greatest extent.

Not all adolescents gave a second or third response, but the mc groups
did so more than the wc, and girls more so than boys. If we take the reason
given by those who actually made a second response as a proportion of the
total group, we find that the mc, especially at 15+, place emphasis on
Table 8.9

Combined responses on reasons for work: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal satisfaction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

personal satisfaction, pleasure and enjoyment derived from work. For the mc and older wc groups, girls suggest this reason more than boys. These differences remain if we take into account up to three responses from each individual. Other responses related to personal satisfaction also appear for all groups, except 12+ wc boys. The types of statements included in this category were: work provides interest, enables one to meet people and make friends, prevents boredom or gives one something to do, and gets one out of the house. Table 8.9 gives the proportion of the mc and wc groups responding in the ways discussed here, with up to three responses combined.

5.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

Within the mc group, if we take up to three responses combined for this question, we find that at 12+ the emphasis on need comes from boys in the field of symbolic control and girls in the field of production. Pleasure and enjoyment and other personal satisfactions receive greater endorsement overall from those in the field of symbolic control. At the older age level, references to both need and to the pleasure and enjoyment to be gained from


Table 8.10

Combined responses on reasons for work: intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure and enjoyment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal satisfaction</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

work, come much more frequently from those in the field of symbolic control, and from girls rather than boys. Table 8.10 gives the proportion of each of our groups responding in this way, with three responses combined.

5.2 What effect does work have on people's lives?

Question: What are some of the effects that a person's job can have on his or her life outside work?

5.2.1 Comparison between MC and WC groups

We thought that this question might have generated responses indicating a recognition of a relation between social class and different types of work and lifestyles. In a small interview study which focussed on this issue, we had asked adolescents to group individuals on the basis of their work and to say in what ways the lives of the people within the groups they had made would differ. Most of the respondents in this study made two or three groups which they then described in terms of life style, focussing on types of housing,
leisure pursuits, and acquaintances. The groups which they constructed were frequently referred to by social class labels, and there was a high degree of agreement as to which types of work fell into which group. It was this experience which led us to expect a similar response on the above question put to our main sample in the questionnaire. To a large extent, however, the adolescents in our main sample answered the question at a personal level, and overwhelmingly considered that work had a negative impact on people's lives. At least half of all of our groups gave only negative or some negative effects. Whilst the mc boys give only negative responses more than girls, for the wc this is reversed. The mc groups, particularly mc girls, mentioned positive effects to a greater degree than the wc groups. This is in accord with their greater recognition of the pleasure and other personal satisfactions which can be gained from work. (See the discussion of the previous question.) The mc, again particularly girls, are also more likely to refer to the positive social effects of work than the wc, and here there is some indication of the type of response which we had at first thought would be generated by this question. Included in this category of response were positive references to the type of friends or associates that one might encounter through work, to the status to be gained from work, and to the type of activities which might be experienced.

Working class groups did find it more difficult to answer this question, but the largest proportion of each of our groups suggested negative emotional and physical effects which work might exert on the individual's personal life, marriage and family, through depression, tiredness, illness, irritability or other factors. This catalogue of woes included the impact on friends and other associates: "They can distress a person who has been working too hard. They can not see enough of their freinds because they are working" (12+ mc boy); "Some jobs affect a person's health both physically and mentally, some people have a bad time at work and bring it out on other people" (12+ mc boy); and dramatically on the family, "If he has a night shift he may not see his wife that often or his children because they are at work or school and also his marriage can be destroyed because of this" (12+ mc boy). A personal plaint came from one 12 year old girl, "Depressing the rest of the family. My mum never stops moaning about her temping work. I'm fed up with it" (12+ mc girl). Another younger girl could see both positive and negative effects: "They can make a person tense or have a nervous breakdown or they can give them a
Table 8.11
The effects of work on life: comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only or some negative effects</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only or some positive effects</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative emotional/physical effects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative social effects</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive social effects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

happy outlook on life" (12+ mc girl). Another had a little difficulty in doing this: "stress and strain, bad temper, tiredness, irritability, I think there must be some good effects too, though I can't think of them" (12+ mc girl). Within this overall framework of negativity about work, the mc groups are more likely to mention positive effects than the wc groups. This difference reaches significance at the .001 level for mc and wc girls at the older age level, possibly reflecting the nature of the work they themselves expect to do on entering the labour market. Table 8.11 gives figures for these responses.

5.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

We find here that the positive emphasis which we noted in the class comparison comes largely from those in the field of symbolic control, who mention only positive or at least some positive effects to a greater extent than those in the field of production. But once again it is negative responses which dominate the children's replies, and in general boys are more negative
Table 8.12
The effects of work on life: intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only or some negative effects</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only or some positive effects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotional/physical effects</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative social effects</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive social effects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than girls. There is a marked tendency for those in the field of symbolic control to emphasise emotional and physical effects, and for girls at least in production to emphasise negative social effects. The chief positive reason given entails positive social effects, and this is made especially by girls from the field of symbolic control, particularly at the older age level. Table 8.12 gives the proportions of our groups responding in these ways:

The girls from the field of symbolic control are the most ambitious of the girls in our sample in terms of both educational and occupational aspirations. From their responses to this question we can see that they expect to derive considerable satisfaction, and to realise positive social effects from the work that they expect to do. The person focus of the socialisation practices of the mc home, and particularly that in families of agents of symbolic control, lead to an emphasis on the communicative even pedagogic relation between mother and child, and thus the need for the mother to be at home with or able to spend considerable time with her young children. These
girls certainly recognise that requirement of their future roles as wives and mothers when asked whether they will work after marriage. In this instance the girls insist that they will work, but not when their children are young. The contradiction inherent in the future dual place in both reproduction and production in which these young women will find themselves is clear in these responses.

5.3 Trade unions, strikes and unemployment

Questions:
(1) What are trade unions for?
(2) For what reasons do people go on strike?
(3) Why are people unemployed?
(4) Are there countries which do not have unemployment?
   If yes, which ones?

These questions are dealt with together since they and the responses made to them are interrelated.

5.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The function of trade unions is seen by the largest proportion of the mc groups and the older wc groups as to "protect, preserve, defend, help or speak for, the rights, interests, conditions, pay and treatment of workers or employees". At the younger age, however, a sizeable proportion say that they do not know what trade unions are for, give no response to the question, or give an inaccurate definition of trade unions. This is particularly true of wc girls. Table 8.13 gives the relevant figures.

If we compare the groups in terms of saying that they 'don't know', giving no response at all or giving an inaccurate response on the one hand, and giving a relatively acceptable definition on the other, we find that the difference between 12- year old mc and wc girls is significant at the .001 level, and between mc and wc boys it is significant at the .01 level. At 15+ mc and wc boys have moved closer together but wc girls remain relatively
Table 8.13
What are trade unions for? Comparison between MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response, 'don't know', or inaccurate definition</td>
<td>34 39 54 53</td>
<td>6 12 14 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect interests/rights of workers</td>
<td>43 56 34 32</td>
<td>65 61 59 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ignorant compared with the rest of the groups, significantly so at the .001 level compared with each of the MC groups, and at .01 with WC boys.

The MC groups at each age level are more aware of the function of trade unions than the WC groups. There is also a considerable improvement in knowledge for all groups with age. Given our adolescents' views of the primacy of income and need as motives for work and the negative effects which work can have on people's lives, especially in the case of WC respondents, this relative lack of information and knowledge about an institution whose role is related to improving these conditions could be seen as a contributory element in an ideology of consent to the rule of the dominant class. The relative ignorance about trade union functions which persists for the older WC girls, especially compared with the boys, might reflect the relative irrelevance of these organisations for the type of work which the girls could expect to do.14

The group who make the most negative statements about trade unions are the older MC males (14% of them), and this group also make the most negative statements about workers when discussing the reasons for strikes (11%). The types of negative statements which our respondents made about workers reflect a more general view which places blame on the unions and workers for problems and difficulties in the economy. Workers were accused of sheer "bloodymindedness", or striking "for silly reasons", of exerting too
much power: "They want to impose their views on others", or more strongly, "To blackmail the government into giving them their demands". Further faults included greed, "For purely selfish reasons now ... more money is looked on as a matter of course by a lot of people who are just plain greedy", and laziness, "Because they are too lazy to work and the trade union leaders would be out of a job if their workers were not continually after more money", "They want shorter hours, or to put it another way they want to be paid for staying at home in bed", "Because some are lazy parasites".

Improved pay was seen as the major reason for strikes by most of the adolescents in each of our groups, but with increasing age, conditions of work were mentioned more frequently, especially by the mc groups. Statements referring to pay which indicated that the adolescents agreed with strike activity were made by wc children more so than mc, particularly at the younger age level. Only two individuals in the whole sample, however, mention trade unions when writing about reasons for strikes.

The question on unemployment included in our set on work was phrased in an open way so that should any of our respondents have considered that unemployment was a structural feature of the economic system it would have been possible for them to express this view. None did so. The responses did indicate, however, that a sizeable proportion of our older adolescents were disinclined to accept the inevitability of unemployment - nearly a third of the wc and half of the mc groups thought there were countries which did not have any unemployment.

The reasons for unemployment offered by our adolescents were largely couched in terms of supply and demand (too many people chasing too few jobs), although mc boys, particularly at 15+, subscribe to this viewpoint least. This group of boys think that the problem of unemployment is largely the fault of the workers - they suggest that the unemployed have a lack of, insufficient or inadequate qualifications, education or skills, or they make a straightforward negative statement about the unemployed. These negative comments included suggestions that the unemployed are lazy, too fussy or choosy, that they have bad attitudes towards work, that they do not want to work or prefer to live on the dole. Twenty-eight percent of the older mc boys make comments of this type. At this age such negative comments are made
more by mc adolescents and by boys rather than girls. If we consider two comments from each individual these differences become more pronounced. We also find when second responses are taken into account that overall the mc adolescents, especially boys, endorse the meritocratic ideology, by emphasising the importance of education and qualifications in finding a job more so than the wc groups. The tendency increases with age and at this stage there is also support for the meritocratic position from about one third of the wc groups. We have noted on the questions about education that a large number of our wc students accept the notion of the importance and value of education, an education that many of them are in fact denied. Table 8.14 gives figures in percentage terms for some of the responses which have been discussed in this section, for the class comparisons.

5.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

No dramatic differences appear between our intra-mc groups on these four questions. We have noted above in the class comparison where gender differences emerge. There is a tendency, however, for those in the field of production to contribute to a greater extent than those in symbolic control to some of the mc responses we have noted above. Those in the field of production are more likely than those in symbolic control to make negative statements about the unemployed, to lay the blame for unemployment on the workers, and to emphasise the importance of education and qualifications, or the contribution which lack of such attributes makes to the condition of the unemployed. Table 8.15 gives these figures.

5.4 How to earn more money

Question: What could the people in these jobs do if they thought they should earn more money for their work: a secretary, a company director, a factory worker?

5.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The question was seen as seeking degrees of autonomy, or possibilities for action available to three categories of worker, manual, female non-manual
Table 8.14
Comparison between MC and WC groups on selected questions on employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for strikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay, respondent agrees with strike action</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay only mentioned</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and conditions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply/demand</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative statement re unemployed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two responses counted:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative statement re unemployed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some countries have no unemployment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* i.e. proportion of the group responding in this way when both first and second response is taken into account.
Table 8.15
Intra-MC comparison on selected questions on employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age 12+</th>
<th>Age 15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F M F</td>
<td>M F M F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade unions</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know, no response, inaccurate definition</td>
<td>33 32 35 37</td>
<td>5 12 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect interests/rights of workers</td>
<td>33 45 50 48</td>
<td>67 64 66 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade unions</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay, respondent agrees with strike action</td>
<td>14 18 10 11</td>
<td>11 2 4 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay only mentioned</td>
<td>44 42 42 32</td>
<td>20 20 19 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and conditions</td>
<td>36 29 42 48</td>
<td>46 64 75 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade unions</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply/demand</td>
<td>56 48 42 58</td>
<td>33 44 45 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>7 21 25 14</td>
<td>19 26 11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative statement re unemployed</td>
<td>17 17 17 10</td>
<td>32 26 26 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two responses counted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade unions</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>16 38 31 35</td>
<td>39 46 26 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative statement re unemployed</td>
<td>32 32 33 24</td>
<td>49 54 43 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some countries have no unemployment</td>
<td>24 32 48 31</td>
<td>51 48 47 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and male high level non-manual. The responses for the first two were relatively unanimous and even stereotyped, but the latter produced some diversity.

The action to remedy the situation with respect to the factory worker posed no problems for the majority of each of our groups - their proposal was strike action. The proportion who made this suggestion increased with age for all groups, especially in the case of wc girls. A similar unanimity applied to the job of secretary, where the largest proportion of each of our groups suggested that his/her course should be to ask the boss or someone higher in the organisational chain. Working class boys at 12+ were less likely to make this suggestion than the other groups, as nearly one third of them could think of no solution to the secretary's problem. This may be related to the difficulty which these boys had in identifying with female work. (See the section on aspirations below, Chapter 12, p. 424.) Changing jobs was an alternative suggestion for the older groups, but a small number held a stereotyped view of the relationship between a secretary and employer or boss, which may be frighteningly realistic if a recent report on sexual harassment reflects the general situation in secretarial work. A small group of boys suggested exploitation of the secretary's sexuality, for example "learn a better knowledge of sex" (12+ mc boy), or, rather more directly, "put her tits out" (12+ mc boy). Very few of our adolescents suggested strike action for the secretary. The secretary works in an interpersonal mode, with the emphasis on an individual relation with her superior. This vertical personal relationship militates against horizontal solidarity.

Other suggestions for improving pay, usually for the factory worker, included industrial espionage or 'go slow'. Here, however, is a secretarial example: "Make typing errors all day long. Break typewriters and copiers (by accident)" (12+ mc boy).

The company director proved the most difficult for our adolescents to find a solution to the problem of too little pay. For almost all groups (except the mc at 15+), the largest proportion could make no suggestion at all, especially so in the case of the younger respondents. (Table 8.16 gives some detail on responses for class and within mc groups in this question.) The major suggestion again appeared to be to ask for money, although a
A sizeable group felt that such a person could just take the money or even "fiddle the books", a response which was especially popular amongst the older male adolescents. A few weaker children thought that a company director could persuade his/her workers to go on strike, a rather convoluted solution, the success of which cannot be assumed. Others thought that the unions might be a problem for the company director, for example "couldn't do much without the union jumping down his throat. Suppose he could do it on the quiet" (15+ male girl). Still other possibilities were contacts in high places - "Do nothing but ask their personal friends in the government" (12+ male boy), or doubt that such a group would need more money: "I doubt if they are underpaid" (12+ male boy).

5.4.2 Intra-male comparison

When discussing the factory worker, strike action is the suggested approach, but in all cases except the younger boys, those in the field of production make this suggestion to a greater extent than those in symbolic control. All groups enjoin the secretary to ask her superiors, girls slightly more so than boys. The company director creates more problems than the other occupations for each of our groups, but a tendency appears (except for 12+ boys) for those from the field of production to suggest asking for more money, and in most cases, for those in the field of symbolic control to suggest taking more, or indeed fiddling the books. This is especially true of male males at the older age level. Table 8.16 gives the major responses on each occupation for all of our groups.

Table 8.17 indicates age movements between 12+ and 15+ into and out of some of the major categories of response on some of the questions discussed in this section, in terms of percentage point differences.

5.5 Summary of results on individual questions

We will now consider briefly the results of questions which were examined individually in this chapter. Not unexpectedly, most of our adolescents considered income, or need, to be the basic reason for working. By looking at three of the individual's responses on this question, we were
Table 8.16

Major responses on what three occupation holders could do if they thought they should earn more money for their work

(i) COMPARISON BETWEEN THE MC AND WC GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company director</td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiddle and take</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) INTRA-MC COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Field</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company director</td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiddle and take</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know, no response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.17

Age movements between 12+ and 15+ on selected questions on employment for both class and field groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for work</th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need*</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotional and physical</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive social</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (2 responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative re workers</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3 responses combined
able to discern some different tendencies amongst our groups in the types of reasons they emphasised. The mc groups, for example, placed emphasis on personal satisfaction, and indeed the pleasure and enjoyment to be derived from work, to a greater extent than the wc, and girls mentioned this type of reason more than boys. Need appeared in the responses of the wc to a greater extent than in those of the mc, with the exception of the older mc girls. For the groups within the mc we find that in most instances it is those in the field of symbolic control who emphasise both need, and the personal satisfaction and pleasure to be gained from work.

When we asked about the effects that work has on the individual's life outside of work, we had thought that there might be some indication of the relationship between social class and different types of work and lifestyles, as there had been in a small interview based study which we had conducted previously amongst adolescents. Most of the adolescents in the current study, however, answered the question at a personal level and considered that work had a negative effect on people's lives. The effects they referred to were largely negative physical and emotional effects. The mc groups, particularly girls, mentioned positive effects more than did the wc groups, and within the mc we find that these positive comments come chiefly from those whose families are located in the field of symbolic control. When referring to negative effects, there is a tendency for those in the field of symbolic control to emphasise negative emotional and physical effects, and for girls at least in production to emphasise negative social effects.

The older girls in the field of symbolic control expect to derive pleasure and satisfaction from work and that work will afford considerable positive social effects, more so than any other group. We have noted a contradiction in the woman's role which is particularly acute for these girls. The meritocratic ideology and that of equal opportunity help to engender in the girls a high level of educational and occupational aspiration. The socialisation practices of the nmc are based on the mother and her interactional practices within the family, and are crucial for the reproduction of this class. The girls in the field of symbolic control recognise this requirement in that they consider that, although they will certainly work after marriage, they will stay at home when their children are young. This
will necessarily conflict with their expressed career aspirations, and their determination that their sex will make no difference to that career.

We posed a series of questions on trade unions, strikes and unemployment to our adolescents. The mc groups had a better idea of the function and purpose of the trade unions than the wc groups at both age levels, although there was considerable improvement with age for all groups. About one third of the wc girls, however, continued to be unaware of the function of trade unions at the age of 15+. On this question, as with others, negative statements were made about trade unions by the older mc boys to a greater extent than any other group. The major reason for strikes was seen as pay demands, but with increasing age conditions of work were suggested more frequently.

Many of our adolescents did not regard unemployment as inevitable, and cited countries where there was no unemployment. These were usually communist countries, but they also included a number of capitalist countries. Although the major reason given for unemployment was couched in terms of supply and demand - too many people and too few jobs - there was some indication of negative reactions to the unemployed and a further endorsement of the meritocratic ideology in the responses to this question. The older mc boys put forward more negative views of the unemployed than any other groups, and they also endorsed the meritocratic ideology, by suggesting that it is the lack of the relevant qualifications and skills which leads to unemployment. These latter responses are also more likely to come from adolescents in the field of production than those in symbolic control, although there are no dramatic differences between our two groups within the mc on these four questions.

The procedures by which holders of particular jobs could increase their pay produced relatively stereotypical responses. For the factory worker the largest proportion of each group in the mc and wc suggested strike action; the mc to a greater extent than the wc, and within the mc the boys to a greater extent than the girls. For the secretary the favoured solution was to ask her/his superior, and the possibility of strike action was mentioned by few of each of our groups in this connection. We saw this as reflecting the vertical personalised relation which characterises such work and militates
against horizontal solidarity. The strategy to be adopted by the company director created most problems for our adolescents, and the favoured solution was again to ask for money. Nearly one third of the older boys from the field of symbolic control, however, thought that the company director could just take the money, or indeed fiddle the books.

6 Overview

6.1 The general picture

A complex pattern of responses for our groups emerged in this section. It was clear that all groups accepted inequalities as expressed in income differentials associated with the occupational hierarchy. A majority of all our groups accepted this hierarchical ordering of differentials, although mc girls, and more specifically those in the field of symbolic control, were less likely to endorse this position than the rest of the groups, significantly so in some instances.

The mental/manual division, for most of our groups, was weakly classified in terms of income. There was a class difference here, with the mc more likely to have strong classification of this division than the wc. This runs counter to our general expectation about strength of classification in the mc and wc, but we have argued from this result that the mental/manual division itself is more salient for the mc. A similar indication of the salience of the mental/manual division for the mc adolescents appeared on a question on gender differentiated work reported in Chapter 7, p. 262 above. Within the mc, those in the field of production were more likely to have strong classification of the mental/manual division than those in symbolic control, and this is in accord with our expectation.

We considered a particular pattern of response for the wc. This was the case when a child thought that income differentials were fair, but had weak classification on the index of modelling of the social division of labour, and weak classification of the mental/manual division. In this case the child would be using compensatory arguments about differential economic rewards, suggesting that higher pay is compensation for hard, difficult, dangerous or
demanding work, and putting both manual and non manual work in the category of high wage or salary earners. This could indicate that the child thought that manual work was adequately rewarded in the income distribution, rather than demonstrating legitimation of differential pay for manual and non manual work. A number of our wc children evidently responded in this way. Weak classification of the reasons for income differentials is more common amongst the wc than the mc children in our sample and is more common for girls rather than boys.

On the index of modelling of the social division of labour, we found that most of each of the younger adolescent groups gave weak classificatory arguments. These were largely compensatory in nature, but some oppositional views were also expressed. The group who gave most weak classificatory, compensatory arguments were wc girls. Although there is a general movement into strong classification for all groups with age, the wc girls steadfastly retain weak classification on this issue. They consider that remuneration under certain conditions does or should relate to the context of the job and the efforts of the worker, rather than to a hierarchical scale of importance of function, or of educational level. More of these wc girls than the boys will be giving the pattern of responses we outlined above, indicating that they consider economic rewards for manual work to be adequate. We could infer this also from their answers on a question asking for their work aspiration as a member of the opposite sex, where 48% give skilled traditional male manual work. The latter response probably also indicates a relatively high level of identification with the working class for these girls.

For working class girls, then, the mental/manual division has less immediate salience than for the mc groups and they do not use legitimising, strong classificatory arguments to the same extent. Sexual divisions are, however, strongly classified for the majority of this group, and we could argue that patriarchy, rather than class is a more important division for these girls, on the basis of the responses on these two indices. Patriarchy, in terms of strong classification of gender differentiation, is also highly salient for wc boys, but in this they are matched by mc boys.

Within the mc group, at 12+ those in the field of production give more arguments indicating weak classification than do those in the field of symbolic
control, which is counter to our general prediction from our model. The younger children in the field of production are focussing on context and worker, similarly to the wc, but particularly wc girls as we noted above, rather than employing a meritocratic or other hierarchy in justification of income differentials. A similarity between the ideological positioning of the wc groups and those in the field of production emerges in a number of instances in our data. See for example Chapter 10 which compares some wc children with high educational aspirations and other groups in our sample on the indices developed in the study. Most of our wc group (97%) are located in the field of production of our model.

Meritocratic and other hierarchies are invoked in justification for income differentials by those in the field of symbolic control at 12+; at 15+ they are overtaken by adolescents in the field of production in this respect.

6.2 Dynamic patterns in the data

The most noticeable change over age in this section of the data is a movement out of weak and into strong classificatory arguments for all class groups on the index of modelling of the social division of labour. Within the mc the movement into strong classification is greatest for those in the field of production. At 15+ the boys from the field of production overwhelmingly consider income differentials to be fair, have moved to some extent into strong classification of the mental/manual division compared with their 12+ compatriots, and use meritocratic or other hierarchical legitimations for such differences.

There is a divergence between the boys from the two fields within the mc. Those in the field of production take the position described here, and give stronger endorsement of the status quo than those in the field of symbolic control. We have argued (in Chapter 3) that variations in ideological positioning within the field of symbolic control can come from a number of sources, and (in Chapter 1) that within the hegemonic order in a society at any point there are both orthodox and heterodox positions, ideas, and theories. Those in the field of symbolic control are more likely to endorse the heterodox positions from the prevailing hegemonic order. We can see this in
the relatively weaker classification of the boys in the field of symbolic control in this study. Girls from the field of symbolic control can also be seen as espousing more heterodox positions here. Some of these girls (as we note in footnote 8 to this chapter), however, take radical positions, especially in arguing that income distribution is unfair. Table 8.8 above gave age movements for each of the groups identified in our sample.

We turn now to the issues which we examined on the basis of individual questions put to the children. Here we find for example that all groups place less emphasis on 'need' as a main motive for work, with increasing age, with the exception of mc girls. It is the older mc girls in the field of symbolic control who move most dramatically to this response. The predominance of references to 'need' as a major motivation for work amongst this group could reflect the social awareness and radicalism which we have found in other areas of response from these girls. In fact, whilst girls in the field of symbolic control are becoming more likely to mention 'need' as a reason for work, the boys in this field are less likely to do so with age, a tendency reflected in the field of production, although not on such a grand scale. We have noted above (Chapter 7) an opposite movement with age for girls and boys in the field of production in their classification of gender differentiation. The divergence between the sexes in the fields of the mc may have implications for the pattern of socialisation in their future families.

As they grow older, all of our adolescents see work more negatively as far as both emotional and physical effects are concerned. The movement is more marked for boys than for girls, and is similar for the males in each field within the mc. When the children were asked what they considered would be the most important thing in their own life, and in men's and women's lives in general, boys did not identify work as important for themselves and other men to the extent that girls did for men in general. The boys' negativity towards work could be related to the fact that they do see it as inevitable and part of the male role as breadwinner.

The meritocratic ideology is increasingly endorsed with age by these adolescents when they consider the reasons for unemployment. Many of them believe that people are unemployed because they have insufficient or incorrect qualifications or training. Within the mc this age movement is
revealed to be contributed entirely by those in the field of production. All class groups with the exception of wc girls make more negative statements about unemployed workers with increasing age, and this is particularly true once again for those in the field of production. These responses can be seen as reflecting a dominant ideological message which identifies individual failure or even collective wc irresponsibility as the reason for problems in the functioning of the economic system. The failure of the wc girls to give this response to the same extent as the rest of the groups may reflect a certain degree of identification with the wc amongst these girls. We have noted above that this is the case for at least some of them in terms of their job aspirations when imagining themselves to be boys; 48% of them chose skilled manual work in this instance (see Chapter 12).

The older boys from the field of production can be seen on all of the issues covered in this section to be moving into a more conservative, more strongly classified, more orthodox position with respect to class, and as we noted in Chapter 7, also to gender differentiation.

We have found some support in the results presented in this chapter for our hypothesis relating to relative strength and weakness of classification between mc and wc groups, and groups within the mc. We have also found some counter examples, usually amongst the younger age group. Here we could argue

(1) that the socialisation into the ideological positioning of the particular class or class fractions is a continuous process and may become more apparent with age;

(2) that it is possible that a different meaning inheres in the same response when it emerges from individuals in different class and gender positions. We have put forward an argument on this basis with respect to some wc children who consider the income distribution to be fair, suggesting that a certain pattern of response might indicate that they thought manual work adequately compensated, rather than a legitimisation of high pay for non-manual work. There is some indication from a sub sample of 15+ year olds drawn from this sample, whose scripts have been examined in detail and their responses interrelated to produce a mapping of the types of arguments emerging in the study, that when referring to 'hard' work, those in the mc think of hard mental work, and those in the wc think of hard manual work.
We have also found that there are gender differences in our groups, and that in some instances the sexes increasingly diverge with age on issues relating to the legitimisation of the hierarchical ordering of the social division of labour. Do these instances of radicalism or opposition, minority positions though they may be, indicate some space for change, or potential conflict within our groups in terms of future behaviour in their own lives, including the socialisation of their own children? Or are they indications of adolescent rebellion and/or social awareness, which continuous socialisation and ideological positioning in terms of class and gender will submerge or eradicate with the passing of time. Can these instances of opposition (particularly within the mc) be seen as a selection of heterodox positions safely within the ruling orthodoxy, or do they represent counter hegemonic ideological positioning emerging from counter hegemonic sites within the society?
NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

1 See Chapter 6 for detailed definitions of these terms.

2 Westergaard and Resler (1976: 75) argue with examples that, although there is overlap across the manual/non-manual division in the occupational hierarchy, in terms of income, the basic division is still extant. One could, however, argue that, rather than being an accurate description of income differentials, those who give only non-manual as high income jobs and manual as low income jobs are perpetuating dominant ideological positions on the relative value of these types of work and of earning power in the occupational hierarchy.

3 The figures for the eight year old sample on this question are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mc</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>wc</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mc eight year olds overwhelmingly consider income differentials unfair. Girls in the younger group are more likely to take this position than boys.

4 The percentages in the categories here are given as a proportion of the total relevant sample, and may not sum to 100% since some of the group may have said that they did not know or have given no response.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc</td>
<td>wc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the mc and wc in providing examples of the mental/manual division for low and high earners, or having some mix of manual and non-manual work at one or other or both ends of the scale, reaches significance for 15+ year old mc and wc boys at .02.

6 Some of this blurring is due to the presence of typical female white collar work in the low income earner lists, particularly in those of girls.

7 The differences between the distribution of boys into strong and weak classification in the index at 12+ compared with 15+ for these two groups are significant; for boys in the wc at the .05 level, and for those in the field of production at .01.

8 Since the numbers were relatively small in this instance we looked at the reasons given by these girls in detail. We thought that they might be arguing that non-manual work of one kind or another was not fairly compensated with high pay, especially given that the mc girls had weak classification of the mental/manual division. These particular girls were, however, largely
objecting to the income distribution, expressing either liberal or radical positions, although some ambivalence emerged. Some examples of the radical position were given on p. 280 above. Ambivalence can be seen in the following two statements: "Everyone has the same birth right to earn the same amount of money but it also depends on the opportunities given to people, how well they are prepared to work to improve themselves. It depends. It is basically unfair." "Many people who are poorly paid often put in many more hours work than those who are well paid. However, the job they are doing is not always so beneficial to the way the country is run, or the welfare of its people."

In the study of eight year olds from which the current work developed there was some evidence that the children (both Swedish and English) took this position. See Dahlberg and Holland (1984: 26).

In a subsample of the 15+ year olds from the adolescents in this study, drawn in order to develop networks to map the types of arguments used, further evidence is available to support this contention. This also indicates that the mc when they refer to hard work more frequently think of hard mental work, and the wc boys at least think of hard manual work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mc</th>
<th>wc</th>
<th>prod.</th>
<th>symb. cont.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard mental</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard manual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the mc and wc boys in this respect is significant at the .001 level.

10 Working class boys give fewer second responses than the other groups, only 45% of them do so.

11 The content of the categories covering social effects are:
(1) positive social effects - types of friends, associates, status, activities;
(2) negative social effects - effects on social life of unsocial hours, taking work home, make enemies, others resent one because of the job.

12 These figures include up to two responses for each individual, and some double counting may occur if an individual uses the same category of response twice. The figures do give an indication of the differences in emphasis amongst the groups, especially between the mc and wc on positive social effects. A chi square test would not be appropriate in this case.

13 When the adolescent's answer seemed to indicate that they did not really understand the function of a trade union we called this an inaccurate definition. Some examples were where children saw trade unions as a kind of trading organisation or perhaps a customs union connected with foreign trade, or saw them as working for the company or bosses rather than for the workers.

14 Women's rights and interests at work have not been at the forefront of trade union concerns historically (see Boston, 1980; Campbell, 1980). Indeed the
labour aristocracy demanded a family wage to enable them to support a non working wife (see Foreman, 1977).

15 See Berg (1970: 73) for a discussion of the escalation of certification, and a demonstration of the mythic nature of some of the arguments used to support it. One might have thought that this argument would be put forward by our new mc group in the field of symbolic control, themselves so dependent on cultural capital, but there is no evidence for this in the answers to this particular question.

16 See, amongst many others, Halsey at al (1980), Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies: Education Group (1981) and Bernstein (1971: 190) on compensatory education, for class differences in education. See Byrne (1978) for figures on educational and training differentials between girls and boys.

17 Recent statistics indicate that 98% of secretaries are women and 90% of bosses are men in the UK (Alfred Marks Bureau Ltd, 1982).

18 Alfred Marks Bureau Ltd (1982): A study of 799 managers and employees of the agency's branches in the UK, in which 66% of employees and 86% of managers reported that they were aware of various forms of sexual harassment present in their office. 51% of the females reported having experienced some form of sexual harassment in their working lives. For a more general discussion of sexual harassment, see for the USA MacKinnon (1979) and for the UK and USA Stanko (1985).

19 It should be noted that data was collected in 1978, prior to the astronomical rise in unemployment which we have seen in the last five years.

20 'Need' refers here to the basic essentials of life, for example food, shelter, housing, clothes, or an explicit reference to 'need' in the child's answer.

21 See the discussion of Aggleton and Whitty (1984) in Chapter 1 footnote 38.
CHAPTER 9
THE ADOLESCENTS' MODELLING OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

1 Introduction

The concept of classification is once again used to develop an index for the adolescents' modelling of the educational process, but in this case an additional dimension is considered. Two features of the relation between education and production are discussed by Bernstein (1977: 185). These are (1) the systemic relation, which defines the role of education in its approximate reproduction of the work force, and constitutes both the class and the material basis for education. In this relation, production is prior to education, and to some extent determines the forms and practices of the educational system. (2) The second aspect of the relation between production and education refers to the relative autonomy of the educational system from the mode of production, and it is here that the concept of classification is used. Bernstein defines the relative autonomy of the educational system in terms of the strength or weakness of the classification or insulation between the category education and the category production. For Bernstein then the relationship between education and production in different social structures can be typified by the specific combination of the systemic and classificatory relation. He gives some examples (Bernstein, 1977: 188):

(a) Strong classification and simple systemic relationships (nineteenth century entrepreneurial capitalism)
(b) Strong classification and extended systemic relationships (twentieth century capitalism)
(c) Weak classification and extended systemic relationships (China to 1976, Romania, Cuba)

In using the concept of classification to create the two indices discussed above - the adolescents' modelling of (a) gender differentiation and (b) the social division of labour - we postulated an underlying dimension of strength of classification. Strong classification or insulation between categories in the above analyses indicated in the case of (a) an acceptance of gender differentiation and specialised gender roles, and in the case of (b) an
acceptance of the distinctions of the occupational hierarchy, of income differentials, and implicitly of the mental/manual distinction. Weak classification implied degrees of rejection, or at least ambivalence towards, the categories of gender differentiation and specialisation and to the social relations of the social division of labour. In the case of the adolescents' modelling of educational processes, instead of an underlying dimension of strength of classification, we are going to examine two dimensions: (i) the classificatory relation, that is recognition or endorsement of the relative autonomy of the educational system, and (ii) a recognition of the systemic relation between education and production.

At the most general level we could argue in terms of our model of fractions of the middle class that those in the field of production, having a direct relation to production, and an indirect relation to education, should be more concerned with systemic relations. Those in the field of symbolic control, who have an indirect relation to the material base, but a direct relation to the institutions and practices of the agencies of symbolic control, should be more oriented towards recognition of the relative autonomy of the educational system. Ambiguities persist in this formulation for a number of reasons. At a general level the reasons are related to the determination of education by the economic base of society and to the nature of the field of symbolic control as a producer of ideas and theories which can be recontextualised and incorporated into the practices of the field of production (for example theories of business studies and practice, of industrial management, and of organisations). At a more specific level, and relevant to the type of material produced in this study, the connection between education and work can be seen by both those in the field of production and of symbolic control as related to the acquisition of particular types of qualification, suited to particular types of work.

We expected that the systemic relation would be recognised by all of our groups, but that there might be a tendency for those in the field of symbolic control to be more aware of the classificatory relation between education and production.
The indices on education

2.1 Questions used, refocussing of original coding, and examples of recoded responses

The questions used for the indices developed to assess the adolescents' modelling of educational processes were those which asked them to think about the value and purpose of education and its reference to their future life. These questions gave an opportunity for reference to both the systemic and classificatory relation of the educational system to production. Our aim was to ascertain to what extent the adolescents were influenced by the messages conveyed through the modality of the educational system. We considered these basic messages to be:

1. Education perceived of in the liberal, humanist tradition, as having an intrinsic value for personal development, and for the enhancement of the individual's life and experience. This we considered to be the basic message referring to the relative autonomy of education from production (the classificatory message).

2. Education seen as closely linked to production, and essential for the individual's future life chances and work. Qualifications and school subjects are seen as directly related to future work (the systemic message).

3. Success in both education and work is seen as a result of the effort and ability of the individual. Just as success is individualised in this perception of education, so is failure. This is a central message of the educational system (the meritocratic message), and is closely related to the systemic relation and in direct conflict with the message of relative autonomy.

We constructed a model which describes the relation between education and production in terms which can be related to the responses of our adolescents to the questions put to them. The diagram below indicates the elements of this model and the way in which the types of response can be mapped onto the model.
High standards required within school (implicitly to meet systemic relation)

internal relations within school. Personal/inter-personal. Intrinsic and general value of knowledge

Systemic relation

B

How individual is positioned with respect to education, qualifications, occupations, outcomes

classificatory relation

C

value of the educational product for future life (not work specific)

D

The left hand side of the diagram refers to the systemic relation, and the right hand side to the classificatory relation. For each relation, the top half of the diagram deals with the internal practices, and the bottom half with the external product of the school. The strongest version of the systemic relation is described in quadrant B, with the arguments in quadrant A as weaker variants; the strongest version of the classificatory relation based on the relative autonomy of education appears in quadrant C, and quadrant D contains slightly weaker variants of this position. We measured the degree to which the adolescents were oriented toward the classificatory or systemic
relations separately, and allocated the following scores to arguments which fell into the four quadrants of our diagram above.

The systemic relation quadrant A = 1          
quadrant B = 2

The classificatory relation quadrant C = 2      
quadrant D = 1

At one level it could be argued that at least three of the questions used in the twin indices for this part of the questionnaire are directing attention to the systemic relation. The responses of the adolescents do indicate, however, that other messages are absorbed from the educational system. The refocussing of the original coding into systemic and classificatory responses of differing degrees of strength is described below.

2.2 Refocussing the coding

Question 1: What have you got out of being at school?

Recoded:

In this question the responses fall mainly at the two extremes of the scale and into quadrants B and C.

Quadrant B (strong systemic response)
Coded here are references to the benefit of education in general or particular aspects of the educational experience for the future, including direct reference to work; discussion and examples of types of qualifications; and negative comments about the school or education which imply that the requirements of the systemic relation are not being met. Some examples: "Have found what subjects I like so I can choose my profession" (15+ mc boy). "I am not too good at maths and I think I blame the modern techniques of teaching, and modern arithmetic for this" (15+ wc boy).
Quadrant C (strong classificatory response)
This category includes statements about the intrinsic value of education and knowledge, and references to social aspects of the school experience including interpersonal relationships within the educational context. Examples are: "Understanding things I would not of known if I had not been at school" (12+ wc boy); "Knowledge" (12+ mc boy); "I have gained friends and a sense of community" (15+ mc girl).

Question 2: Will the things that you are doing at school be useful to you when you leave or not?

In this question the adolescents are being asked rather more directly about the product of the school in terms of the systemic relation, and most responses do fall into that category indicating recognition of a strong systemic relation, referring to the value of education for future work. A number of respondents, however, make statements which fall into the category describing the weak version of the classificatory relation. Here they refer to the use of schooling for future life experience not directly related to work. The responses fall largely into quadrants B and D on our diagram.

Recoded:

Quadrant B (strong systemic response)
Responses coded here were: general agreement that what was done at school would be useful after leaving; any reference to the general benefit of schooling for future life, whether gender specific or not; references to the value of education for obtaining work; examples of particular school subjects related to future work requirements; statements about the value and importance of qualifications; and negative comments about school or indications of dissatisfaction related to the relevance of their education for the individual's future life and work. Some examples: "Yes, because I can use my knowledge for a job" (12+ mc boy); "... some things will be fairly useless. Like religious education which is forced on boys and girls for their first three years of secondary education" (15+ wc boy).
Quadrant D (weak classificatory response)

Here we included references to specific school subjects related to future life which were independent of work, whether gender specific or not, and an example is "Maths physics and biology give a basic understanding of our world" (15+ mc boy).

Question 3: What are some of the things that help people get on at school?

In this instance attention is being focussed on the internal processes and practices of the school, and the individual's relation to these processes. Mapped onto the top half of the diagram above are (a) a systemic response, which includes meritocratic elements - brains, ability, and hard work, and the role of teachers and parents in facilitating the individual's school career; and (b) a response indicating autonomy of the school from work which emphasises the development of self and interpersonal relationships.

Recoded:

Quadrant A (weak systemic response)

This category contains references to brains, intelligence, hard work and study; and to the role of the teacher and parents in facilitating a successful educational experience. We found in general that some references to teachers merely stated that teachers help you to get on in school, others specified the necessary qualities or relevant capacities required of the teachers ("good teachers"), and others referred to the quality or nature of the relationship with teachers ("a good relationship with teachers"). We have included all such references as indicating a weak systemic relation, since even those referring to relationships with teachers are concerned with their competence in facilitating (or otherwise) success within the educational system. We see these comments as implicit references to the adequacy of the school in meeting the requirements of the systemic relation. We consider that the social relations within the school to which the adolescents refer are largely with peer groups and not with teachers, and this is made quite explicit when references are made to friends.
Quadrant C (strong classificatory response)
Personal characteristics of the individual are coded here, as is any reference to the importance or role of friends, and the individual's interest in particular school subjects. Some examples are: "Ability to make friends" (12+ mc girl); "Interesting work, something that will make the work interesting and enjoyable" (12+ mc girl).

Question 4: If you were to have children, what would be most important in their education?

Recoded:
The projective nature of this question led to a wider range of responses than in the previous questions and they fell into all four quadrants of our diagram as follows:

Quadrant A (weak systemic response)
Here we coded comments referring to good standards being required of the school and of teachers, and discipline. An examples is: "The sort of school they would go to, preferably a grammar school" (15+ wc boy).

Quadrant B (strong systemic response)
References to specific school subjects, to qualifications, or to the child's future life and/or work fall into this category. An example: "If I had children, which I will, I'd think maths would be the most important thing" (15+ wc boy).

Quadrant C (strong classificatory response)
In this category we have included general comments about education of various types, which refer essentially to the intrinsic value of the experience. This includes references to the desire that the child should learn a lot, references to characteristics or attitudes of the child her/himself which the respondent considers necessary for the experience of schooling to be valuable, and references to broad values which should be acquired through education, for example independence,
freedom, and respect for the rights of others. For example, "A lot of interests and knowledge ... and that they enjoy it" (12+ mc girl).

Quadrant D (weak classificatory response)
We include in this category responses which refer to values related to specific conduct which will have an effect on the child's relationships in future life, rather than to the more general values allocated to quadrant C above. For example, the child should be taught good manners, and respect for her/his elders: "Learn politeness" (15+ mc boy); "The way they talk and behave" (15+ wc boy).

3 Construction of the index

On each of the four questions used in the indices considered here we used two responses for each individual, when two were made. The highest possible score on each index was, for the systemic relation 10, and for the classificatory relation 12. An index of the individual's modelling of the educational process was derived for each of these two relations by summing her/his responses over the four questions used. A zero score on either index indicates that the individual did not refer to either the classificatory or the systemic relation at all on these four questions, whereas a relatively high score on either index indicates a number of references to the particular relation over the four questions.

In each of the indices which we developed, although in different ways and for differing numbers and types of response, we are scanning a series of questions to pick up the individual's endorsement of particular positions. We used as our coding unit the set of questions and we scanned this set and coded responses where they occurred across the questions. If an adolescent did not produce the relevant type of statement, or produced no statement at all, for the purpose of our index the outcome is the same. We consider that the respondent was not demonstrating a recognition of one or other (or both) of the educational messages which our coding was designed to capture.
4 Results

4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

4.1.1 The classificatory relation

Although the highest potential score on the classificatory index was 12, in fact the highest actual score on each index was 10, and few individuals scored as high. In the tables below the distributions for our groups are given in terms of absence of the response, and three levels of score.

Between a quarter and a third of each of the class, gender and age groups make no reference to the classificatory relation between education and production (the relative autonomy of education from production) on the questions specifically on education in the questionnaire.

The mc are more oriented towards the classificatory relation than the wc. If we compare the groups on the basis of those who score 3 or below (including zero) and those who score 4 and above, there are significant differences between the mc and the wc at the following levels: for 12+ boys at .02, 12+ girls at .05, 15+ boys not significant, 15+ girls at .01.

Girls also refer to the classificatory relation to a greater extent than boys, but the differences are more pronounced at the younger age level, reaching significance for both class groups at .001 in terms of those scoring 4 or more points and 3 or less on the index.

4.1.2 The systemic relation

For each of our groups the systemic relation appears to be more relevant than the classificatory relation - few of our adolescents make no reference at all to it. The younger girls have a slight tendency to ignore this relationship to a greater extent than other groups, when answering the four questions on which this index is based.

If we look at those who score 4 or more, there is a reversal of the situation on the classificatory index. In this instance it is the wc who are more likely to score 4 or above than the mc, and who are more oriented to
Table 9.1

Recognition of the classificatory relation between education and production by the MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the classificatory relation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the classificatory relation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the systemic relation between education and production, although the differences are small at the older age level. This finding indicates the extent to which wc individuals accept both the general systemic message of the school concerning the usefulness and importance of qualifications for life and work chances, and the specific meritocratic message which legitimises differences in rewards in social life on the basis of individual effort and worth.
Table 9.2

Recognition of the systemic relation between education and production by the MC and WC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the systemic relation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the systemic relation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Intra-mc comparison

4.2.1 The classificatory relation

Overall there are no systematic differences for the within mc age and gender groups in those who do not mention or recognise the classificatory relation between education and production. Similar proportions (between a quarter and a third) of the groups do not mention this relation at 12+. For girls
Table 9.3

Recognition of the classificatory relation between education and production by the intra-MC groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classificatory relation</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classificatory relation</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the field of production and boys in symbolic control, this proportion increases with age. For those who do refer to this relationship, girls are more likely to make such reference than boys (in terms of scoring 4 or above), although for 15+ boys and girls in the field of production the difference is small. The difference reaches significance at the .01 level for boys and girls in the field of production at 12+. The differences between boys and girls are diminished at the older age level since boys from both fields make more reference to the classificatory relation (i.e. score 4 or more) at 15+ than at 12+. Girls from the
field of symbolic control are more likely to have higher scores on this index at 15+ than at 12+, whilst for girls from the field of production the situation is reversed. It is only in the case of 15+ year old girls that the relationship which we might have expected between our adolescents in the fields of production and symbolic control appears - those in production are less likely to mention the relation and those in symbolic control more likely to score high on this index.

For the 'ideal typical' groups within the field of symbolic control and production, only at 12+ do those in symbolic control score higher on this measure, and consequently refer to the classificatory relation to a greater extent than those in the field of production. For the other 'ideal typical' groups the pattern of responses reflects that for the total within mc group located by field. The pattern of responses then for those who have both mother and father in the same field is similar in all respects to the pattern for the total field groups. The figures for the 'ideal typical' groups are given in Appendix 6.

4.2.2 The systemic relation

As we noted in the comparison between the mc and wc groups, we can see that it is the systemic rather than the classificatory relation between education and production which has greatest effect on our groups within the mc. Fewer of all groups do not refer to the systemic relation at all; most groups make more reference to the systemic relation with age, and this is especially true of boys in the field of production.

The 'ideal typical' groups within the mc sample once again have a similar pattern of response to the overall groups located by field, as do those groups for whom both parents are in the same field location. (See figures in Appendix 6.)

The systematic differences between our groups in the mc which we expected have not emerged on these two indices, although differences have appeared between boys and girls. All of our adolescents evidently respond to both classificatory and systemic messages from the educational system, but more strongly to the systemic relation. They all regard education and knowledge in a more instrumental fashion than is implied by reference to the classificatory relation. Other information from within this study, including that arising from questions on the social division of labour, indicate that the
Table 9.4  
Recognition of the systemic relation between education and production  
by the intra-MC groups  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Field Prod</th>
<th>SC Prod</th>
<th>Prod SC</th>
<th>SC Prod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to the systemic relation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15+  
No reference to the systemic relation  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Field Prod</th>
<th>SC Prod</th>
<th>Prod SC</th>
<th>SC Prod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

meritocratic message has a great impact on most of our adolescents, and provides powerful ideological support for inequalities in the distribution of power and rewards in society.

5 When the unit is an item in this topic area

Three questions in this section were not included in the index for the topic area on the educational process. Two asked for information with which
we defined our sample, dealing with educational aspirations in terms of public examinations and the expected age of leaving school. The third asked who made the decisions about any examination which the students expected to take. We will also examine a question about gender differentiated school subjects which we included in the index of gender differentiation. Questions which are interrelated will be grouped and discussed together.

5.1 Educational aspiration

Questions

(1) Do you expect to take any public examinations while you are at school? Which subjects?

(2) At what age do you expect to leave school?

5.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

At the broadest level, the experience which our adolescents are having at school reflects their class location and the well documented relationship between social class and educational experience. When writing about formal examinations which they expected to be taking, allowing for slight variations with age, the mc students expect to take GCE 'O' levels and a considerable number refer also to 'A' level examinations, whereas the working class students expect to take CSE or a mixture of CSE and GCE at the 'O' level stage, and hardly any mention taking 'A' level examinations. It is in fact a surprisingly small proportion of wc students who mention that they expect to take 'A' level examinations, averaging only 3% at 15+. We do not think that only those who mention 'A' levels in their answers will eventually attempt this examination; although our wc group is not a representative sample, a larger proportion of working class children do in fact take 'A' levels than our groups suggest.

The vast majority of the mc students expect to leave school at age 18 or over, consistent with their 'A' level expectations (52% at 12+, 81% at 15+). Interestingly enough, however, almost a third of the wc students on average expect to stay at school until they are 18. A number of these may be planning to take vocational courses, and it is the older adolescents who both mention vocational subjects amongst the examinations which they plan to take, and who expect to stay on at school until 18 years of age.
At the younger age level, as would be expected, more children are unable to say at what age they would leave school, but this is particularly true of girls, and especially of mc girls (wc 24%, mc 36%). Could this suggest that a mc girl's educational life is more tied to her performance whereas a boy will be put through the educational system as a right?6

When we look at the subjects our adolescents are taking in examinations, we find, as indicated above, that the wc are taking more vocational subjects7 than the mc groups, especially at the older age level. We wanted to look at the arts/science division which operates so strongly for boys and girls in examinations and curricular choices.8 Our category for those taking science required that the student planned to take 2 or 3 science subjects plus maths, but only a small proportion of our groups fell into the category. Those who did, however, were mc girls and wc boys at 15+. We do find the arts/science split between girls and boys when we look at those taking science and a mixture of science and arts subjects compared with those taking largely arts subjects. See Table 9.5 for details.

5.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

Our mc group was selected from private schools and could expect to be provided by their parents with an extensive and thorough education. We would expect from our theoretical model, however, that those in the field of symbolic control might consider the educational experience more crucial than those in the field of production. There is some evidence in the responses to this series of questions to support this contention. Overall, for example, when mentioning the type of examinations they will take, those in symbolic control are more likely to mention GCE 'O' and 'A' levels, while those in production refer to CSE examinations to a greater extent. As we saw from our comparison between the mc and wc groups, however, this is within the context of most of the mc adolescents taking GCE 'O' and most probably 'A' levels. The older girls in the field of symbolic control are most certain about the latter (80% of them refer to GCE 'O' and 'A' levels). As for the numbers of examinations which are going to be taken, there is a tendency for those in production to say 'none' to a greater extent than those in symbolic control, and for those in symbolic control to be more likely to mention seven or more examinations which they plan to take. There is also a related tendency for those in the field of symbolic control to be planning to stay at school until
Table 9.5
Distribution of MC and WC groups into basic focus of examinations to be taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Science and science plus arts | 40 | 31 | 20 | 20 | 65 | 48 | 30 | 8 |
| | Arts | 12 | 28 | 14 | 22 | 17 | 39 | 14 | 31 |
| | Any vocational | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | - | 3 | 14 | 29 |
| | Mixture science, arts and vocational | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 30 | 24 |

the age of 18 or more to a greater extent than those in the field of production. There is an exception here. Surprisingly enough, the lack of certainty about the age at which they would leave school amongst the younger mc girls which we noticed in our class comparison is largely contributed by girls from the field of symbolic control, 48% of whom suggest that they do not know at what age they will leave school. Perhaps this can also be interpreted within the framework of a parental focus on education, where success in the school career is the key to continuation. If the parents in the field of symbolic control place more emphasis on education, and we accept the argument put forward in the class comparison, that girls are less likely to be supported as a right in an extended education by mc parents than boys, then the girls in symbolic control might be more vulnerable to discontinuation of education, or change in educational plans or aspirations unless a pattern of success is established.

The differences between boys and girls in the main focus of their examinations, with boys more likely to take a mixture of science and arts and
girls more likely to take arts and humanities subjects, persists here, as, of course, in the total mc group. There is a slight tendency for those in symbolic control to be more likely to take science or a mixture of arts and science than those in the field of production. For boys at each age this difference is small, since few plan to take only arts or humanities subjects. For girls at both age levels it is more marked. Could this once again be related to the importance of the focus on education for those in symbolic control? Taking science subjects in public examinations can be seen as at least keeping open the option of a series of career possibilities for these girls. They are not experiencing the early channelling of girls into subject areas which reduce or preclude certain career options.

5.2 Personal autonomy in educational decisions

Question: If you do expect to take exams, who decided that you would be taking these examinations?

5.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

This question was related to the issue of personal autonomy, to what extent did our adolescents feel that they had control over important decisions affecting their lives? This theme recurs underlying other questions, particularly in those on political issues. Our coding reflected that concern and looked at the extent to which the individual said that s/he had made the decision about the examinations alone, in conjunction with parents and/or representatives of their school, or had taken no part, perceiving the decision as not in their hands. At the younger age level one might have thought that the issue was a little less immediate than at 15+, but the response rate was high, with only wc boys, who planned to take fewer examinations in any case, giving no reply or saying that they did not know. The younger wc boys who gave no response or said that they did not know amounted to 19%; the average for the rest of our groups was 3%.

More mc adolescents than wc at both age levels and for each gender group thought that they had made the decision alone. For all groups, with
Table 9.6

Degree to which students saw themselves involved in examination decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Self involved in decision</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision made by others</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Self involved in decision</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision made by others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

increasing age the school becomes more important than the parents in influencing or making the decision.

The most dramatic difference between our class groups, however, comes when we compare the extent to which the adolescents perceive themselves to be involved in the decision, contrasted with the decision being made entirely by others. At each age level and for each gender group there is a significant difference between the mc and wc adolescents, with the mc seeing themselves as involved in the decision, and the wc seeing others as making the decision for them. These differences were significant, for 12+ boys at .01, for 12+ girls at .001, for 15+ boys at .001 and for 15+ girls at .001.

We consider that this differential response, when related to the striking similarity amongst the students when assessing the usefulness of what they are doing at school for the future, to which all give an overwhelmingly positive evaluation, is suggestive of an important ideological component distinguishing the two social class groups.
Table 9.7:
Proportion of the class groups considering that what they do at school will be useful when they leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th></th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This similarity in assessment of the value of school (despite doubts emerging at the older age level, especially for wc boys) can be interpreted as having different meanings according to different positions in relations of dominance when we take into consideration the students' statements about their own degree of control over their educational experience. The dominant mc groups see themselves as having some control over the educational process which they value, whilst the dominated wc groups, who also value the educational process, see themselves as having little control over it. It could be argued that in fact the mc groups themselves have little control over educational decisions which are taken largely by their parents, in terms of the school they will attend (especially so in the case of our privately educated mc group), and parents and school play a major role in the decisions about examinations. The mc adolescents, however, perceive themselves as having some control over these crucial decisions, in contrast to the wc group. These differing conceptions can be seen as indicative of underlying processes of socialisation into an ideology of dominance (mc) and of consent (wc). These differences can be related to the differences we find between our two class groups with respect to control over the political process (see Chapter 11). In that instance we find that mc adolescents accept the notion of representation of differing viewpoints and parliamentary democracy, indicating that they feel that they can play a part in political decisions, whereas the wc groups emphasise leadership and the national interest, and defer to the right of political parties and the government to make decisions for them.
5.2.2 Intra-nc comparison

There are no systematic differences between our adolescents located in the fields of symbolic control and production on the issue of personal control over educational decisions as this is reflected in decisions about examinations. At 12+ girls from the field of symbolic control and boys from production see themselves as involved in this decision to a greater extent than the other groups; at 15+ the groups are very similar with roughly 80% of each considering that they are involved in decisions about which examinations they will be taking.

5.3 Sex stereotyping of school subjects

**Question:** Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls? If yes, why is that; if not, why not?

5.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

This question, which is included in the index of gender classification, is relevant to the educational sphere. Table 9.8 gives the distribution of mc and wc girls and boys at each age level who agree or disagree with this proposition. A small number of respondents were ambivalent or did not reply so the totals do not equal our total sample size; percentages are of the relevant whole group.

The differences between girls and boys in endorsing or disagreeing with the view that there should be differentiation of school subjects based on gender is significant for each class and age group with the exception of 12+ wc girls and boys. The difference between mc boys and the girls at 12+ is significant at the .001 level, and 15+ at .001, and for the wc at 15+ at .001. Girls are more insistent than boys that there should not be gender segregated education, and even for the 12+ year old wc group, a larger proportion of boys than girls agree with the proposition.
### Table 9.8

Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls?

**Comparison between MC and WC groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+</th>
<th></th>
<th>15+</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we examine class differences within each gender group, we find that there are also significant differences between the class groups (in all cases except 12+ boys) with mc girls and boys more likely to deny that different school subjects are suitable for boys and girls. The differences between the wc and mc groups are significant at the following levels: for 15+ boys at .01; 15+ girls at .001; and for 12+ girls at .001.

#### 5.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

Within the mc, there is a tendency in each age and gender group (except for 12+ boys) for those from the field of symbolic control to be more likely to consider it inappropriate that there should be gender differentiated school subjects. For the 15+ boys this difference reaches significance (at the
Table 9.9

*Are some school subjects more suitable for boys and others for girls?*

**Intra-MC comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Prod M</th>
<th>Prod F</th>
<th>SC M</th>
<th>SC F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>22 20 20 15</td>
<td>38 30 42 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31 36 20 46</td>
<td>53 55 42 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 7 18 8</td>
<td>58 14 34 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 37 31 46</td>
<td>34 74 59 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No |                            | 0.02 level. This once again accords with the general trend in which those in the field of production take a more traditional or conservative view than those in the field of symbolic control.

Table 9.10 below indicates the comparative positions of our groups on some of the issues discussed in this chapter; Table 9.11 gives age movements on selected issues.
Table 9.10
Comparisons between class, field and gender groups on selected educational issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC WC Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>WC WC Prod SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classificatory relation

- **Low recognition** (score 3 or less)
  - 12+: WC WC WC P M M M M
  - 15+: WC WC WC = P M M M M

- **High recognition** (score 4 or more)
  - 12+: MC² MC¹ S F² F² F² F
  - 15+: MC MC M = S F F F F

Systemic relation

- **Low recognition**
  - 12+: MC MC P
  - 15+: S P F M

- **High recognition**
  - 12+: WC WC S M M M
  - 15+: P S F M

Science/Arts exams

- **Science, sci + arts**
  - 12+: MC MC S S M M M M M
  - 15+: MC MC S S M M M M M

- **Arts**
  - 12+: MC P P F F F F

Decisions re exams

- **Self**
  - 12+: MC³ MC⁴ M = S F F M F
  - 15+: MC³ = S P = F F F F

- **Others involved**
  - 12+: WC WC S P M = F M
  - 15+: WC WC = S P M = F M

W/F school subjects

- **Yes**
  - 12+: WC³ WC⁴ P = M³ M³ M M
  - 15+: WC³ = M³ M³ M M

- **No**
  - 12+: MC MC S² S F F F² F²
  - 15+: MC MC S² S F F F² F²

For each comparison the group shown on the table were greater than their comparison group in the category of response under consideration. The differences when significant are indicated as follows:

1 = at .05; 2 = at .02; 3 = at .01; 4 = at .001.
Table 9.11

Age movements for selected issues on education, class and field groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classificatory relation</th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 0-3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 4+</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systemic relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 0-3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 4+</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's done in school useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M/F school subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Overview

6.1 The general picture

In this chapter we have generated two indices which were designed to reveal the extent to which the adolescents recognise and refer to the classificatory relation between education and production (which postulates the relative autonomy of the educational system from production) and the systemic relation (which refers to close links between the content of education and the requirements of production). If we consider first the classificatory relation, we find that for our class comparison, between a quarter and a third of each of our groups make no reference to this relation at all. There are significant differences between the mc and the wc in the extent to which they do refer to this relation, however, with the mc doing so more than the wc. Girls are also more oriented towards this message from the educational system than boys.

We had expected that the mc might be more oriented towards the classificatory relation than the wc, since the wc children might either regard education as irrelevant, or see it in a more instrumental light. We would expect that within the mc it would be agents of symbolic control who would respond to the message of relative autonomy to a greater extent than those in production. There are two possible explanations for the girls' greater orientation towards the classificatory message about the educational system than the boys:

(1) The ideological positioning of women in the private domestic sphere rather than the public domain of production. This could lead to an emphasis on other values for education apart from the instrumental connection between qualification and career.

(2) The possibility that girls are in general more susceptible to the ideological messages in the society. We have seen, however, in many other instances that the tendency amongst the girls in this study is to be less accepting of the status quo than the boys.
The situation between the class groups is reversed when we examine the systemic relation. Although most of the adolescents do refer to the systemic relation, it is interesting to note that it is the wc who are more oriented towards it than the mc. There are two aspects to this wc response: the wc children do seem, as we suggested above, to regard the educational system in an instrumental way, and have accepted the message about the usefulness and importance of education and qualifications for future life and work chances. This view can also imply or contribute to the acceptance of the meritocratic legitimation of reward in social life as a function of individual worth and effort, which we find permeating the children's responses at many points in this study.

The groups within the mc in fact show few systematic differences, and are, as we saw in the class comparison, more oriented towards the systemic rather than the classificatory relation. Girls in the field of symbolic control show a slightly greater tendency to make references to the systemic relation than their compatriots in the field of production. But at the older age level (where for most groups the reference to this relation increases) it is boys in the field of production who provide most arguments of this type. We have seen this tendency for older boys from the field of production to relate particularly to the meritocratic argument in their modelling of the social division of labour (see Chapter 8 above).

We have found that these indices do discriminate between our class groups, with the mc more oriented towards the classificatory relation than the wc, and conversely the wc more oriented towards the systemic relation than the mc. We had expected a greater reference to both systemic and classificatory relations from the adolescents in the field of symbolic control compared with those in production for two reasons:

(1) The importance of pedagogic capital to the reproduction of agents of symbolic control;

(2) The importance of the maintenance of the educational system itself both as a reproducer of the consciousness of those in the field of symbolic control and as a locus for their own professions.

It is clear, however, that educational qualification and more generally pedagogic capital, has also become an important element in the reproduction
of those in the field of production (we found our sample of both intra-mc
groups in exactly the same schools), and this is reflected in our adolescents'
responses. Fifteen year old girls in the field of symbolic control do comply
with our initial expectations.

There is some support for a greater emphasis on education and
qualifications for those in the field of symbolic control in the individual
questions in this section. It seems from the results on these indices that the
ideological messages about the nature, function and purpose of education
which the school itself and the society at large are producing, are acquired
by all of our groups, and reproduced in response to the questions which we
asked. We could argue that the form of the questions leads most of our
adolescents in the same direction. The question on the value of education for
the adolescents themselves, for example, produces a general tendency to point
to the intrinsic value of education, the importance of knowledge for its own
sake, and personal and interpersonal development, the strongest version of the
classificatory relation. The value of what is done at school once the
individual has left directs attention largely to the systemic relation, the value
of qualifications, and the relevance of particular school subjects to future
work. Factors important to success in school are seen largely (but not
overwhelmingly) as hard work and study (effort), brains or intelligence (IQ),
and suitable relationships with parents and teachers. Effort and IQ are of
course the essence of the meritocratic ideology. On these questions there is a
slight tendency for those in the field of symbolic control to endorse this set
of factors to a greater extent than those in the field of production, and their
own take up of educational provision is higher. But there is still considerable
endorsement of this fundamental societal message on the part of all of our
groups on these and other questions which were put to them.

In answering the projective question about their own children's
education, our younger adolescents endorsed the systemic relation,
particularly those in the field of symbolic control, but mc children
increasingly recognise the classificatory relation with age. Tables showing
question by question results on the questions used in the indices appear in
Appendix 7.
The questions on education which were not included in the indices revealed some differences between the groups. The well documented relationship between education and class was borne out in the differential experience of our class groups in terms of expected length of education and types of public examinations to be taken. Middle class adolescents expected to stay on longer and take more GCE 'O' and 'A' level examinations; the wc adolescents were more likely to expect to leave school at a younger age, to take CSE examinations rather than GCE if any, and to follow vocational courses. This was, of course, not unexpected given both the literature on the relation between class and education (see for example Halsey et al., 1980) and the schools in which we chose to locate our study.

We did find some evidence for the greater endorsement of the value of education and the concomitant need for the accumulation of pedagogic capital from those in the field of symbolic control which we had expected on these questions. Those in the field of symbolic control were more likely to mention GCE 'O' or 'A' level examinations, to be planning to take more examinations, and to stay in the educational system for longer than those in the field of production.

We saw an interesting interrelationship between gender and class, with more of the younger mc girls unable to say at what age they would leave school than any other group. Surprisingly enough, when we looked within the mc we saw that this uncertainty was generated by girls from the field of symbolic control. We saw this finding as indicating a parental focus on education, but related to successful performance, and surmised that the latter is more crucial for girls than boys, since parents who value education highly are more likely to underwrite less able sons than daughters.

The examinations which our adolescents expected to take revealed the familiar division between girls and boys into arts and science subjects. There was, however, a greater tendency amongst our mc girls, especially those in the field of symbolic control, to take science subjects than might have been expected from the traditional patterning of girls' education discussed in much of the literature (see for example DES, 1975; Byrne, 1978; Deem, 1980).
Our class groups show a dramatic difference in the degree to which they consider that they are involved in decisions about their education, specifically in relation to public examinations. The mc see themselves as involved in the decision, and the wc see others as making the decision for them. Both class groups value the educational process and accept the meritocratic ideology, but the mc consider (possibly erroneously) that they have more control over their educational destiny. We have interpreted this in terms of relations of dominance, and an ideology of consent on the part of the dominated group. The dominant mc group regard themselves as having some control over the valued educational process, and the dominated wc group regard themselves as having little control. We suggested that answers on a question about the importance of political parties, where the mc endorsed parliamentary democracy and representation of differing viewpoints, and the wc pointed to leadership and the preservation of the national interest as important, indicated a similar relation of control and consent between the class groups.

A final question on the appropriateness of gender specific education in terms of particular subjects suited to each sex indicated differences between our class, within class and gender groups. More mc than wc adolescents feel that gender typed education is inappropriate, and overall there was a tendency (except for 12+ boys) for those in the field of symbolic control to take this position to a greater extent than those in the field of production. For all of our groups (with the exception of 12+ wc girls and boys, and 12+ girls and boys in the field of production), there were significant differences between girls and boys in the extent to which they considered gender segregated education appropriate, with the girls roundly rejecting the idea.

6.2 Dynamic patterns in the data

There are no dramatic age movements for any of our groups on the indices referring to both the classificatory or systemic relations between education and production. We could note that within the mc, girls in the field of production refer to the classificatory relation less, and girls from the field of symbolic control refer to it more with age, which accords with our hypothesis relating to education and the fields of the mc. Boys from the field...
of production refer to this relation to a greater extent with age, which does not accord with our hypothesis. These boys, however, also make more references to the systemic relation with age, and it seems as if we can see a greater involvement in educational processes reflected in an increase in responses to the questions posed for them in this section, as they pass through adolescence.

The most dramatic age difference to emerge sees the girls and boys in the field of production moving once more in opposite directions. Whilst all other groups within the mc move increasingly to a position rejecting education segregated by sex as they get older, boys in the field of production suggest to a much greater extent at 15+ than at 12+ that different school subjects are appropriate for the two sexes. This response illustrates the more conservative position taken by those in the field of production compared with those in symbolic control which we have found in this study in many instances, and particularly with respect to gender issues. It is also a further illustrative instance of divergence between girls and boys in this field with increasing age.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 9

1 That is to say, the difference between boys and girls in the field of production at 12+ who scored (i) 0-3, or (ii) more than 4, is significant at .01.

2 These groups are described in Chapter 4.

3 See Halsey et al (1980) for a recent example of the political arithmetic tradition in the sociology of education. This study indicates that, despite improved educational chances for all since 1944, the gap between the educational experience of wc and mc children remains fairly constant. A ray of hope was seen by the authors in that they felt that the mc might have reached saturation point in take up of educational provision, so that any new expansion of education would probably benefit the wc more. Recent educational cut backs at all levels have dashed that hope. See also Gould (1981) for a discussion of the way in which the salaried mc benefits from provision by the welfare state, where he discusses education amongst other aspects. Bowles and Gintis (1976) draw together considerable statistical information on the relationship between class and educational experience for the USA.

4 Twelve percent of school leavers (1978-79) from comprehensive schools had one or more 'A' levels. DES Statistics of Education, School Leavers CSE and GCE 1979, Vol. 2, London, HMSO, 1981: 7. The figures for other schools are Grammar 52%, Direct Grant 76%, Independent 54%.

5 Those who expect to leave school at given ages, in percentage terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>12+ mc</th>
<th>12+ wc</th>
<th>15+ mc</th>
<th>15+ wc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field:</td>
<td>Prod.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Prod.</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7 Usually stereotypically male and female, e.g. typing and business studies for girls, and technical drawing and electrical engineering for boys.

8 See DES Educational Survey 21 (1975), and for a discussion of the impact of single sex and mixed schools on stereotypical curricular choices, see Byrne (1978: 135 ff.).
Girls taking particular types of examinations, in percentage terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+ Prod.</th>
<th>12+ SC</th>
<th>15+ Prod.</th>
<th>15+ SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science or science and arts</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>41 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and humanities</td>
<td>38 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference is significant at .05 for 12+ girls.

We had expected that there might be differences amongst our middle class groups on the basis of school attended since the schools selected included those considered to have a 'traditional' pedagogic practice, and those with a more relaxed regime and less explicit hierarchical relations between teachers and pupils. The boys in the mc sample were almost equally distributed between the fields of production and symbolic control in each of the schools; there was a tendency for girls in the field of symbolic control to predominate in the less traditional girls' schools, but only a slight tendency for the girls in the more traditional school to come from the field of production (56% = production; 44% = symbolic control). Using an early measure of strength of gender classification, we examined age, sex and field differences within each school for the mc sample. Age effects outweighed school effects in strong and weak classification of gender relations, together with a movement into weak classification with age for almost all of the groups. Boys in the two fields were differentially affected in the three schools considered in this measure: there was no systematic effect arising from the position of the school on a progressive/traditional dimension neither for the boys from the field of production, nor for those in the field of symbolic control at the younger age. At 15+ the progressive school was more likely to produce boys from the field of symbolic control holding a weak classification than the other two schools. In almost all cases there was a field effect in the expected direction (boys in the field of symbolic control more likely to have weak gender classification than those in production) for each school. For the girls the more traditional school had a tendency to produce more children holding strong classification at the younger age level, but this was not so at the older age. In all instances there were field differences in the expected direction within the schools.
CHAPTER 10

THE WORKING CLASS RE-EXAMINED

1 Introduction

The working class have been examined in this thesis so far as a broad group, divided only by gender. The occupational subcategories of the field of production, into which most of our wc respondents fell, yielded little which signified dramatic difference in ideological positioning within the wc group. Ethnic divisions, which might well produce differences, were not a focus of this study, and the sample was collected in a way designed to omit this variable. There was, however, a difference within the wc which we felt might influence ideological positioning: the degree to which the children held educational aspirations. We have noted that in general a meritocratic ideology held strong sway over the views of our wc adolescents. But what of those who were in a position to act on these beliefs, children who had high educational aspirations?

In this study we have developed a number of indices to examine the adolescents' modelling of certain aspects of the social and sexual division of labour, and of educational processes and we decided to examine the wc children with high educational aspirations using the same indices. We used two criteria to indicate high educational aspirations amongst the wc group:

(i) the intention to take six or more examinations (GCE or GCE and CSE)
(ii) the intention to leave school at 17 years of age or older.

We considered only the 15+ year olds in the sample since the examination and school leaving plans of the younger children were tentative. The 15+ year olds had a much clearer idea of their educational futures.

Our rather stringent criteria yielded from our total 15+ wc sample of 217 adolescents, 25 males and 43 females, who represented 23% and 41% of their groups respectively. The analysis in this chapter, as with all those involving the indices used in this study, is based on the sample of adolescents for whom we had a precise field location for the father. For the sample of wc high educational aspirers within this group we find the set of characteristics
given in Table 10.1. The numbers of high aspirers is reduced, since for some wc children in the total sample, we did not have the father's precise field location.

Most of the wc children with high educational aspirations conform to the strongest criteria, they plan to leave school at age 18 or older and to take seven or more examinations at age 16. It is also interesting to note in this description of children with high educational aspirations in the wc, some factors which militate against the commonly held view that girls' educational performance falls off in the secondary school. In the sample of wc 15+ year olds in this study, girls are more likely than boys to expect to stay on at school beyond the compulsory leaving age and to be taking a number of examinations.

If we look more closely at the actual number of examinations to be taken by these high aspirers we see that boys are more likely to be taking seven examinations (56% of them) and girls, eight or more (51% of them). If we make the assumption that entry for public examinations reflects the schools' expectation of at least a chance of success, we can say that in this wc sample the girls might be considered to be exhibiting a higher level of educational performance than the boys. Our inspection of the actual examinations to be taken by this group of high aspirers, however, indicates that gender divisions in educational channelling are possibly occurring to an even greater extent amongst this group than amongst the rest of the wc group. Table 10.2 below gives the combination of examinations to be taken by these two groups.

When we examined a sub group of wc boys with high occupational aspirations (see Chapter 11), we noted that a factor which distinguished this group from the rest of the wc was the fact that a higher proportion of their mothers were engaged in white collar work. This is also true of both female and male high educational aspirers when compared with the rest of the wc groups. These high educational aspirers are twice as likely to have a mother engaged in white collar work than the remainder of the wc: 27% of the high aspirers compared with 13% of the rest of the wc group.
Table 10.1:
Comparative characteristics of high educational aspirers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High educational aspirations</th>
<th>Total WC sample</th>
<th>High aspirers as % of WC</th>
<th>% of high aspirers with white collar mothers</th>
<th>% WC with white collar mothers</th>
<th>% of high aspirers leaving school 18+</th>
<th>% of high aspirers taking 7+ exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.2

Gender differences in examinations to be taken for working class high educational aspirers compared with the rest of the working class group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>High aspiring WC</th>
<th>Rest of the WC group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science or Science and Arts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any vocational</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of Science, Arts, Vocational</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions with which we are concerned are: in what other ways does this group of wc high educational aspirers differ from the 15+ year old wc group as a whole, and how does this group compare with our mc adolescents?

2 Comparison of the wc children who have high educational aspirations with other wc and mc groups

We made comparisons between the group of wc children who had high educational aspirations as defined above and the following groups:

(i) the remainder of the 15+ wc group

(ii) the 15+ mc group as a whole
(iii) the 15+ intra-mc groups in the field of production and symbolic control.

The comparisons have been made on the basis of the indices developed to assess the adolescents' modelling of

(i) the educational process
(ii) the social division of labour
(iii) gender relations.

Each of these indices will be discussed in turn.

2.1 The adolescents' modelling of educational processes

2.1.1 The classificatory relation between education and production

Table 10.3 below gives the comparison between wc children with high educational aspirations and the other groups which we have distinguished, with respect to the classificatory relation between education and production. This relation refers to the intrinsic value of education and knowledge, and the relative autonomy of education from production. The differences between the wc high aspirers and the other groups are small, but some points can be drawn out.

The boys remain similar to their wc age peers in terms of reference to the classificatory relation between education and production. If we divide the group into those who score 3 or less on the index, including making no reference to the relation at all, and those who score 4 or more, the difference between the male wc high aspirers and the mc group is significant at the .01 level. The wc boys still refer to this relation less than the mc boys.

Girls who have high educational aspirations, however, become less like their wc age peers and more like the mc girls, who have a greater tendency to mention this relation than wc girls and boys. These high aspiring wc girls now differ significantly (at the .02 level) from the rest of the wc girls in terms of making greater reference to the classificatory relation. That is these
Table 10.3

Comparison between WC high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of the classificatory relation between education and production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WC high educational aspirers</th>
<th>WC group minus high aspirers</th>
<th>Total MC group</th>
<th>Intra-MC groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...girls are a lot more likely to refer to the intrinsic value of education, and its relative autonomy from production.

2.1.2 The systemic relation between education and production

From Table 10.4 we can see that, for the wc boys with high aspirations, the systemic relation, which refers to the links between education and production, has become a less dominant response than it is for any of the other groups, and in this they have become more similar to the boys in the field of symbolic control.

Working class girls remain similar in their endorsement of the importance of the systemic relation between education and production to all
Table 10.4

Comparison between WC high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of the systemic relation between education and production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WC high educational aspirers</th>
<th>WC group minus high aspirers</th>
<th>Total MC group Prod</th>
<th>Intra-MC groups SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the other groups. Middle class girls from the field of production are less likely to refer frequently to this relation than the other groups in contrast to the response of the boys on this index.

In general we can say that the wc boys who have high educational aspirations remain similar to the total wc group of boys with respect to the classificatory relation, but become more similar to the boys from the field of symbolic control with respect to the systemic relation. In the case of the wc girls with high educational aspirations, there is similarity with the girls in the field of symbolic control for both the classificatory and the systemic relation. In each instance, and for the girls from the field of symbolic control this coincides with our expectation of responses in connection with educational processes, the girls are more likely to mention the relation and to do so more frequently than the other groups we examined. The girls from the field of symbolic control, and girls from the wc with high educational aspirations,
Table 10.5
Comparison between WC high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of classification of the social division of labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WC high educational aspirers</th>
<th>WC group minus high aspirers</th>
<th>Total MC group</th>
<th>Intra-MC groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recognise and refer to both the classificatory and the systemic relations between education and production to a greater extent than do any other of our groups of either sex. It is of interest to note that the relevant reference group in terms of these indices for WC girls with high educational aspirations is the MC group drawn from the field of symbolic control.

2.2 The adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour

Table 10.5 indicates the responses of our groups on the index of classification of the social division of labour. We can see that high educational aspirations lead to a much stronger classification of the categories of the social division of labour for the WC boys. Strong classification indicates a greater acceptance and legitimation of the hierarchical ordering of the social division of labour; weak classification indicates either an oppositional model, i.e. disagreement with or rejection of the principles of hierarchical ordering, or more frequently amongst these
children, a compensatory model, where greater reward is accorded to work which is hard, unpleasant or involves risk. Strong classification of the social division of labour is more characteristic of the adolescents from the field of production than those in symbolic control, and in this the wc boys become similar to those in the field of production. The meritocratic ideology is being absorbed and acted upon by these wc children, and they are clearly oriented towards upward mobility in the context of an acceptance of existing social relations.

There is a difference in the case of the wc girls. The wc girls with high educational aspirations remain weak in their classification of the social division of labour and its social relations. Working class girls in general are more likely to hold a weak classification of the social division of labour than any other of our groups. The mc girls are more likely to hold a strong classification of the social division of labour than any other groups (with the exception of the wc boys with high educational aspirations). Within the mc, for girls as for boys, it is those in the field of production who are more likely to take this position. There is a difference between the mc and wc girls in the sample in their own relation to and expected positioning in the social division of labour. The mc girls hold strong expectations of relatively high level work, and may even argue explicitly that their sex will make little difference to their career choice. The wc girls are much more likely to choose work which could be characterised as traditional female stereotyped work. It would seem from this that considerations of class and the effects of class location are more salient for the mc girls in this respect than gender, whilst for the wc girls there is an intersection between class and patriarchy.

We can also see that, in relation to the wc boys, the girls' gender influences the degree to which they aspire to positions high in the occupational hierarchy, and the degree to which they hold strong classification of that hierarchy. We could argue that gender, and the patriarchal hierarchy, leads to a strong distinction between the positioning which wc boys and girls take for themselves with respect to the social division of labour.
2.3 The adolescents' modelling of gender relations

Table 10.6 gives the responses of our groups on the index of classification of gender relations. In contrast with the results for our high aspiring group of wc adolescents on the index of classification of the social division of labour, where the movement is into strong classification, the movement with respect to gender relations is into weak classification. In terms of proportions of the groups holding weak classification of gender relations, this type of response makes both girls and boys become similar to the adolescents from the field of symbolic control.

There is still considerable difference between the high aspiring wc girls and boys, as there was between the total group of wc girls and boys, in the strength and weakness of their gender classification. A test for significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups indicated that the difference was highly significant. The mean scores for the two groups were: wc girls .814, and wc boys 5.56. We see then that, whilst high educational aspirations lead to a strengthening of the classification of the social division of labour, marginal for girls it is true, but considerable for boys, such aspirations lead to a weakening of the classification of gender relations. Very large differences, however, still remain between wc girls and boys with high educational aspirations on the classification of gender relations.

3 Overview

If we consider first the children's responses on the indices relating to education, what we have found with respect to the classificatory relation between education and production is that the wc boys with high educational aspirations remain similar to the rest of the wc boys; but that the wc girls become significantly different from the rest of the wc girls, and similar to the mc girls. The high aspiring wc boys refer little or not at all to this relation, whereas 50% of the wc girls refer to it relatively frequently.

We had found in our middle class sample that mc boys in the field of production were more oriented towards the systemic relation between
Table 10.6
Comparison between WC high educational aspirers and other groups on the index of classification of gender relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WC high educational aspirers</th>
<th>WC group minus high aspirers</th>
<th>Total MC group</th>
<th>Intra-MC groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We had expected that children in the field of symbolic control would be more oriented towards this relation, and this is the case for girls. Both boys and girls with high educational aspirations become more like the children in the field of symbolic control on the index for the systemic relation, but, as we have seen, the result is different for boys and girls.

The explanation for the stronger orientation towards both the classificatory and systemic relations which we have found for the girls in the wc who have high educational aspirations, and which leads them to become similar to the girls within the mc in the field of symbolic control, is as follows. These wc children are more likely to have white collar mothers who are likely themselves to be more oriented towards education and concomitant social mobility. Our analysis of Gordon Wells' data (in Chapter 6) suggested that a white collar mother in the wc was more likely to use forms of personal control rather than positional control in her family interactional practices,
and in this respect to be more like the mc mothers, and we could infer that
the white collar mothers of wc children in our sample might have similar
patterns of primary socialisation. In this these mothers are more like those in
the field of symbolic control (some of them indeed will be in the field of
symbolic control) and would influence their children in that direction. As we
have seen, this argument can be used for the girls in respect of these
educational indices, but not for the boys. We should point out, however, that
we have found considerable indication in other parts of the questionnaire
relating to education, that children in the field of symbolic control are indeed
strongly oriented towards education and its messages.

We should also be clear that all groups in the study mention the
systemic relation to a greater extent than they refer to the classificatory
relation, and, as we have seen throughout the study, the children have
strongly acquired the meritocratic ideology. What our discussion here has been
cconcerned with are differences within our subgroups in the degree to which
they explicitly endorse this ideology on the questions related directly to
education.

In most of the areas we have examined in this chapter, the wc children
with high educational aspirations become more like the mc children than they
are like the rest of the wc group. There are variations within this pattern,
and the particular fraction of the mc to which they become more akin varies
for the different indices. For the educational indices, the movement is
towards those in the field of symbolic control, for whom, as we have argued
in this study, education is an important channel and source of reproduction of
class location. For the index of modelling of the social division of labour,
where the movement is into strong classification, and a greater acceptance
and legitimation of the hierarchical ordering of the social division of labour,
the similarity is with those in the field of production. A variation between wc
and mc girls, and wc girls and boys, is noted on this index in that gender and
patriarchal hierarchy seems to influence those in the wc to a greater extent
than those in the mc, at least in terms of the children's modelling of the
social division of labour and positioning of themselves within it, creating a
divergence between the girls and boys. For gender, where the mc, and in
particular those in the field of symbolic control, hold weaker classification of
gender relations, the high aspiring wc children become more like those in the
field of symbolic control. More of these high aspiring wc children hold weak classification of gender relations than is the case for the rest of the wc group.

The ideological positioning of these wc children is accomplished through their experience of the educational system coloured by their acceptance of the meritocratic ideology, and their primary socialisation experiences in the family, which is influenced in many cases as we have noted by a mother in white collar work. They are oriented towards the mc and appear to desire upward mobility. This upward mobility and positioning in the class structure is different for girls and boys in the wc due to the strong influence of patriarchal hierarchy on these groups. The children become stronger in their legitimation of class relations as reflected in the social division of labour, although this is less strong for the girls due to the influence of patriarchy. They accept the power relations behind the classification of the social division of labour, and their responses demonstrate the hegemonic success of the meritocratic ideology. These children also begin to abandon the strong classification of gender relations which characterises the wc groups, for the weaker classification more typical of the mc, particularly those in the field of symbolic control.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

1 These two percentages give the proportion of mothers in white collar work for the high aspiring and for the rest of the 15+ wc sample used here. Some children, however, in both high aspiring and in the rest of the wc sample, did not give any occupation for their mother. The percentage of white collar mothers for each group for those who did give their mother's occupation are: high aspirers, male 33%, female 29%; rest of the wc group, male 17%, female 15%.

2 The notion that girls' performance deteriorates from the high standard which they achieve at the end of primary education compared with boys has been used in the past to justify discrimination against girls' allocation to places in selective secondary education. Since girls' performance at 11+ on examinations or tests used for allocation to grammar schools, or to ability bands, was consistently better than boys, the norms used in such allocation downgraded the girls' scores, so that top ability bands and grammar schools would not have 'over-representation' of girls. See Yates and Pidgeon (1957), NFER (1964, 1969, 1972). The ILEA, amongst other local education authorities, has recognised the discriminatory nature of this practice (see ILEA, 1982), but it still continues. The Gainsborough News (10 June 1983) reported a case where Lincolnshire County Council had awarded grammar school places to boys whose marks on the selection examination were equal to or lower than those of girls who did not get grammar school places. The EOC and the parents of one girl planned to take court action against Lincolnshire County Council, and the process generated a file six inches thick in the EOC Legal Department. The case, however, did not reach the courts, being withdrawn in November 1984.

3 When we consider age at leaving school in the total wc sample of 15+ year olds, we find that 42% of boys and 60% of girls expect to leave school at 17 or above. In general in this wc group girls expect to stay on longer at school than boys.

4 The difference between the numbers of girls and boys who are high educational aspirers in this sample on our criteria is significant at the .05 level.


6 For the girls the difference between high aspirers and the rest of the wc group in their distribution into the categories of weak and strong classification is significant at the .05 level.
CHAPTER 11

FURTHER ASPECTS OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL MODELLING

1 Introduction

The presentation format in this chapter differs from that of the three previous chapters. We decided that for both conceptual and empirical reasons it was impossible to create an index to encapsulate the responses of each individual on this section of the questionnaire in a way similar to that of the three other topic areas. Two sets of questions are dealt with here, one relating to property and the other to notions of order and change. At a very general level of conceptualisation, all of these questions are related to issues of power, order and change, but at the level of the individual question they are diverse, and could not be united conceptually. We were therefore unable to use the concept of classification as a means of distinguishing between types of response. In addition, at the empirical level, the response rates varied considerably over these questions, since some questions appeared at the end of the questionnaire, where the non-response rate, especially for the wc, had begun to rise. In the series of questions on order and change, the wc groups have higher non-response rates than the mc groups, and the gap becomes particularly wide for wc girls. For these reasons we considered it inappropriate to group the questions in the way that we have for the other question areas, and accordingly we present the results in this chapter in a question by question form. We will examine the responses of the groups based on class, intra-mc location, gender and age, as described by the original set of coding categories developed for the questions in this area. We will discuss the results for each question under two basic headings:

(1) A class comparison between the mc and the wc,

(2) An intra-mc comparison between our two groups, one from the field of production and the other from the field of symbolic control.

Gender and age differences or, where interesting, similarities, will be included in the discussion under these headings. The questions are considered individually, apart from a pair related to change and how to effect it, which are interrelated and presented together. As in each section where the unit of analysis is a question, three types of result are given: firstly differences
between our groups which are significant, together with the level of significance; secondly, differences which do not reach significance but which can be related to a general trend in the material on the basis of the overall responses of particular groups; and thirdly selected quotations. These quotations are not a representative selection from amongst the many comments produced by this sample of adolescents, but are used either to illustrate particular positions taken, or to demonstrate what we consider to be interesting or unusual comments. The sequence for the presentation and discussion of these results will be:

2. Property
3. Order and change
4. Overview

The following section will deal with four questions which directly addressed the issue of property.

2. Property

This sequence of questions asked what the individual owned her/himself, what s/he would like to own, and invited suggestions for common ownership.

2.1 Personal ownership

Question: Do you own anything yourself? If yes, give some examples.

2.1.1 General comments and comparison between mc and wc groups

Most of our adolescents admitted to owning something, although a surprising 28% of the younger wc girls claimed that they owned nothing. Many provided extensive lists of their property, and more mc than wc adolescents at both age levels provided lists of over four items. Some made very careful distinctions between their own and household or parental possessions, whilst others listed household items, including in one instance a light bulb, amongst their property. Some limited themselves to their physical or mental self in
defining what was their own. Some examples of these types of responses are: "I do not, all I have I say my parents gave me. Apart from clothes, I do own my own diary" (15+ wc girl); "I do not believe that you can, at our age, own things jointly with ones parents. Although we call it 'our' house, it is really theirs" (15+ mc girl); "I own things like clothes but they were all given to me for presents. I feel the only way I actually own something is when I save up and buy it for myself - for example, books" (15+ mc girD); "My body and my intelligence" (15+ wc boy); "Everything is shared in our family" (15+ mc boy); "No, I come from a working class family" (15+ wc boy).

Of those who mentioned money, savings or actual property, most were in the middle class - for example "I own half a maisonette in Mill Hill. My brother owns the other half" (12+ mc girJ); "I own a building society and a National Savings account where I can put in or take out as much money as I want" (12+ mc girl); "Money in the building society which I have got from my grandparents, which I will use when I leave school" (12+ mc girl).

The vast bulk of the property referred to by our respondents, however, falls into stereotypically male or female divisions. Many more boys than girls refer to means of transport (anything from a bicycle to a boat) and to items associated with sports and hobbies. The latter category did not include items associated with pop culture for which we had a separate category and for which a slightly more complicated pattern emerged. In the case of items connected with sports and hobbies, there was also a class difference within the gender groups, with more mc than wc individuals possessing such items. All girls mentioned clothing and jewellery to a greater extent than boys. These differences between girls and boys in the distribution of items owned were significant at the .001 level for each age and class group.³

Although this is cross sectional data, we can note age differences, which suggest that boys at 15+ are less interested in sport and hobbies than at 12+, and are more interested in items connected with pop culture. The girls, except for wc girls at 12+, who in any case, as we have noted, lay claim to fewer possessions, maintain a steady interest in pop culture as indexed by their ownership of its items. Included in this category were records, cassettes and the equipment for playing them.
### Table 11.1

Class, gender and age groups owning particular types of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and hobbies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop/electronic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery/adornment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.2 Intra-mc comparison

Here we find the same overall male and female differences operating as for the class groups above. If we look at the male mc involvement in the popular culture as measured by ownership of relevant items, we find that more boys in the field of symbolic control own these items at both age levels than boys in the field of production. Boys in symbolic control also have more possessions connected with sports and hobbies than those in production. Within the girls' general predilection for clothing, it is girls in the field of symbolic control who mention these items to a greater extent than girls in the field of production, at each age level. A further interesting general point emerging from this question relates to a difference between boys and girls. For most of the questions on the questionnaire girls have a tendency to give more
responses than boys, on this question in the mc group, boys give more responses than girls. Is it the case that these boys have more possessions, or that they are happier writing about possessions than girls or even find it easier to write about possessions than on any other topic upon which they were asked to comment?5

2.2 Desire for ownership

Question: Is there anything you would like to own?

2.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The basic distinctions which we make on this question were between (1) reality or fantasy in the adolescents' choices, and (2) whether or not the items suggested could be considered current wishes or desired at some stage in the future. A large proportion of all of our groups gave items which could be considered realistic expectations or hopes. (Table 11.3 on p. 383 gives relevant percentage figures.) This was especially true of the wc groups and particularly so of wc girls at 15+, 75% of whom had realistic choices. Most groups also became more realistic in their aspiration for material possessions with age. When we look at the distinction between current and future desires we find that at 12+ the mc groups are more likely to mention items which are within their present prospects to acquire, but the wc groups mention items for which it is reasonable for them to aspire at some stage in the future. At 15+ this reversal does not hold, but the wc are still more likely than the mc to mention future desires. The types of items included in the category of realistic current desires for property were the same as those given on the table above for the students' actual possessions, and included means of transport, items which are associated with sport and hobbies, records and cassettes and the means of playing them, clothing, jewellery and other adornment. Future expectations included a house, a car, or business property. We have seen from the first question in this set that the mc groups do appear to own, or at least admit to owning more in general than the wc groups. Their listing of items they would like to own relatively soon may reflect reality in terms of the likelihood of the realisation of these desires. It seems that our mc groups are richer than our wc groups! Chief amongst the items for future
Table 11.2

Within class, gender and age groups owning particular types of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop/electronic</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery/adornment</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consumption were a car and a house, and girls rather than boys expressed the desire to own a house. The degree to which this is a realistic future desire might differ for girls from different social backgrounds in that, once again, as with other desirable items, the mc girl might be more likely actually to acquire it. But the desire itself could reflect for all of these girls an orientation towards the home and family (most of the girls, as we have noted on other questions, wished to get married and expect to have children).

The major difference between boys and girls emerged in terms of fantasy. More boys than girls of all groups made only fantasy suggestions or included such an item in their desires. Whilst some of these fantasy items might well be judged in their own terms as relatively run of the mill fantasy desires - "a mansion with a swimming pool", "a palace", "a win on the football pools", a whole range of exotic automobiles, a yacht, a private aeroplane, a Harley Davidson, even Britt Ekland, Racquel Welch or Marilyn Monroe (alive) - others exhibited somewhat more imaginative flair. Some boys wanted football teams or clubs, Leeds FC, West Ham - a girl was interested in Liverpool FC; another in "a field with a barn which could be converted into a theatre"; a costume museum, a cinema, the Empire State Building, a private army, a radio station, Concorde, a film company, a record company, an athletics track, twenty acres of Scottish coastline, a spaceship, a research centre, the world - all found their way onto these extravagant lists.

Some responses did not focus on material possessions; happiness, freedom, a happy family were mentioned. There were also attempts to grapple with personal identity and development revealed by the desire to own the self in some way, for example "I would like to own myself, to be free to think what I wished, not to be bound in with convention. I love my parents and they love me but they don't understand" (12+ mc girl).

2.2.2 Intra-mc comparison

The main finding here is that those in the field of production mention fantasy elements and particular extravagant items to a greater extent than those in the field of symbolic control for each age and gender group. Once again, as with the overall class comparison, girls are more concerned than boys to own a house, but there are no other systematic variations across the
intra-class, gender and age groups. Table 11.4 on p. 384 gives figures for the intra-mc comparison; Table 11.5 gives age movements for both class and intra-mc groups for the questions on property.

2.3 What belongs to all?

Question: Are there things which are considered to belong to everybody? If so, what are they?

2.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

This question was included in order to provide a focus for the following question about what ought to belong to everyone, and basically public amenities were what came to the adolescents' minds in response. The largest proportion of each of the groups, but particularly those in the mc, gave public amenities, including buildings and other facilities, and parks and open spaces. The wc groups found it harder to give an answer and said that they did not know what was considered to belong to all to a greater extent. The option of an outright 'no', however, was not taken by many.

Some of our adolescents refer to government ownership with approval, as signalling assets which are shared by all - for example "the countries assets because we are a democratic state (although some would have us communist) so the community owns what is said to belong to the country" (15+ mc girl); "Anything owned by the state is owned by us all!" (15+ mc girl); and some with disapproval "no, everything belongs to the government" (15+ mc girl). Most respondents take the question at a general level, although a few continue to write about their own homes, since they have been listing their personal possessions and desires immediately prior to this question. For examples of such responses we have "The car and the furniture is considered everyone's" (12+ wc boy); "The television, the cat, the furniture, the record player" (12+ wc girl); "In our house things like the stove, the fridge and the TV belong to everyone" (15+ mc girl).

A number of our adolescents offer either some or all embracing notion such as 'the world', 'everything', 'nature', or abstract 'goods', such as
happiness, freedom, or life itself. This occurs slightly more frequently amongst the older groups and the middle class. One rather dramatic list of things owned by all - "Earth, water, fire, air, and human rights" from a 12+ wc boy is followed by doubt and more worldly concerns when what everyone should own is considered "Dunno! Money?". Another 15+ wc girl is clear about what should belong to all, offering it on both questions, but is obviously doubtful about whether these desirable elements of life do in fact belong to all: "Freedom is meant to belong to everybody and the right to work" - "The right to work, freedom". An idealistic 12+ wc boy suggests that everybody owns "there rights" and ought to own "To be important to the earth".

2.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

For the whole mc group, as we saw above, the largest category of response is public amenities, with those from the field of symbolic control proposing these to a greater extent than those from the field of production. Girls from the field of symbolic control are also more likely than all other groups to offer some general, all embracing notion of the type outlined above; older girls from the field of production had more difficulty than any other group in answering this question.

The comments above are based on the adolescents’ first response, but some of our adolescents generated lists combining these major elements - for example "Nationalised industries, government, freedom" (15+ mc boy); "Equal rights, parks" (15+ wc boy); "freedom, London Transport, shops" (15+ wc girl). The "working class" and "artists" appeared as possessions of us all, and for an elaborate general statement: "Everyone has themselves. They also have all the earth and skies to see and to try to understand. They have their feelings and ideas" (15+ mc girl); or more succinctly and personally oriented: "Individuality, personality, conscience, mind" (15+ mc girl).
2.4 Common ownership

Question: Are there things which ought to belong to everybody but do not? If so, what are they?

2.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

One of the most interesting findings on this section of the questionnaire occurred on this question and is in a sense a non finding. It is the degree to which our adolescents found it impossible to answer this question. For the mc/wc comparison the average non-response rate was 33% for our groups, with a range from 18% to 57%. The non-response rate on the following question on the questionnaire, however, averaged only 4% for our groups. We speculate that the idea of private property is so deeply embedded in the society that the notion of something owned by everyone, or things which all should be expected to have, is a difficult one for these adolescents to encompass. This interpretation is strengthened by the degree to which the adolescents are able to give an emphatic or a reasoned "No - there is nothing that should be owned by everyone". We find that the boys are more emphatic than the girls, saying no to a greater extent, and that this is particularly true of the mc, dramatically at 15+. Working class girls, again dramatically at 15+, find the question impossible to answer. See Table 11.3 for the relevant figures.

2.4.2 Intra-mc comparison

Within the mc again boys are more assertive than girls, but also those from the field of symbolic control are slightly more assertive than those from the field of production. Girls from the field of production at 15+, however, share the same difficulties we saw for wc girls and are unable to respond - 45% of them do not respond, and this figure reaches 61% when we add in direct 'no's.

2.4.3 Examples of responses

Those who do respond are fairly evenly spread over our categories of (1) the basics of life - food, clothing, shelter, work; (2) general all embracing
ideas; (3) abstract 'goods'; and (4) public amenities, agencies and services, with no very strong biases within any groups. Some examples will give the flavour of their ideas. Some 'no's from the older mc girls - "No - people are brought up to be naturally possessive", and "No, people wouldn't know how to cope if more things were free", and a defence of private property from a 15+ year old girl from the field of symbolic control "No, people have a right to own things that are rightfully theirs such as their family houses and works of art". A few radical suggestions for common ownership - "businesses should be owned by the government not to private people" (12+ mc girl); "All schools, all factories" (12+ mc girl); "private grounds, private campsites, private schools" (12+ wc boy); "North Sea oil" (15+ mc girl); "Tampax" (15+ mc girl); "All industries, bourgeois land" (15+ mc boy); "Information and the wealth of the country" (15+ mc boy); "Yes, oil (free) food (free). No one owns nature" (15+ wc boy).

3 Order and change

The sequence of questions on order and change was constructed so that, despite the open ended and projective nature of the questions, the adolescents would be led to talk about broad societal issues rather than personal concerns. The first question was entirely open, but as we shall see the response reflected a clear social distinction.

3.1 Who rules the individual?

Question: What stops you from doing exactly what you want to do?

3.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

In the comparison between our broad social class groups, the largest proportion of adolescents in each of our groups, age, gender and class, referred in two basic ways to what they took to be the constraints on their freedom of action:

(1) adults, particularly parents; and

(2) the State, specifically the police or the law.
Table 11.3

Selected responses on the property questions for the class comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic only</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy only</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What belongs to all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public amenities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should belong to all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No + no response</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.4

Selected responses on the property questions for the comparison within the middle class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic only</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy only</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What belongs to all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public amenities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should belong to all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No + no response</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.5

Age movements for the class and field groups on property issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to own</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic only</td>
<td>+8 +5 -2 +16</td>
<td>+2 -3 +12 +10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A house</td>
<td>+6 +13 +10 +21</td>
<td>+5 +3 +3 +16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractions belong to all</td>
<td>+15 +5 -11 -3</td>
<td>+14 +5 +13 +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing should belong to all plus no response</td>
<td>+2 +15 -1 +15</td>
<td>+8 +29 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are, however, interesting differences within this overall response. Looking at only these two types of response, we find that at both age levels the mc girls and boys are more likely to mention the state, law and police, whereas the wc mention adults, particularly parents. This difference is significant for girls at both age levels (for 12+ year olds at .05; for 15+ year olds at .02) and for boys at 12+ (at .05). Can we say that the mc adolescents recognise external authority, and the legitimacy of the state to a greater extent than the wc group, whilst those in the wc are more oriented towards the home and the authority of the parents?

In addition to this variation in response between the class groups, there is a gender difference in the endorsement of these two versions of authority. More boys mention the police and the law, and more girls mention parents. This gender difference exists for all of our groups, is larger in the wc, and grows with age. In some instances the difference reaches significance (for 12+ wc girls and boys at .05, 15+ mc at .05, and 15+ wc at .01).

We see this difference between the girls and boys in our sample in emphasising either (1) adults, and in particular parents, or (2) the State, and in particular the law and the police, as the source of restriction of the freedom of action of the individual, as reflecting a division between the private and the public sphere in the control and management of adolescents. Nava (1981) discusses this division in terms of control over girls and boys in the context of the Youth Service. The argument is that since wc boys are seen as a street problem the aim of youth provision is to provide them with activities which will keep them off the streets. As girls are not considered to be so problematic in this respect since the major sources of control for them lie in the home youth provision is largely directed towards boys, and girls are marginalised. McRobbie (1978: 96-108) suggests that there are material constraints which operate on wc girls to keep them close to home, for example their mothers might pay them to perform domestic labour. McRobbie found that mc girls enjoy a greater freedom of contacts than wc girls outside the home. Our finding certainly supports the existence of this differential control over girls and boys and in their own perception of constraint, and, as we have noted, this differentiation increases with age, and is stronger in the wc group. We will return to these points later. Table 11.6 on p. 393 gives figures for the class comparison for selected responses on the series of
questions on order and change. Table 11.8 on p. 395 indicates age movements on these issues for class and intra-mc groups.

3.1.2 **Intra-mc comparison**

Since the differentiation between forms of control perceived by males and females is weaker for the mc than for the wc in our class comparison, when we look within the mc to our field groups, although we still find this difference between girls' and boys' recognition of sources of control, the difference does not reach significance. Table 11.7 on p. 394 gives figures for the intra-mc comparison for selected responses on the series of questions on order and change.

3.2 **Who rules the country?**

**Question**: Who do you think runs the country?

3.2.1 **Comparison between mc and wc groups**

Once again our adolescents are broadly in agreement on this issue in that the largest proportion of each age, gender, and class group mention that the government or parliament runs the country; the proportions range from 40% of 12+ wc girls, to 61% of both wc and mc girls at the older age level. The older girls offer this response (government or parliament) to a greater extent than the boys. A small minority of wc girls and boys at the lower age level suggest that the queen runs the country.

A class difference emerges however in connection with the role of the trade unions. The wc groups at the lower age level do not mention these organisations as having a role in or indeed running the country, and very few of them suggest it at 15+. It is the mc groups who to some extent do make this proposal, especially so with increasing age, and particularly in the case of the boys. If we count two responses from each individual, 32% of 15+ mc boys and 23% of 15+ mc girls mention trade unions running the country. The comparable figures for the wc are boys 5% and girls 4%. In the context in which these comments are made on this question we have interpreted the
responses as indicating an unfavourable attitude towards trade unions. Indeed this is often made quite explicit. This unfavourable attitude towards trade unions in general, and to what is seen as their power, is also reflected in other questions, and occurs in the responses of the mc boys to a greater extent than for any other group. One older wc girl proposes quite the opposite viewpoint on the question "Who runs the country?": "The capitalists and parliament, government - but the workers keep it going".

3.2.2 Intra-mc comparisons

For this comparison we found, as with our class comparison, that the response given by most of the adolescents in our sample is that the government or parliament runs the country, with the girls, especially at the older age level, mentioning this more than the boys. The differences between our groups from the field of symbolic control and production were small on this question, but we could note a contrast in the content of the second largest category of response for the 12+ year olds: those in symbolic control refer to "the people", and those in production "the prime minister", which might indicate for this latter group an emphasis on leadership. At the older age level there were more unfavourable comments made about whoever it was that the adolescent saw as in charge, particularly from those in the field of symbolic control and from boys; 23% of the 15+ boys from this field made specific unfavourable comments.

3.3 Political parties

Question: What is the importance of political parties?

3.3.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

At 12+ the mc group, both male and female, are divided between two types of responses:

(1) that political parties are important for providing representation of different viewpoints or interests, and provide choice and the possibility for change; and
(2) that these organisations preserve the interests of the country and provide leadership.

A minority suggest that political parties perform no useful function, or make some other negative comment (19% of the boys and 16% of the girls). The wc groups have the highest non-response rate and their largest category of response is a reference to leadership and to the preservation of the interests of the country. At the older age level this class difference has become more clearly defined. The main category of responses in the mc is "representation and choice". Twenty percent more mc adolescents (chiefly girls) make this response at 15+ than did at 12+. For the wc adolescents the main category of response is the preservation of national interests (both internally and externally) and leadership. If we compare for those who answer this question the numbers for each social class and gender group falling into these two categories of response, we find significant differences between them at the .001 level. The mc at 15+ then emphasise parliamentary democracy as an important reason for the existence of political parties, the wc emphasise leadership and the national interest. For the majority of the sample who do respond, we can see that the mc adolescents are endorsing a democratic ideology which implies a possible involvement in decisions affecting their lives, albeit at a distance, and provides legitimation based on fair representation of the views of the ruled. The wc, however, do not distinguish between different interests which would require representation, but are concerned with leadership and the preservation of the national interest. The legitimacy of political parties and by extension any government appears for the wc to be based on the capacity to govern in the national interest and provide leadership. This national interest is, presumably, for those of our wc groups who respond in this way, decreed from above. We see this position as reflecting a legitimisation based on consent, a supra-party requirement.

Despite this clear difference in emphasis between the two class groups for those who respond to this question, we can see within the wc group a lack of knowledge, and a lack of interest and concern about the activities of political parties. A sizeable minority of boys at 15+ (this is also true for mc boys at the younger age level) make clear negative statements, or say that political parties have no importance at all: 23% of wc boys and 25% of mc
boys. The older wc boys can be seen as divided between the argument based on legitimisation by consent suggested above, and making an unfavourable comment about the role and function of political parties. One mc boy produces the by now familiar objection to trade union power: "none, they all get dominated by the unions anyway" (15+ mc boy). This boy takes an interesting position in that he seems to recognise a consensus basis to British political life at a time when distinctions between the two major parties were beginning to become more defined:10 "Despite electioneering speeches which they would have you believe, they are all much the same - half the measures passed seem to be put through by the opposition anyway". The wc boys are more colourfully dismissive, political parties are there to be laughed at, "preach false information", are "all middle class anyway", are corrupt, and explosively, "Stuff political parties". One radical offers an alternative: "No importance, only one needed. Read the little red book and find out for yourself".

3.3.2 Intra-mc comparison

If we consider both unfavourable comments, and those who say that they do not know in what ways political parties are important, we can say that at the younger age level, those in the field of production are more negative about political parties than those in symbolic control. In general, however, we find our two middle class groups largely falling into the two categories discussed above, representation of differing interests, and leadership and the national interest. At the older age level there is a slight tendency for the reversal which we saw between the wc and mc groups to appear within the mc group. Those in the field of symbolic control tend to mention representation of differing views more frequently, whereas those in production mention leadership and the national interest. However, the largest proportion of each intra-mc group at this age write about representation of differing viewpoints, and indicate a general acceptance of the principle of parliamentary democracy.
3.4 Change

Question:
(1) Are there any changes you want to see happen? If yes, what are they?
(2) If you want to see changes, how can these be brought about?

3.4.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

The largest proportion of all groups (averaging one third) in both these questions on change gave no response. The older mc girls are an exception here, and their responses largely referred to current issues. Some of those who wrote about the changes they thought desirable were not able to say how such changes could be achieved. Of those who did answer, most talked about current issues when suggesting changes and the government as the means of effecting change. There were some small variations in emphasis on the current issues which were of concern: mc boys at both age levels mentioned trade union power as something to be changed; wc girls talked about unemployment, prices and inflation and housing; mc girls at 12+ focussed on unemployment and inflation and at the older age on education. In terms of how change can be attained, perhaps surprisingly, mc boys were slightly more inclined to mention the use of force than any other groups, and wc boys and girls forms of public action other than force, such as demonstrations and petitions. Some of the younger mc boys were concerned to have the age of consent lowered. One or two radical suggestions were made by wc boys and girls - "Anarchy, vive la revolution" (15+ wc boy); "Margaret Thatcher tarred and feathered", and change effected by "Having one political party" (15+ wc boy); "Seeing England turn into a perfect communist state" by a "peaceful revolution" (15+ wc boy); and a wc girl who thought that change was necessary "but I can't really hope to know as I have got a lot of life to live", the way to effect change suggested, however, was "revolution or anarchy". One mc despond (a 12+ year old boy) wanted "The human race wiped out" by "dropping a lot of A bombs". Middle class girls were slightly more likely to make idealistic suggestions about peace, freedom and equality, and to some extent wc girls were concerned about violence.
3.4.2 Intra-mc comparison

Once again current issues were the main focus of concern and the government was seen as the chief means of effecting changes, with girls placing more emphasis on this solution than boys, and suggesting, especially at 15+, a change of government to a greater extent.\textsuperscript{11} We find that within the mc it was boys in the field of production who contributed most to the male emphasis on the use of force noted above (14% of them at each age level) and at 15+ it is the girls in symbolic control who contributed the concern with education amongst their current issues. The latter finding is consistent with our prediction of greater concern with education on the part of those in the field of symbolic control. There were some examples of radicalism and counter hegemonic positions from the adolescents in symbolic control, for example "less exploitation of the working class, banning of all fascist and nazi type factions" (12+ sc boy); and from the girls "I would like true equality and less defined social classes" (15+ sc girl); and "more equality for women as far as jobs are concerned" (15+ sc girl). Each of the adolescents from whom we have taken these comments had both parents in the field of symbolic control.

Tables 11.6, 11.7 and 11.8 which follow give figures for class and intra-mc comparisons and age movements on issues of order and change; Table 11.9 gives an overview of the differences which emerged in the results reported in this chapter between our groups, with levels of significance where relevant.

4 Overview

4.1 The general picture

No index was developed for this chapter or section of the questionnaire since we could not use the concept of classification in a systematic way over the variety of questions included. There was also a rising non-response rate, especially for the wc, on the questions related to order and change, which appeared at the end of the long questionnaire. If we consider the questions on property first, our major findings are as follows:
Table 11.6  
Selected responses on issues of order and change for the class comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs on freedom of the individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults/parents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/law/police</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who runs the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/parliament</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions (2 responses)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment or tone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of different interests</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.7

Selected responses on issues of order and change for the comparison within the middle class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Age 12+</th>
<th>Age 15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender _ M Female</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs on freedom of the individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults/parents</td>
<td>29 26</td>
<td>14 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/law/police</td>
<td>19 21</td>
<td>32 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who runs the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/parliament</td>
<td>31 64</td>
<td>44 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>19 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>19 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comment/tone</td>
<td>10 6</td>
<td>12 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of different interests</td>
<td>19 23 25 21</td>
<td>33 34 38 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>21 23</td>
<td>21 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>21 14</td>
<td>25 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>34 24</td>
<td>12 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.8

Age movements for the class and field groups on issues of order and change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Field groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curbs on freedom of the individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults/parents</th>
<th>Government/parliament</th>
<th>Trade unions</th>
<th>Trade unions 2 responses</th>
<th>The people</th>
<th>Negative comment</th>
<th>Importance of political parties</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>No importance</th>
<th>Don't know/no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-7 -1 -3 -5</td>
<td>+2 +5 -6 +21</td>
<td>+13 -7 +5 +2</td>
<td>+21 +12 +5 +4</td>
<td>-19 -1 -11</td>
<td>+9 +6 +11 +3</td>
<td>+16 -8 -7 +10 -14 -6 -7</td>
<td>+14 -8 -11</td>
<td>+6 -7 +10 -4</td>
<td>-14 -11 -20 -12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of political parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represent different interests</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>No importance</th>
<th>Don't know/no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+16 +23 +3 +3</td>
<td>-5 -8 -7 -6</td>
<td>+4 -6 -7 -10</td>
<td>+14 +11 +13 +32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values indicate the movement in percentages.
### Table 11.9
Comparison between class, field and gender groups on issues of social and political modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs on freedom of the individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults/parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state/law/police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent different interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own property**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should belong to all:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing + no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Levels of significance for differences: 1 = .05 2 = .02 3 = .01 4 = .001

** Gender differences in distribution of owned items, significance levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The types of property which the adolescents own reflect basic class and gender divisions. The mc groups as a whole own more than the wc, in fact 28% of the younger wc girls claimed that they owned nothing. The possessions listed by girls and boys differed significantly, with girls mentioning clothing, jewellery and items of personal adornment to a greater extent, and boys mentioning means of transport, and items associated with sports and hobbies. For most groups there is an increase in references to items associated with pop culture, and a fall in references to those associated with sports and hobbies with increasing age. In the case of all but the younger mc groups, boys own more items associated with pop culture than girls. For all but the older wc adolescents, boys appear in general to own more than girls - and this is especially true of the wealthier, mc groups. Boys also own items which it can be inferred are more costly - transport and electronic equipment for example. This could be related to a tendency for mc parents to spend more on sons than daughters: Sutherland (1978) has found this to be the case for a sample of Canadian university students. Parents do seem to spend differently on their sons and daughters, as we have seen, reinforcing gender distinctions. From the older boys' possession of items related to pop culture, we could infer greater involvement by boys in youth cultural forms, since popular music is a crucial element of identification for these groups. The girls mention clothing and adornment more frequently than the boys, and this too is important to youth culture identities. But perhaps more importantly this emphasis on personal adornment can be seen as part of the female socialization experience into gender appropriate forms of self presentation.

The adolescents were realistic in the desires and wishes they expressed for possessions they would like to have. Many of the items they suggested were for immediate use and some were projections into a possible property owning future. Girls were especially realistic in their desires, particularly those in the wc, although the chances of attaining the desired possessions must differ for the social class groups. Girls, for example, had a greater tendency than boys to want to own a house, reflecting perhaps an orientation towards the home and family which we have noted elsewhere in their responses, and a desire for security. This tendency increased with age. The mc girls' chances of achieving this ambition must, however, be greater than those of the wc girls.12
Despite sociological conviction that the wc are unable to defer gratification, we found that the wc groups were more likely than the mc to mention items which they could conceivably expect to own in the future. In fact each group revealed the capacity to defer gratification, but what they deferred differed. Those things which wc children desired to possess in the future might well be items which the mc children already owned.

The major difference between girls and boys was the degree to which they mentioned only fantasy items, or included such extravagant desires in their list, for all of our groups, boys did so more than girls. One is tempted to relate this finding to patriarchal power. The boys' potential and actual assumption of patriarchal power and superiority in the hierarchy of gender relations gives them the freedom to fantasise about the fruits of that power and superiority. The girls' subordination in gender relations binds them more strongly to material reality and to the conditions of their existence, and this is reflected in the property they desire.

The only difference between our groups within the mc was that those from the field of production were also more likely than those from symbolic control to mention fantasy elements and specific extravagant items for both gender and age groups. A similar argument to the above interpretation on gender differences in fantasy desires might be made in this connection. Those from the field of production, as we have argued previously, are more closely connected to the material base of society, and thus to power; the modality of those in the field of symbolic control is control. This closer connection to the source of power in the society might release those in the field of production to fantasise, as patriarchal power might release boys.

The most dramatic finding on this set of questions on property, which appeared in the middle of the questionnaire, occurred on the question asking what ought to belong to everybody. The non-response rate on this question soared to an average of 35% for all our groups, but on the next question it fell to 4%. We postulate that the notion of private property is deeply embedded in the culture and that it is difficult for these adolescents to move outside this viewpoint. This interpretation of the non response is strengthened by the degree to which most adolescents gave a decisive "no" as an answer when they did respond. In the mc the boys were more emphatic than the girls
in giving such an answer, thus endorsing the status quo to a greater extent. Some radical or counter-hegemonic comments did emerge on this question, mainly from those in the field of symbolic control. In general, however, those from the field of symbolic control were as emphatic if not more so than those from the field of production in their belief in private ownership.

Turning now to the questions on order and change, we found that there was a difference between our class groups on where they located control and authority over their own freedom of action. The mc adolescents were more likely to mention the state, law and police as providing constraint over the individual and the wc to mention adults, particularly parents. We might almost have expected the wc boys, particularly the older ones, to refer to the law or the police as the crucial constraint on their freedom of action, in terms of what might be their own experience of constraint. Perhaps the reversal is due to the question having a different meaning for individuals located differently in social space; for example the mc boys who respond in this way might read the 'you' in the question as the generalised you, or 'one', and give a general response in terms of order as constructed by the state's legal apparatus. The wc boys may read the 'you' in a local, personalised sense, and respond accordingly. The mc adolescents may in general be oriented towards external authority and the legitimacy of the state to a greater extent than the wc group.

This difference between class groups in recognising sources of constraint on the individual appeared also for our gender groups; girls located control with adults, particularly parents, and boys with the state, law and police. The gender difference was much stronger for the wc group, where we have noted in other instances that gender divisions are stronger. To a certain extent, however, we can see our adolescents locating themselves differentially, the girls in the private, domestic sphere, the boys in the public sphere. The division between public and private spheres can itself be seen as a form of ideological constraint, a support for the separation of men and women in production and the domestic sphere and for the inferior position in which women find themselves in the labour market, despite the fact that 40% of the labour force are women. We can see elements of this ideological positioning of women and men emerging for the adolescents in the study on an open ended question on freedom of action.
When asked "who runs the country?" most of the adolescents concur that the government or parliament does so. There is a class difference in references to the trade unions, and a large minority of the mc groups, especially the older boys, state with disapproval that the trade unions run the country. Negative views on trade unions have appeared for the older mc boys on other questions, for example one dealing directly with the functions of trade unions. It was also clear on the latter question that the mc adolescents, again especially the older boys, had a clearer idea of what the functions and performance of the trade unions are than the wc groups (see Chapter 8). No important differences emerged between the groups located within the mc on the issue of power with regard to this question.

A clear class difference appeared in connection with the role and function of political parties, which we have related to an ideology of consent on the part of the wc, the dominated group. The mc groups largely endorsed parliamentary democracy and the notion of the governed playing some part in decisions which affect them (however far removed from the source or exercise of power the individual might be) by stating that the importance of political parties was to represent differing viewpoints. This position legitimises political power by considering that a fair representation of views is made and protected by political parties. The wc groups, however, largely endorse the notion of leadership and the preservation of the national interest. A larger proportion of the wc than mc adolescents could not answer this question, expressed no interest in or knowledge about political parties, or made negative statements. Whilst this political apathy could be related to disillusionment with politics and politicians, it could also be seen as another form of implicit acceptance of the rule of others, a consent to being ruled. The emphasis on leadership and the national interest on the part of the wc groups can be seen as a legitimation of political power in terms of consent; they accept that decisions which affect their lives are taken for them by those in power. There was a slight tendency for this same reversal to appear in the responses of the groups within the mc at the older age; those in the field of symbolic control more likely to endorse representation of differing viewpoints, and those in production, leadership and the national interest, but this was within an overall pattern of mc support for parliamentary democracy and fair representation of views. Similarity between those in the field of
production, and the wc groups is a theme which has appeared in a number of instances in our data, and would be expected within the framework of our model of the social division of labour. The wc respondents in our study came largely from the field of production, and we have argued that those in the field of production have a closer relation to the material base of society than do those in the field of symbolic control. The difference between the mc in the field of production and the wc group is related to power and super- and subordination.

The final pair of questions put to the adolescents asked what changes they would like to see occur, and how they thought such change could be effected. As was intended by the sequencing of the set of questions, almost all of the adolescents took them at a general, societal level, rather than at a personal level. Many, however, could not or did not answer these questions. Those who did talked about current affairs, with small differences in emphasis; for example the wc girls mentioned unemployment, prices, inflation and housing; the mc girls at 12+ focussed on unemployment and inflation, and at 15+ on education. The government was seen as the means of effecting change, although some more spectacular methods, such as revolution or force, were recommended by a few of the respondents. Within the mc, it was girls in the field of symbolic control who contributed to the concern about education, and boys in the field of production who contributed to a mc male tendency to mention force as a means of effecting change. We have expected the adolescents in the field of symbolic control to be more concerned about and involved with education, since this is a crucial means by which the class reproduces itself, and is an area of work in which many agents of symbolic control are themselves employed. It is also the case for mc girls, and perhaps particularly those in the field of symbolic control, that education can provide a route to a career and to possible independence.

Some counter hegemonic arguments appeared in response to this question from adolescents in the field of symbolic control, as we have argued that we would expect.
4.2 Dynamic patterns in the data

There are some differences with age in responses to the questions in this part of the questionnaire, some of which we have touched on in describing the data. Two appear to be of particular interest. Girls in the field of production have increasing difficulty, more so than any other group, in challenging the concept of private property with increasing age. They either cannot suggest what ought to belong to everyone, or assert that nothing should, to a greater extent when 15+ compared with their responses at 12+.

The mc adolescents, especially girls, are increasingly committed to the idea of parliamentary democracy, with political parties representing differing viewpoints, as they progress through adolescence. Within the mc this increasing emphasis is contributed essentially by the girls in the field of symbolic control.

The two types of response can almost be seen as symbolising the different modalities of power and control for the two field groups. Girls in the field of production, as they get older, implicitly accept the power basis of the society, and particularly the position of those in the field of production, that is the ownership of private property. Girls in the field of symbolic control are endorsing the idea of control over the political process, and thereby the state, on the part of individuals in society. Although this specific notion of control might be illusory, indeed could be part of an ideological masking of the source of power, it is in these areas of the state and the apparatuses of communication that the control of agents of symbolic control is realised.
We can see, however, that some children who do not respond to earlier questions in the sequence evidently do to later ones, and some who want changes are unable to say how they are to be brought about.

See Chapter 4, p. 171 for a discussion of some examples of this original set of coding categories.

Calculated on the first response only, but the relationship between the differences in the distributions remain the same when three items are added for each individual, as on Table 11.1. We did not use the additive distribution in case individual adolescents were double counted.

Each of the figures in this table represents the proportion of the relevant group defined by our basic variables who mentioned an item in a given category. To produce this figure we have used the first three items given by any individual which fell into different categories in our coding scheme. It is possible that a small degree of double counting could have entered the picture for individuals who mentioned only three items, of which more than one was in the same category.

Sutherland (1978) throws an interesting light on different levels of material support afforded to offspring by families. In the context of a study on a representative sample of 1000 Canadian university students she consistently found that the male university students in her group had more money to spend than the female, a fact which she could not explain through differential full or part-time work while studying, or
differential receipt of scholarships, government loans or local authority bursaries, for there were no such differences. Control for marital status provided no explanation. The only conclusion to be made was that more generous family financial support went to men than to women university students. This generosity to sons was given as a natural right regardless of ability, and Sutherland concludes that "it would seem then than families provide niggardly support for able daughters but continue to underwrite their less able sons."

6 The younger girls differ from the rest of the groups here, with those in the field of production at 43% and symbolic control 37%.

7 See David (1983: 36) for a discussion of the American Family Protection Act, which considers educational, welfare and fiscal issues related to the sexuality of women, particularly young women, and its control by parents, particularly fathers. David says of this Act, "The thrust of the Family Protection Act was to recreate notions of sexuality and sexual responsibility as apparently private rather than public matters. In other words, the locus of responsibility was to be the family rather than the state, and the patriarchal family at that." In this paper David is considering the US 'pro-family' movement, which she sees as aiming to restore heterosexual patriarchy. Details of the Act appear in The Congressional Quarterly (1981) weekly report, 39, 40, 3 October, p. 1916.

For a brief discussion of the assignment of public and private life to men and women respectively in Western history, and of the relationship between this division and the state, see Eisenstein (1981: 22-26 and 222-225). For interesting illustrations of the operation of male control to maintain the public/private division see Imray and Middleton (1982). Barrett and McIntosh (1982: 58, 59) relate "two striking, though crude, statistical facts" to the public/private division. These are the fact that many more men than women are convicted of criminal offences, and many more women than men are treated for depressive and neurotic mental illnesses. Barrett and McIntosh argue that men are more firmly located in the public sphere, and thus more likely to fall foul of formal techniques of social control, whereas women are subject to "the coercion of privacy" (Stang-Dahl and Snäre, 1978: 8) and thus protected to some extent from the reach of criminal law. And it is married women who are more likely to become depressed than the unmarried and those who work outside the home. See Gamarnikow et al (1983) for a series of papers which question in various ways the public/private division. The basic argument here, as in other contributions to the debate, is that the public permeates and invades the private sphere. As Barrett and McIntosh themselves point out (1982: 90), there is a danger of elevating at the level of theory a distinction which has been historically and ideologically constructed - "This distinction between public and private should be an object of analysis not a conceptual tool" (p. 90).

8 An area which has been pursued in some detail in the study of political socialisation has related to young children's and adolescents' concepts of authority. See particularly a series of publications by Easton, Hess Dennis, Torney and Shipman from 1962-1969, based on a Chicago University study of 12,000 children from grades 2-8. The focus for the children's concept of authority was their attitudes towards the President and their local policemen. A general tendency to idealise the
major representative of authority in the sociopolitical system is reported in young children, a finding reproduced in a study by Greenstein (1965). Greenstein (1969) finds a similar response to the queen (as opposed to a certain cynicism with respect to the Prime Minister) amongst English children, and an idealistic conception of the queen was also found in a study by Connell (1971) in Australia. In general in these studies adolescents' views of authority are seen in terms of a decline in the idealisation of relevant representatives of the power structure in society and a movement towards the typical adult conceptions held in the particular society.

9 The questionnaire was completed in 1978 prior to the election of a Conservative government under Margaret Thatcher. See also the discussion of the question of political parties which follows.

10 See Gould (1981) for a discussion of consensus and conflict politics in the UK in the context of the rise of the salaried middle class.

11 The percentage figures in this instance are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Symbolic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of government</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Leonard (1980: 250) asks an interesting question: to what extent can the increasing levels of home ownership by wc couples during the past decades be attributed to women's earning power?

13 See note 7 to this chapter on the division between public and private spheres, and the permeation of the private by the public in some respects.

14 There was a Labour government in power when the questionnaire was administered in 1978.
CHAPTER 12

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS AMONGST THE ADOLESCENTS

1 Introduction

Occupational aspirations have been the object of a considerable number of studies in the past, and part of our concern in asking for the adolescents' aspirations in this study was to relate their responses to class and gender, as had been the case in earlier work in this area. We also wanted to examine the interrelationship between class and gender; the questions in this section are relevant to the areas in the study which deal with the social division of labour and gender differentiation, as the responses indicate the way in which the individual places her/himself in the social and sexual division of labour.

Five questions are considered in this chapter; two are related to what the adolescent hopes or expects to do on leaving school or starting work; one asks for the source of the idea for their occupational aspiration; and two seek their aspiration as a member of the opposite sex and whether they think many of their own sex actually do the work they suggest. The results are presented in a question by question format.

We will consider briefly major or typical contributions to the extensive literature on occupational choice, in order to place our results and thinking in the context of existing work.

Pavalko (1971) has categorised the basic approaches in this work, the classical studies of occupational choice, and describes: (1) the rational decision making approach where the individual makes rational choices based on personal characteristics, capacities, interests, values and so on, and the characteristics of certain occupations. This can take place over a period of time, mapping onto a maturational process, or onto the decision making points in the educational system. This work is typified by the studies of Ginzberg et al (1951), Super (1957), Holland (1959), Blau et al (1956) and Sherlock and Cohen (1966). In contrast Pavalko proposes (2) the fortuitous approach where individuals drift into certain occupations rather than making any explicit
choice. The work of Katz and Martin (1962) and Caplow (1964) is relevant here. Pavalko suggests that these contrasting approaches to occupational choice might be based on the types of occupation open to members of particular social class groups, that the rational decision making model could apply to middle class youth moving into jobs at the professional end of the occupational scale, and the fortuitous model might be more accurate in describing the process for working class youth moving into skilled or semi-skilled manual work. The third category of approaches which Pavalko identifies examines "socio-cultural parameters constraining occupational choice". Such studies focus on external factors which limit the capacity of the individual to make decisions about her/his occupational life, for example social class background (Sewell, Haller and Strauss, 1957; Turner, 1962; Davis, 1964), race (Sprey, 1962), and sex. In studies which examine sex as a limiting factor, the work is fundamentally based on women as wives and mothers "with no culturally prescribed necessity to engage in occupational activity" (Pavalko, 1971: 59). Turner (1964) suggested that the investigation of women's ambitions could best be accomplished by finding out what qualifications they sought in future husbands. Psathas (1968) did in fact attempt to outline the factors which make the process of occupational choice for women very different from that of men, emphasising the "setting" in which such decisions take place. The work is, however, grounded in basic sexist assumptions, since his major thesis is that to understand the factors which influence the entry of women into occupational roles one must begin with the relationship between sex-role and occupational role, and a first consideration is the "intention, time, reason for marriage, the husband's financial situation and attitude towards his wife working".

The emphasis in much of the English work is on the influence of educational experience on occupational preferences; some examples are the work of Himmelweit, Halsey and Oppenheim (1952), Katz (1962), Liversidge (1962), Elder (1965), Ford (1969). A general finding is that the experience of a higher level of education (grammar school in the earlier studies, top stream in comprehensive schools in the later) raises the level of aspiration and that secondary and latterly lower stream children in comprehensive schools are relatively realistic in their choice of occupations. Rauta and Hunt (1975), however, in a study which compared level of aspiration with level of ability in 1,957 fifth form girls (15-16 years old) in a range of schools (including
grammar, technical, secondary modern, and comprehensive) concluded that the influence of the home background was apparent irrespective of the type of school attended and vice versa. They comment that "at all levels of ability, home background and school background contributed independently to the girls' level of aspiration" and that 'privileged' girls, in terms of the socioeconomic level of their home, had aspirations which were above average for their ability level.

In an attempt to synthesise the approaches to occupational choice based on the purposive, rational decision making model, Ford and Box (1967) postulated two fundamental propositions:

(1) In choosing between alternative occupations, a person will rank the occupations in terms of the relation between his values and the perceived characteristics of the occupation; the higher the coincidence between the characteristics and his values, the higher the rank;

(2) The higher a person perceives the probability that he will obtain employment in the higher-ranked occupation, the more likely he is to choose that occupation. They conclude that occupational choice represents the culmination of a process in which hopes and desires come to terms with the realities of the situation in the labour market.

The two general findings which emerge from the work on occupational choice are that a strong reality principle appears to operate in such choices and aspirations, and that the choices follow quite closely the patterns of social class position. In early studies the argument was put forward that an explanatory factor in the reproduction of the system of social relations, and more particularly of the occupational structure, was lack of aspiration on the part of the working class (see for example Hyman, 1953; Ginzberg and associates, 1951). This argument reflects the dominant ideology about achievement, in which advancement in the class and occupational structure is seen as based on effort and ability, and open to any individual possessing these attributes. We have seen that this meritocratic ideology has a considerable hold over all of the adolescents in this study.
The distribution of life chances and work opportunities can be seen as related to social class location, educational experience, and gender, and reflecting relationships of dominance in a patriarchal, class society. From this perspective, working class aspirations for working class, manual work can be seen as

(1) a realistic assessment and appreciation of the objective chances of achieving specific occupational locations in the existing social structure; or

(2) when combined with a high evaluation of education and an acceptance of a meritocratic ideology, as a form of consent to dominance relations, and to the legitimacy of the reward structure of society.

A parallel interpretation can be made for women. Women who aspire to stereotyped female work may be making a realistic assessment of their chances of obtaining particular types of work. When this type of choice is combined with a general acceptance of women's inferior position in the labour market, using for example arguments which legitimise traditional differentiation between the work that men and women do, this can be seen as a form of consent to the hierarchical relations between men and women. The forms of class and gender ideology prevalent in the society generate, support and reinforce these modes of acceptance of existing social relations.

Willis (1977) produces an interesting argument based on the penetration of the meritocratic ideology by wc boys, who realise that the educational system does not and cannot offer them what it purports to. They consequently create for themselves a counter culture which opposes the values of the school and the educational system, and in fact provides for them, with its parallels with shop floor culture, the perfect training ground to enable them to take up their place as sellers of relatively undifferentiated labour power in a capitalist system. This penetration of the veil of ideology in Willis' view does not reach political articulation by virtue of the deep divisions in the social fabric which enable these wc boys to value manual labour. These divisions are (1) the mental/manual division, in which of course their type of work is devalued, and (2) gender divisions, in which they find themselves in a dominant group. In some way mental labour becomes associated with femininity and consequently devalued, and manual labour with masculinity, and thus valued. It seems to be the case from our data on a number of issues discussed by our adolescents that gender differentiations and divisions are
more overt and extreme in the wc groups, despite the fact that in many instances some of our wc girls at least attempt to expose such divisions and expectations of women as unfair.  

Most studies of girls' aspirations report that they make stereotyped occupational choices (Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Ford, 1969; Rauta and Hunt, 1975; Sharpe, 1976). Frequently the upward social mobility reflected in working class girls' aspirations compared with the father's occupational level is dismissed by the suggestion that such female ghetto clerical or office work, 'traditional white blouse' occupations in Douvan and Adelson's terms, does not represent a genuine desire for upward mobility (Ford, 1969). If we look at the 224 wc girls in this study, we find that 66% expressed aspirations which could be described as female stereotyped work. An inspection of the jobs held by the mothers of these girls, most of whom were employed in unskilled and semi-skilled manual work, indicated that the girls did in fact aspire to jobs which represented upward mobility compared with their mothers' work. Similar responses were found in a smaller sample of eight year old working class girls (Holland and Skouras, 1977b; Dahlberg and Holland, 1984). We should perhaps point out that (1) the usual procedure of considering occupational aspiration in comparison to the father's occupational level omits a range of information available from a consideration of the mother's work, and (2) that the relative status of certain categories of female stereotyped work, for example clerical and secretarial work, differs for girls from different social class backgrounds.

The argument about the relative mobility of female white collar workers can be placed in a broader context by considering the historical development of the distribution of the labour force in industrialised countries, in particular the feminisation of certain categories of service work (McNally, 1979; Manley and Sawbridge, 1980). Some social theorists take the position that there has been a proletarianisation of certain types of white collar work (for example Braverman, 1974; Carchedi, 1978). This process is discussed in the context of the deskilling of certain categories of work, and the relationship in terms of class location, interests and consciousness of those who engage in these types of work and the wc. What then is the relationship between proletarianisation and feminisation? Parkin (1972) suggests that there is a buffer zone between the two major class blocks, largely filled by women due to the expansion of the service sector and the growth of women's jobs in
this area. Adopting this concept, Giddens (1973: 288) considers that women thus form an 'underclass' of the white collar sector. West (1978) argues that lower level white collar work which has become feminised has resulted in the proletarianisation of the women performing it. Some support for the deskilling aspect of this argument is provided by Carter and Carter (1981). These authors suggest that in recent years in the USA a split has developed in professional work between prestige jobs with good pay, autonomy, opportunities for growth and development, and a "new class of more routinized, poorly paid jobs with little autonomy and which are unconnected by ladders of promotion to prestige jobs in the profession" (p. 478). They produce evidence for this deskilling in the areas of college and university teaching, medicine and the law, showing that the upper tiers in these professions remain male, and the growing lower, routinized tiers are female. This is an important plank in any argument which attempts to define the boundaries of the white collar sector and indeed to incorporate women into this system on the basis of their location in the division of labour. Which women are in these routine white collar jobs? There are women who may be from a middle-class family of origin (based on their father's work), possibly from a middle-class family of marriage (based on their husband's work) but who, if we accept the deskilling argument, are being proletarianised by their own experience of the labour process. In the same work there are also women who could be from a working-class family of origin, and marriage (see Payne, 1983; Goldthorpe, 1984) who may retain their working-class consciousness. We have suggested (Chapter 1) that the fact that our working-class girls when asked what work they would aspire to as a male offer skilled manual work, as an indication of their working-class identification. We must conclude that women have a contradictory location not only as a result of their position in both production and reproduction, but also within the social division of labour itself. We will consider some of these issues further in presenting our results.

2 Results from the questions on aspirations

2.1 Aspirations and expectations

Questions:
(1) What would you like to do when you leave school?
(2) What sort of job do you think you will do when you start working?
(3) What gave you the idea of doing that work?

2.1.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

As we might expect from their answers about educational expectations within the school, the mc students, especially at the older age level, wrote about their plans and expectations on leaving school in terms of further education. The wc students in general wrote about the jobs they would like to take up, although at 15+ a small group do aspire to further education, often of a vocational training type. Since we had expected that the mc students might well respond with educational aspirations to the first question, and we wanted to know what work they hoped to do, we asked the second question precisely on this issue. Whilst this sequence of questions operated as above for the mc students, normally producing information on education and work aspiration, for the wc group it provided an opportunity for them to give an aspiration in response to the first question and an expectation in response to the second.

We have noted from the literature on occupational choice a general finding that occupational preference follows closely the pattern of social class location, influenced to some extent by education. We find that the occupational choices of the mc students certainly reflect this pattern. At both age levels most of the mc adolescents give education or non manual work relatively high in the occupational hierarchy as their aspiration on the first question about plans on leaving school. Within this framework, the older children in general, and girls rather than boys, refer to education most frequently. Seventy percent of 15+ mc girls write about continuing their education. The gender difference within the mc in mentioning or not mentioning education as their aspiration on leaving school is significant at the .001 level for each age group. From the educational experience and location of the mc boys, we know that many or most will in fact continue their education after leaving school. It is possible that girls have made a more exact reading of this question. But perhaps the boys, despite the fact that they will continue their education, are more oriented towards the work they will ultimately do than are the girls, and spontaneously offer this as a response to the initial question more frequently.
For the second question, asking what work they will do, all mc groups overwhelmingly give non manual work as their aspiration and, of these, most again aspire to relatively high level work in the top three categories of the Hall-Jones (1951) scale. At 15+ the level of aspiration of mc girls falls slightly compared with the rest of the mc groups; in this instance less than half of the girls aspiring to non manual work hope for jobs in the top three categories of the scale.

When we come to the wc students' responses, the situation is not so clear cut. Although the largest group of wc boys do aspire to and expect to do manual work, a large minority, especially at the older age level (36%) aspire to and indeed expect to do non manual work. These occupations are spread more evenly across the occupational hierarchy than the clustering at the top that we see with the mc responses. If we look at the students who aspire to non manual work in each of our age, class and gender groups, we find that a greater proportion of mc than wc, and especially of boys than girls, aspire to the top two levels of occupations as defined by the Hall-Jones scale. Girls' aspirations, including our potentially highly educated mc girls, are always lower than those of boys within the mc. For their expectations at 15+, this difference reaches significance at the .001 level in terms of those aspiring to the top three non manual levels and those aspiring to other non manual work. Very high aspirers in all groups become slightly more realistic when we compare their expectation with their aspiration.

Our wc girls also aspire overwhelmingly to non manual jobs, very few of them at the highest levels, and as we have seen, 66% of them could be regarded as aspiring to female stereotyped work. The mc girls were less inclined to give stereotypical work as their aspiration - only about 32% of them did so. Within the stereotypical aspirations wc girls had a bias towards office work and work which accentuates the female supportive role, or work which involves relationships with others, whereas those of the mc girls who had stereotyped aspirations inclined towards female supportive or more glamorous occupations, such as air hostess and pop or film star. Table 12.1 p. 416 gives the broad outline of the responses on the first two questions in percentage terms.
Amongst the wc adolescents it is certainly the case that the boys exhibit a wide range of choices, including non manual work, whereas the girls' choices are predominantly limited to female stereotypes. This reflects the reality of the labour market situation in terms of ranges of work available to women and men, even if the high aspiring wc boys (like the high aspiring mc girls) might be disappointed when they actually find work.

2.1.2 Working class high aspirers

We looked more closely at the group of relatively high aspirers amongst the wc boys to see if any features distinguished them from the rest of the wc boys. It seemed that their expectations were rooted in reality insofar as their educational expectations or plans were concerned, they were much more likely than the group as a whole to expect to stay on at school after the compulsory leaving age (this applied to 68% of the high aspirers, and 32% of the rest), and planned to take GCE examinations to a greater extent and vocational courses much less than the rest of the group. They were also more likely to refer to the value of specific school subjects when discussing what use school had for them. They appeared to be evenly distributed across the relevant schools in the sample, across the age groups, and across the skill level of their father's occupation. When we examined their mothers' work, however, we saw that more than twice as many of their mothers were in white collar work of either a lower grade professional nature, or were employed in secretarial or clerical work, than was true for the wc male group as a whole. These specific adolescents are in cross class families with mothers in the field of symbolic control. This can lead to a more personal mode of family interactional practice and communication, which weakens classification, and can therefore generate aspirations which do not necessarily follow class lines. We have also noted that those in the field of symbolic control emphasise the importance of education, and its role in improving occupational chances.

The major distinguishing feature of the group of male high aspirers compared with the rest of the male wc group was that many more of their mothers were performing white collar work (27% of the high aspiring group compared with 11% of the rest of the male wc group).
We wanted to know what sources of influence the adolescents might acknowledge in making their choice of an occupation, and asked what had given them the idea of doing the work they aspired to. Three responses by any individual were coded on this question, and taking the initial response only, influential sources of inspiration were: the family, the school, and personal knowledge, ability or experience. An example of the latter is "Because I've worked with horses since I was seven". Most of the children, however, referred to personal preference or interest, for example: "I have always liked finding bones and things". For our class groups there were some differences: girls mentioned personal preference and interest to a markedly greater extent than boys, especially in the mc; boys appeared to be somewhat more influenced by the family than girls; mc boys and girls were more likely to mention their own capacities or experience as guiding them in their occupational choice than were the wc groups. These differences become more marked when up to three responses for each individual are taken into account. The influence of the school increased with age and was strongest for the mc adolescents, most especially girls at the older age level.

Despite the differences we have noted, the adolescents in our sample overwhelmingly saw themselves as the source of inspiration for their future occupations, in terms of their own knowledge, ability or experience, or their own personal interest and preference. Table 12.2 gives figures for these responses. Table 12.1 gives aspirations and expectations for the class, age and gender groups.

The differences in the distributions of the mc and wc adolescents into the various categories for these questions were significant in some instances.

2.1.3 Intra-mc comparison

When we look within the mc groups, we find that adolescents from the field of symbolic control are more likely than those from the field of production to wish to continue their education. We find here the difference in orientation towards education and educational qualification between our field groups which we have expected. This intra-mc difference reaches significance at the .001 level for the 15+ year old girls.
Table 12.1
Aspirations and expectations: the class comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual work</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The forces</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual work</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The forces</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These responses are included in the manual and non-manual work categories.
Table 12.2

Sources of inspiration for the adolescents' occupational aspirations:

the class comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>29 14 21 15</td>
<td>17 10 17 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3 8 4 1</td>
<td>12 29 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal knowledge, ability, experience</td>
<td>13 11 4 8</td>
<td>17 8 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal preference, interest</td>
<td>35 52 35 40</td>
<td>25 29 31 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to three responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>60 19 24 18</td>
<td>23 17 18 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>9 13 5 3</td>
<td>25 40 14 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal knowledge, ability, experience</td>
<td>21 21 11 9</td>
<td>25 22 17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal preference, interest</td>
<td>47 71 43 48</td>
<td>39 67 41 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the younger age level those in the field of symbolic control are more likely to aspire to occupations high in the occupational hierarchy when specifying the non-manual work which almost all desire. Table 12.3 gives the broad outline of responses for our intra-mc groups for these two questions.
Table 12.3

Aspirations and expectations: the intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation work different from aspiration</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual work</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall-Jones scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 2 levels</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 levels</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation work different from aspiration</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(10)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual work</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall-Jones scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 2 levels</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 levels</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These responses are included in the manual and non-manual work categories.
Table 12.4

Sources of inspiration for the adolescents' occupational aspirations:

the intra-MC comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod SC</td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>26 12 33 18</td>
<td>16 14 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2 8 - 7</td>
<td>14 24 9 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal knowledge, ability, experience</td>
<td>16 12 10 9</td>
<td>12 10 23 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal preference, interest</td>
<td>33 52 42 51</td>
<td>21 30 32 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to three responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>33 17 40 25</td>
<td>18 24 25 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2 14 4 14</td>
<td>25 36 25 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal knowledge, ability, experience</td>
<td>22 21 19 20</td>
<td>19 14 30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal preference, interest</td>
<td>43 70 58 70</td>
<td>30 68 53 64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Occupational aspiration as a member of the opposite sex

Questions:
1. Suppose you were a boy/girl, what work would you like to do?13
2. If you have given an occupation in answer to question (1), do many (same sex as respondent) do the work you mention? What is the reason for that?

As will be seen from the above discussion, we started with certain expectations of the relationships we might find between class, gender and occupational choice in our material. In addition we wanted to examine the students' consciousness of the relationship between social class, gender and occupational aspirations, and finally decided on the above questions which required them to attempt to identify with a member of the opposite sex. We subsequently asked them whether or not many of the same sex as themselves do the job they suggest as their opposite sex aspiration. In the initial pilot study, which was based on an interview using very similar questions to those in the questionnaire, girls found it easy to give a job done by men as their aspiration, and this occupation frequently (in the case of wc girls always) differed from their own aspiration. The subsequent question "Why don't you want to do that as a girl?" produced some interesting responses from the 15+ year old girls being interviewed. Some of them talked about problems that women would face in aiming for a job of the type they had mentioned in general, what they personally would not like about that situation, and mentioned experiences which they, or friends and acquaintances, had had in this connection. For example, one girl said "I would like to be a printer as a girl except for they don't accept girls in the print - well they're meant to but they say girls aren't as good as boys" (Interviewer: "And what do you think about that?") "I think - I've been to a printing firm and I've worked there, just doing little things you know, but I can do it - if I took an exam they still wouldn't have me there" (15+ wc girl). We had hoped that these two questions would work in a similar way on the questionnaire, despite the fact that we would not know whether or not the aspiration as a boy had been the same as the aspiration as a girl. We also referred directly to the question on their opposite sex aspiration, since occasionally in the pilot interviews and in some cases on the questionnaire, it was thought that some boys had in fact been
Table 12.5

Work as opposite sex the same as the individual's own aspiration in percentage terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

referring to their own aspiration as a boy. This tendency links up with the later discussion here of boys' responses (or non responses) to this question.

2.2.1 Comparison between mc and wc groups

There is a greater tendency for the mc adolescents to wish to do the same work or continue their education in the same way as a member of the opposite sex as they in fact wish to do as themselves. The trend is more pronounced at the older age levels, and for girls rather than boys.

The differences between the mc and wc are significant at .001 for girls and boys at each age level. Within the mc the differences between girls and boys are significant at 12+ at the .02 level, and for the 15+ year olds at .001. The difference between the mc and wc groups would seem to reflect for the mc an acceptance of both the ideology of equality of opportunity, and of the meritocracy. The wc responses reflect the salience of gender divisions in work for these groups.

The mc girls who do not aspire to the same choice of occupation as a member of the opposite sex, and a large majority of the wc girls at both age levels, give a typical male job in response to this question. The mc girls usually, but not exclusively, refer to non manual work (for example lawyer, doctor, engineer, or pilot) and the wc girls refer to skilled manual work (for
Table 12.6

Types of jobs suggested as opposite sex aspiration, as a percentage of total responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female stereo.</th>
<th>Typical male</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

example mechanic, carpenter, electrician). For the boys the most typical response is to give a stereotypical female occupation such as secretary, nurse, or air hostess. Table 12.6 gives a picture of these patterns in terms of proportions of total responses.

The wc girls then easily identify with boys, want to do chiefly skilled manual work, recognise of course that women do not do these jobs in their response to the following question, and offer as explanations for this that the work is too heavy, or more usually that there are traditional male and female distinctions in types of work performed. This is true of wc girls at both age levels, but at 15+ another reason begins to loom large - at 12+, 9%, but at 15+ 25% of those who think that women do not do the type of job they mentioned consider that the reason for this is discrimination against women. Whilst most of the mc girls want to do the same work as a girl or boy and
therefore largely feel that women actually do those jobs they aspire to, those who gave typical male jobs did not think that many women did that work. These girls endorsed the position taken by the wc girls on reasons for this, and, as with the wc girls, many of them (48%) at the age of 15+ thought that discrimination was the reason.

Amongst the boys who discussed reasons when saying that men did not do the work they mentioned as an opposite sex aspiration, the most frequent reference at both ages and for both class groups was to traditional differentiation between male and female work. The wc mentioned this traditional differentiation between male and female work to a greater extent than the mc boys, and the older boys more so than the younger. A few mention preference.

We have seen that our mc girls are by and large aspiring to relatively high level non manual occupations which are not typically in what could be described as female job ghettos. In the light of their own aspirations it is reasonable for them to aspire to the same job as a man, although we could say that they were over-optimistic in their expectations of the occupations they will in fact be able to get in terms of our knowledge of the occupational distribution of females in the labour market. The ideological message behind the over-optimism of these mc girls could be a belief that education and personal ability will be sufficient to ensure high occupational achievement. This same message may underlie the responses of the mc boys who think that as a girl they would have the same occupation as their own aspirations. Certain responses which we found amongst the working class boys led us to think that other factors might also be at work to produce these mc male responses, and thus differentiate them from the similar female mc response.

In examining the answers to this question we noted that a certain number of adolescents (about 10% of each class group) had some difficulty in answering it. They either said nothing, said they did not know, or refused to answer, making some kind of comment instead. But dramatic differences lay within this picture, as we can see from Table 12.7. It is the boys, and in particular the 15+ year old wc boys, who have difficulty imagining themselves as a member of the opposite sex. The differences between girls and boys are significant for the wc groups at 12+ at the .01 level, and at 15+ at the .001
Table 12.7

Percentage of subjects refusing to offer an opposite sex aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

level (Hopkins and Glass, 1978). Their problem emerges poignantly in the types of comments made. The girls who made a comment here were largely mc (6 of them at 15+) and they asserted that their sex would or should make no difference to their plans. Two of them said, for example, "I don't see that it should make any difference. I hope you don't either!"; and "Whatever career I decide to pursue I am sure my sex will not affect it in any way." The only two wc girls who had difficulty with this identification and made comments, both 15+ year olds, said, "I can't imagine it"; "I don't think like a boy". The boys, however, take an entirely different position, and their comments suggest a rejection of the female identification, for example, "I am not a girl and would not like to be", and even, "If I was a girl I'd be worried".

We have interpreted this response as indicating an unwillingness or inability to identify with women, and, although this has the air of paradox, we think that this kind of reaction might be underlying some of the seemingly liberal responses of the middle class boys who want to have the same occupation as a girl that they would have as a boy. A possible psychological explanation for this unwillingness to identify with the opposite sex could be related to the processes which contribute to establishing their own masculine identity, an identity which, although not necessarily precarious, might be in need of reinforcement rather than exposed to the dangers of counter-suggestion in adolescence. At another level, the difference in the ways in which the unwillingness to identify with the opposite sex response
manifests itself in the MC boys and the WC boys can be related to the fact that in the case of the MC the meritocratic ideology enables them to choose the same occupation if a girl as they would choose for themselves. No such ideology supports the aspiring skilled manual worker and indeed there is almost no evidence of women holding this type of job, so that the male/female distinction becomes much more apparent. We can see how clearly the male/female distinction is operating for the WC boys when we look at their responses on other questions more directly related to this issue. When asked whether some school subjects are more suitable for boys and others for girls, it is chiefly WC boys and a majority of them, increasing with age who say yes - frequently offering typical sex typed lessons as examples. On the issue of types of jobs typically done by women and men they give many examples of precisely those skilled manual jobs which women cannot expect to fill, as typical male occupations. We suggest that in asking these WC boys to choose an occupation for themselves as a female we are asking them to identify with a social group (WC women) who are hierarchically subordinate on both the class and the gender dimensions, and that this constitutes a threat to their only area of dominance, which is based on gender.

2.2.2 Opposite sex aspiration: intra-MC comparison

The main difference to emerge between the groups here is in the extent to which they would want to do the same work, or pursue their career in the same way as a member of the opposite sex. In this, in all age and gender groups, those in the field of symbolic control want to do the same work more than those in the field of production. The difference is more marked for girls at each age level, and the contrasting emphasis from girls from the field of production is to mention a typical male job. This difference of emphasis, the same as their own aspiration for work as the opposite sex for those from the field of symbolic control, contrasted with a typical male job from those in production, reaches significance for the younger girls (at the .02 level). Boys from the field of symbolic control, as we have said, are more likely to want to do the same work as a girl, and the contrasting emphasis made by boys in the field of production is on female stereotyped work. We can see again here the tendency for those in the field of stereotyped work to have less traditional views than those in the field of production, in this instance about the types of work which men and women can do. This is exemplified by the fact that
Table 12.8
Opposite sex work aspirations amongst those in the fields of production and
symbolic control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12+</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as own aspiration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female stereo</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical male work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

they see the work they aspire to themselves as capable of being performed by
men or women to a greater extent than those in the field of production. Since
these groups largely want to do the same work as a member of the opposite
sex, they consider that members of their own sex actually do this work in
response to the next question, arguing that there is no discrimination in the
work they propose, or that there should be none, since men and women are
equally capable of pursuing these careers. The exceptions here are girls in the
field of production at each age level. A larger proportion of these latter girls
aspire to typical male jobs, and when they consider that women do not do
these jobs, the younger girls suggest traditional distinctions between men's
and women's work as a reason for this, and the older ones suggest
discrimination.

Table 12.8 gives the percentages of each group in the categories which
dominated the responses.
3 Overview

We have indicated here some of the main themes emerging from the literature on occupational choice, and the way in which the responses of our adolescents compare with other findings. As we noted, a general finding in the literature is that a strong reality principle appears to operate in occupational choice, based on class location, educational experience and the actual situation in the labour market. Beyond this reality principle we have also suggested forms of legitimization of the occupational hierarchy and its reward structure, related to both class and gender differentiation. The most powerful legitimising ideology, which emerges in the responses of our adolescents at a number of points in the questionnaire, is the meritocratic ideology, which, allied with that of equal opportunity, suggests that high income and position in the occupational hierarchy is a just reward for ability, effort and the acquisition of relevant qualifications. We have seen this ideology as supporting a high level of aspiration amongst our mc girls and boys, and enabling the boys (a) to make an identification with girls and (b) to argue that the same work can be done by men or women, when they are of equal ability or capacity.

Deviation from the operation of a reality principle, however justified or legitimised, emerged in our data. A group of wc boys aspired to a range of relatively high level non manual work, and we found (a) that their educational aspirations were consistent with their occupational aspirations; but more importantly (b) that the influence of a mother who did white collar work, in some cases lower level professional work such as teacher or nurse, could be found amongst this group.18

The mc girls had high aspirations and thought that their sex should not influence their capacity to pursue the occupation of their choice. Despite the fact that these girls are in the process of being highly educated and that many of them can expect to acquire a university degree, their expectations are unrealistic when we consider the actual distribution of women into the occupational structure of the UK (see Holland, 1981b: 16, 17; and 1984: 2; and the latest Annual Report of the Equal Opportunities Commission, appendices of statistics), where the types of occupations in which women are found, and the level to which they can rise within these occupations, is severely limited.
Rauta and Hunt (1975) found in a study of 1,957 fifth formers that the influence of a privileged family background on high levels of occupational and educational aspiration was independent of ability.

The wc girls in our sample, 66% of whom chose work well within the areas associated with women's work, can be seen as somewhat more realistic in their aspirations and expectations. In this connection, we also drew attention to the fact that aspiration to white collar work of different types had a different meaning for girls coming from different class backgrounds. For wc girls to be a secretary, or a nurse, could produce a wide gap between their own occupational experience and that of their mother, who in many of the cases in our study held a low level manual job. For mc girls, such an aspiration, for secretarial or nursing work, might represent a low assessment of the capacities of women compared with the level of occupation of their father, and their mother. In fact, as we noted, most of our mc girls did not make stereotyped choices. This itself could be seen as a result of their high level of education.¹⁹

We have considered the aspirations of these wc girls from a different perspective; how do they relate to the feminisation of certain categories of work? If a large proportion of the women who fill lower level white collar occupations come from families of origin who are located in the wc (based on father's and perhaps also mother's class location as defined by their work) and indeed can expect to marry a manual worker, what does this imply for the class location and consciousness of this group? We have seen that a large proportion of the wc girls in our sample who aspire to female stereotyped work of a lower level white collar nature do in fact, when asked for an opposite sex aspiration, offer skilled manual work. This response suggests both an identification with the wc rather than with the mc, and would also represent for many of them as women, upward mobility compared with their mother's work.

A further theme which emerges from the above points and was found in our data on aspirations was an interaction between class and gender: gender divisions were stronger in the wc than in the mc. More wc girls chose typical female work for their own aspirations than did mc girls. Working class boys were less able to identify with women when choosing an opposite sex
aspiration. We linked this latter incapacity to an argument developed by Willis (1977) in which wc boys value manual work and aspire to such work, thus legitimising and reproducing through their own consent the social relations of production. This valuing of manual work is accomplished by a devaluation of mental work which is associated with femininity. The process is facilitated by, indeed depends on, strong gender divisions within the wc. The strength of gender divisions is recognised with disapproval by a section of our wc girls. These girls aspired to skilled manual work for their opposite sex aspirations, and considered that it was discrimination against women which prevented women from pursuing this type of work. These particular girls are rebelling against the ideology of a division between women's work and men's work, recognising the arbitrary nature of this division, and linking it to power, as did a group of the mc girls.

We saw from the results on the question area on education, that the wc group accept the meritocratic ideology to a large extent. We have suggested that aspirations to manual work combined with an acceptance of (a) the value of education and (b) other aspects of the meritocratic ideology, can be seen as a legitimation of the occupational hierarchy and its reward structure. This would also lead to a reproduction of the social relations of production without the valuation of manual labour required by Willis' formulation. In this instance we might find a downgrading of the importance of work in the individual's life, and a focus on some other aspect of existence, such as the family and their role within it. We saw some indication of this type of response from our questions relating to the most important thing in the individual's life, where more than a third of wc boys point to the family in this regard.

There has been some indication on a number of questions that the mc group have a sense of autonomy, or control over aspects of their own experience, to a greater extent than the wc groups. This has emerged on questions about examination decisions, and on the role and importance of political parties. It appears again in this series of questions, where we sought the source of inspiration for the occupational aspirations. The mc groups were more likely to mention their own interests, capacities and experience as influencing their occupational choice than were the wc group.
Our mc group as a whole have high aspirations, but within this we noted differences. Regardless of educational level or aspirations, boys in general had higher aspirations than girls. This may indicate an element of reality in our mc girls, although, as we have noted earlier, their own aspirations are high compared with what they can realistically expect in the labour market. From our intra-mc groups, those in the field of symbolic control aspired higher than those in production. We also found greater endorsement of the meritocratic ideology in those adolescents from the field of symbolic control, in terms of their plans to pursue their education on leaving school.

Working class boys, whose gender position facilitates their socialisation into an acceptance of male manual work, seeing it as part of a masculine identity, can be thwarted by high levels of youth unemployment. Indeed elements of the public debate on youth unemployment today certainly imply that positive self evaluation is related to having a job. Other elements in the public debate, however, indicate that at the level of ideology, preparation is being made for a permanent core of unemployed. The emergent emphasis on leisure, on life skills and even transferable skills at the level of public discourse, and in the discourse and practice of education and other state agencies, point in this direction.21

For the mc the timing of unemployment can be delayed by pursuit of education, but what will be the effect on the mc of current cuts in higher education? Can we expect an adjustment of the meritocratic ideology, or even a rejection of its validity by disappointed, disaffected members of the mc who aspire to higher education but are unable to find a university place?22 What implications will these changes have for the children of agents of symbolic control, dependent on the educational system for the reproduction of their class position?
NOTES TO CHAPTER 12

1. See Ashton and Field (1976) for an English study of school leavers suggesting that there are three types which match different social class locations: those who are careerless - the lower working class; those with the possibility of short term careers - the upper working class and lower middle class; and those with potentially extended careers - the middle class.

2. See also Veness (1962) for a general study of the aspirations and expectations of school leavers.

3. Bissaret (1979) charts the development and function of this middle class ideology in its historical context.

4. See the discussion of the question on the adolescents' work aspiration as a member of the opposite sex below.

5. In our sample few of the mc girls aspired to routine office work, but some did to typical female 'support' types of work in the medical and educational fields (at 12+ 18%, and at 15+ 10% of the mc girls did so).

6. The issue of the class location of women is discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 49 ff. above.

7. In biological and social terms, see Edholm, Harris and Young (1977) for a discussion of the need for clarification of the confusion which inheres in the use of the term reproduction. They specify three levels of reproduction: (1) social reproduction of relations and forces of production; (2) reproduction of the labour force; and (3) biological reproduction.

8. The Hall-Jones classification of occupations was used to classify the students' aspirations (Hall and Jones 1951) and the top three categories of non manual work are: (1) professional and high level administrative and entrepreneurs with over 100 employees; (2) managerial and executive, and entrepreneurs with 1-99 employees; and (3) inspectional, supervisory higher grade. See Appendix 8 for a table showing the proportions of high aspirers in the top three levels of this scale for all our groups.

9. These findings are replicated in a study of 500 wc children undertaken by the current author and L. Chisholm in a project on "Girls and Occupational Choice" (see Chisholm and Holland, 1984, for an initial outline of this project).

10. This type of influence from the mother is a frequent finding in sociological studies; see in this connection for example Greenald (1954), Floud (1956). For more recent work on cross class families see Britten and Heath (1983).
Levels of significance of the differences between the mc and wc groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mc/wc males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mc/wc females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>very similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences were due to the mc emphasis on education for their aspiration, and the wc emphasis on manual work for their expectation. The mc and wc girls' expectations were very similar since most of them aspired to non-manual work.

These high aspirations were at the top three levels of the Hall-Jones scale.


We have discussed the ideological component of the argument about male work being too heavy for women in Chapter 7.

We have evidence from their responses to other questions that they are not unaware of certain of the realities of the job market which women face. In suggesting that our mc girls are over optimistic we do not seek to deny the fact that mc girls are in a better position to obtain non-stereotyped work than are wc girls, by virtue of their higher level of education. In terms of the reality they will face, however, a couple of examples will indicate that the level of optimism of these mc girls may well be misplaced. Leavitt et al (1971) studied 331 women and 695 men in various types of work in the USA, taking as their focus the difference between the ideology of reward for achievement and the actual experience of women workers. They concluded that "most women received far less income than they ought to have received ... had worse jobs than equally qualified men, worse than they ought to have based on their achievement" (p. 94). Hunt (1975), in a study on management attitudes in the UK, reported that "a majority of those responsible for the engagement of employees start off with a belief that a woman applicant is likely to be inferior to a man in respect of all the qualities considered important", and when asked "whether they would choose a man or a woman if they had identical attributes, the only job for which a majority would choose a woman is catering or domestic work" (p. 12). The optimism of the mc girls is however matched by that of Klemmack and Edwards (1973) who comment on the fact that of the 77% of their 300 female college students who put occupational aspirations above those of housewife and mother, 53% aspire to non-traditional stereotyped jobs: "Within the constraints imposed by the contemporary institutions, especially economic institutions, the type of occupational aspirations held by these women may presage substantial changes in the constraints themselves." These points are made in Holland, 1981b, pp. 31, 33, 35.

We see from the mc girls' comments above that implicitly the meritocratic argument also supports their position.
We have discussed above Willis' (1977) argument about the importance of sexual divisions within the wc, enabling boys to construct manual work as valued work.

See the discussion of cross class families in Chapter 1, p. 50.

The differences within the mc for girls choosing female stereotyped work was small; in percentage terms,  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prod. SC</th>
<th>Prod. SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have noted in connection with educational decisions that the subjective feeling of autonomy experienced by the mc adolescents as expressed in their responses may in fact be illusory.

As unemployment or serial YTS become the most likely prospect for wc children when they leave school, there appears to be a reassertion of the liberal humanist tradition of education amongst school teachers. Emphasis is on the classificatory relation between education and production, education as an enhancer of life and experience, an end in itself, rather than on the systemic relation, providing skills or qualifications relevant to the labour market. This shift in the focus of teachers of wc children has emerged in the author's current research on girls and occupational choice.

Perhaps what we will see is a reduction in the proportion of university places which go to children from wc families, contrary to the expectations (or hopes) of Halsey et al (1980). These authors thought that mc take up of educational provision had reached saturation point, and that any expansion in higher education would result in an increased proportion of places going to wc children.
CONCLUSIONS

1. Introduction

The thesis has attempted to explore the relationship between patriarchy and class through an examination of adolescent conceptions of the social and sexual division of labour. It has been concerned with the ideological positioning of individuals in particular class locations, and the intersection of patriarchal ideology and practice with that of class. Stated in the broadest terms, we have been examining the ideological supports for these two basic principles of social organisation, class and patriarchy, and their realisation in the discourse of our sample of adolescents, analysed in terms of class location and gender.

In order to specify class, and particular fractions of the middle class with which we were concerned we found it necessary to develop a model of class based on the work of a number of recent theorists. This work was reviewed and criticised in the process of describing the derivation of the model used in the study. To explain the way in which the concept of patriarchy is used, we traced its development within the field of study of gender relations.

To locate this piece of research in the context of the field of study of gender relations, we undertook a critical review of explanations of the sexual division of labour and its manifestations in a range of institutions in contemporary British society, supplemented where necessary with comparative material. This review, in addition to delineating the problematic within which the study is placed, provides a crucial theoretical and empirical background through the discussion of the major institutional sites in which gender and class relations are reproduced in both material and ideological terms. We see these sites as critical for the realisation, construction, reconstruction, dissemination and negotiation of ideologies, stereotypes, images, and representations of social agents and facts, and for the construction of the self through lived experience of the material and discursive practices of these institutions. The work of others is used to support this contention. Our own empirical research can be seen as evidence of the extent to which these institutions and their social relations and practices are successful in the work
of ideological positioning, and reproduction, that is the extent to which hegemonic control is exerted by dominant ideological messages. We reproduce here the basic model of the argument of the thesis which we introduced in Chapter 1.

2 The efficacy of the concepts, methodology and model employed

In this study we have focussed on two aspects of the reproductive process:

(1) The nature and positioning of particular class fractions (i.e., the new middle class or agents of symbolic control, and those in the field of production).

(2) The importance of ideological supports for class and gender relations.

We have employed a range of concepts to provide the ordering principles for the analysis of our data and its interpretation. The conceptual language we have used derives largely from Bernstein, who provides the fundamental conceptual space of the thesis with the distinction between two specialised fields of the division of labour, and a series of subsidiary concepts concerned with a typology of family interactional practices, the nature of the relationship between education and production, and the mechanism by which the power relations of the society become part of individual consciousness. The concept of field itself comes from Bourdieu.

The very flexibility of the concept 'field' adds to its appeal, and it can be (and is used by Bourdieu) at a number of levels. For example he uses it at a general, macro level (the economic field), at a slightly more specific, intermediary level (the business field, the academic field, the administrative field) and at a relatively micro level, in terms of particular agencies or organisations within a given field - a factory or firm. The rules for inclusion or exclusion from a field are not made explicit, but must be inferred from the particular usages of the term. The definition which we have adopted in fact is one which Bourdieu uses to describe a particular economic unit or organisation, a relatively micro description, but it captures what we consider to be relevant in understanding what a field consists of: "a system of differentiated positions which are united by objective relations of complementarity, competition, and or conflict and which can be occupied by
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relatively interchangeable agents who, in the strategies which put them in opposition to those who hold different positions, are obliged to take account of the objective relations between the positions" (Bourdieu, 1978: 203). As Bernstein puts it at once more tersely and more generally, the fields consist of divisions of interrelated specialised functions which can be identified, as can their social relations.

In accordance with this definition, and Bourdieu's intermediate use of the term, we can conceive of the fields of symbolic control and production (a macro level definition) as including subfields - in the case of symbolic control diffusive, reparative, reproductive etc. The focus of Bernstein's distinction between the fields of production and symbolic control, as will be seen from the elaborations of the distinction discussed below, is the field of symbolic control itself, and this field is seen as analogous to the field of production, but with relative autonomy from the material base of the society.

We could argue that the concepts and categories discussed here can only deal with comparative statics, but they offer a description of the complex interrelationships and separations of social space, not an analysis of the processes of transformation and reproduction. Perhaps Bernstein's major preoccupation, whilst dealing with power, control, and the constitution of the subject, is with the issue of moral regulation. We have attempted to introduce into our model the process whereby social transformations take place, or agents are socialised into their particular understanding and acceptance of social reality through using the related concepts of hegemony and ideological positioning.

The definition of the concept of hegemony, crucial to Gramsci's theoretical position, is the subject of considerable controversy, as are other concepts which he developed. This derives in part from the desire of commentators to abstract their own definitions of the concepts in support of particular political positions or even movements, and in part perhaps from antinomies in the work itself. We could suggest that Gramsci uses the concept both as descriptive of forms of control which emerge, have emerged at particular socio-historical junctures, and as a theoretical construct which can guide practice towards a particular political outcome. In the latter sense it can be seen as a political strategy for the proletariat in the struggle to
overcome the bourgeois state and establish socialism. The nature and content of the hegemony of the new state (after the proletariat gains state power) and the forms and institutions of the superstructure cannot be known before the new state emerges, as they will change in the process of class struggle. From the perspective of the dominant groupings in a social formation, hegemony involves compromise, since the hegemony of a class is based on the ability to form strategic alliances and to present itself as representing the 'universal' interests of the whole society.

In our usage of the concept we have abstracted elements of both definitions outlined above, emphasising (1) process and the negotiated nature of consent to hegemonic control, and (2) the loci in the social formation for the strategic development of counter hegemony, opposition to the ruling hegemony. In our work then, hegemony, with these crucial elements of consent of subordinate groups, and the possibility for counter hegemonic positions draws attention to the negotiated nature of the process, and ideological positioning to the basis of the possibility for continuity in the consciousness of the individual agent.

We can find in Gramsci's own definitions of intellectuals those which would seem to place these agents completely in the field of symbolic control:

"The relationship between the intellectuals and the world of production is not as direct as it is with the fundamental social groups but is, in varying degrees, 'mediated' by the whole fabric of society and by the complex of superstructures, of which the intellectuals are, precisely, the 'functionaries'.... The functions in question are precisely organisational and connective. The intellectuals are the dominant group's 'deputies' exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government." (Gramsci, 1971: 12).

and those which see them more generally as functioning in all fields in the social formation:

"By intellectual must be meant not only those strata commonly understood by this denomination, but in general the whole social stratum that exercises organisational functions in the broad sense, both in the field of production, and in the cultural one, and in the politico-administrative one." (Gramsci, 1971: 97).
We tend to favour the latter definition, as the discussion on the interrelationship between the fields, agents, and agencies of the state, symbolic control and production will have indicated (see Chapter 3 above).

It is the case, however, that the field of symbolic control is the arena in which the contradictions, cleavages and dilemmas of hegemonic practice are played out. The specialisation, differentiation and fragmentation of agencies, agents, and subdomains of the field of symbolic control can help to disguise the nature of the ideological work of the field. It is also the case that the institutions which are part of the field of symbolic control can be the locus for the development of counter hegemonic positions, and ideologies.

2.1 The major conceptual tools

2.1.1 'Dominant' ideology, ideological positioning and hegemony

We have restricted our use of the term 'dominant ideology' to refer to the overall direction of the ideological messages of the society with respect to support for inequalities based on class and gender. We have frequently noted that the dominant ideology is neither unitary in its messages nor perfect in its reproduction. Whilst at any given historical moment in the trajectory of a society the dominant ideas may be those of the dominant class, we consider that the hegemonic control exercised by dominant groupings in the society, which requires the consent of the dominated or subordinate groups, must be constantly won and that ideology is a powerful weapon in this struggle. The naked reality of the material conditions of life are explained, made acceptable, at times obscured by the dominant ideological messages which become not merely an explanation for the way in which the society is organised and functions, but part of the 'commonsense', 'natural', knowledge of individuals within the society. Think of the power and relative indestructibility of gender stereotypes. Think also of the way in which new elements are incorporated within them, that contradictory gender stereotypes exist and can be adhered to at the same time, as examples of the negotiation necessary for the maintenance of hegemonic control in the process of reproduction.
We have used the concept of ideological positioning to describe the way in which the social becomes incorporated into the consciousness of the individual, and that dominant ideological messages become part of the commonsense knowledge, and perhaps more fundamentally the self image of individuals. From the perspective of the individual, ideological positioning refers both outwards to a particular world view, and inwards to a concept of self, constructed through the lived experience of the material conditions, social relations and ideological messages of the institutions in which the individual takes her/his place.

We have used these concepts as defined briefly here, but in more detail in the body of the thesis, in order to explain the representations which have emerged in the discourse of the adolescents. In order to make the link between ideological positioning, representations and aspects of the social structure, we have used Bernstein's concept of classification.

2.1.2 Classification

Classification refers to the degree of insulation between categories. In this study classification refers to (a) the categories of the social division of labour and by extension class relations; and (b) the categories of the sexual division of labour and gender relations. These categories can be strongly insulated from each other (+C) or the boundaries may be blurred (-C). The surface and deep levels of the classification may be at variance (e.g. the invisible pedagogy produces a pedagogic style which is -C at the surface but +C at the deeper level). In this instance classification is used to describe the modelling of class and gender relations held by the adolescents in the study as indicated by their responses.

The major reason for the use of this concept is the linkage which it affords between the structure of the society and the consciousness of the individual. The concept translates the power relations on which distinctions and divisions, and so structural inequalities, are based, into features of consciousness. The nature of classification, and its twin concept framing, in a particular context is a realisation of the structure of power and control which operates in that context. In looking at the degree of strength of the adolescents' classification of the categories of the social and sexual division
of labour we hoped to find the degree to which they recognised or accepted the divisions based on class and sex, and the power relations lying behind them.

As with the concepts of dominant ideology and hegemony above, we have defined our particular usage of the concept of classification in the context of this study. The full complexity and subtlety of the concept has not been employed, nor has its twin 'framing', as a result of the nature of the data with which we were dealing and the level of generality at which this data was approached. The power of the concept to engage (preferably in conjunction with other tools from Bernstein's conceptual language) with empirical data of a more specific and detailed nature would provide a valuable exercise in both conceptual clarification and theoretical development. In the context of the objects of this study, we think for example of a detailed investigation of the ideological positioning of social agents in specific class locations in terms of the classification and framing of social objects and relations which they experience. This might require detailed observation of the social relations and interactional practices of a series of contexts in which the individual is (or has been) embedded for example, production/work, the family/household, and educational institutions. In this way elaborations in the classification operating possibly differentially at surface and deep levels of experience and interaction could be explored, and the process through which the power and control exercised in particular institutions becomes incorporated into the individual's understanding of society and self could be investigated.

There are a number of issues in the operationalisation of the concept of classification and in interpreting changes in its strength which we should draw attention to. Firstly, change in classificatory strength is always relative and as a consequence it is really not possible to compare two different arrangements, processes, categories, unless each has moved from a previously known common initial position. Secondly, even given the above, the indicators of changes of strength of the classificatory principle must be common across the comparison. In our research these issues were not a problem as all our comparisons were generated by the same questions and differences in the strength of classification were measured by the same indicators for all group comparisons. Further, when we compared the same group across time and
compared it with others we knew the initial starting point of each group, that is the initial classificatory strength. Thirdly there is the question of inferring changes in strength of classification. Change in classification in this thesis has been attributed on the basis of what has been considered either a quantitative or a qualitative change. The former change is really a change in intensity in which a position is held and operates rather like the scoring of an attribute on a common dimension (e.g. important ... not important). Here we have measured agreement of others with our own ranking. The latter change (qualitative) is attributed on a very different principle. An example in this thesis would be where we have allocated responses to different degrees of classification on the basis of what we consider to be different positions with respect to the explanation of differential earnings and their justification. Here we have derived classificatory strength from our theory. Thus the extreme position of strong classification would be a position which would ultimately be grounded in biology whereas the extreme position of weak classification would be a position which totally rejected or opposed differential earnings. Thus strong classification represents preservation of a principle of hierarchy which produces a specialisation of differential ranks whereas weak classification represents a rejection of that principle and an affirmation of a dissolution of such specialised difference. Fourthly and finally there is the question of interpretation. How do we know whether a change (usually a weakening) of classification is a change in power relations favouring a more equitable distribution? Bernstein gives two rules: one, in whose interest is the change in classification, and two, what other relevant classifications have remained the same (usually strong). For other studies using classification and framing see Moore (1983), Donoso (1984) and Tyler (1984).

2.1.3 Patriarchy

The concept of patriarchy was used to indicate the principle on which gender relations and hierarchy are based, and it was defined generally as the power which men exert over women and younger men. This power has effect at the economic, the political and the personal levels. We have considered in some detail the uses to which this concept has been put in Chapter 1. We have argued that the concept of patriarchy, which has come under attack for this variety of usage, can be valid and valuable in the analysis of particular
contexts or events if the way in which it is being defined and interpreted is clearly specified. In this study we have sought evidence in the representations of the adolescents of the hegemony of ideological messages in support of the principle of patriarchy and the concomitant gender hierarchy.

To interlink the major concepts which we use in this thesis, we could say that we do not argue that men and women constitute classes per se. In fact we argue strongly that the class location of individuals mediates and specifies the impact of the principle of patriarchy on them as men and women, influencing their ideological positioning. We have suggested that hegemonic control can be exercised by groupings in the society based on gender rather than class. Within class men constitute a power grouping and they exert hegemonic control over women. Ultimately these power relations derive from material conditions. Class and patriarchy interact to produce the specificity of the material conditions and experience of production and reproduction of women in the middle class and in the working class. The severe limitations on women's access to positions in the economic sphere, production, would seem to be the result of the influence of patriarchy rather than class, or what could be thought of as a rational capitalism. The strength of gender divisions within the working class in terms of the domesticity/breadwinner distinction would also seem to indicate the hold which the patriarchal principle exerts and the power of this ideological message.

2.1.4 The model of the social division of labour employed in the study

The model of the social division of labour we have used in the study (described in detail in Chapter 3), whilst influenced by a range of theorists of social class (see Chapter 2), is based essentially on Bernstein's distinction between the old and the new middle class, those in the field of production and agents of symbolic control. At the moment when we generated, clarified and employed the model to allocate our adolescents in social space, the conceptualisation of the distinction, and of the relationship between the fields of production and symbolic control, had reached a certain level of development. In operationalising the distinction some of the problems of interpretation inherent in it became apparent, and were dealt with in particular ways. The comments below form a condensed statement of the
process of conceptual clarification which the notions of the fields of production and symbolic control and their interrelations have undergone, an implicit auto-critique of the formulation employed in this study, and a suggestion for future directions for any further empirical use of this model of the social division of labour.

As we have noted in Chapter 3, agents of symbolic control at any given time may operate in a way which maintains insulation, regulating and reproducing the social and power relations of the social division of labour. They may, however, work to redefine and change boundaries and therefore social and power relations.

Within the field of symbolic control there could be variations both within and between the subsections in the degree to which maintenance and reproduction or change was pursued. There could be differences for example between repairers working in medical, psychiatric or social welfare, and teachers working at different levels of education. We can identify these subdomains within the field in our model but did not pursue this issue empirically.

Agents of symbolic control can work in the field of production (for example private doctors) and this will affect their ideological positioning. We have considered this possibility in some of our analyses by omitting such agents, and examining only those embedded in the field of production. It is also possible to have agents and agencies of symbolic control functioning in and regulated by the market conditions of the field of production, with a division between those concerned with the demands of the market and those concerned with the creation of the object or text to be marketed. We illustrated this division by pointing to the differing interests of film companies and producers on one hand, and directors and actors in films on the other. Another way of thinking of these divisions is to suggest that there can be in agencies operating in the field of symbolic control, agents who are themselves located in either the field of production or of symbolic control.

A further consideration in the complex interrelations between and within fields is the role of agents of symbolic control within the state. Functions, agents and agencies of the state can occur in all fields. Agents of
symbolic control work within state agencies and as such can operate as disseminators or disrupters of dominant ideological messages. We have made the general statement of agents of symbolic control, that whilst they are indirectly related to the field of production by virtue of their pedagogic socialisation, their actual field location will affect their interests and ideological positioning.

If we turn our attention to the family, we could find within a family men and women who are located in different fields, in different class fractions. In our sample men from the field of symbolic control are more likely than those in the field of production to marry a woman in the same field, albeit at a lower hierarchical level. We found in our data and that of Wells which we analysed (see Chapter 6) that the field location of the mother had an effect on the ideological representations of the adolescents, and on the interactional practices of the family. Wells' sample showed the same pattern of intermarriage as our own.

In terms of conceptualisations of class, the model used here could be seen as just one more classificatory system, with the problems and difficulties associated with any such formulation - we have drawn attention to such inadequacies in the class categorisation systems of others (in Chapter 2). Despite the problems associated with the model as we have used it here, and the evident need for further development of the specific interrelationships inherent in the classification system, we feel that in principle the model has some merit in providing a potential method for the elaboration of positions in the new middle class and the working class.

The elaboration of the distinctions between and within the fields of production, symbolic control and the state which have been made lead to two necessary conclusions. The model of the social division of labour, should it be used again as a basis for empirical investigation, needs itself greater elaboration and refinement to locate the specific categories of agents identified above. One could also imagine this elaboration taking into account a more highly developed set of categories for the types of work in the fields of production, symbolic control and the state which is undertaken by women. The second consideration is the need for specific empirical investigation of the ideological positioning of agents of the types identified above. The model
would then operate as a general framework for identifying the fields, and the parts dealing with the specific agents who were to be the object of study would be expanded and elaborated in order to define the specificity of their positioning.

This work of refinement of the model could also be extended to include a more thorough and detailed specification of positions within the working class, leading to a more detailed investigation of variations in ideological positioning in this group. The current study was largely focussed on the middle class.

### 2.1.5 The questionnaire

We have drawn attention to the advantages and limitations of our method in the discussion of methodology in Chapter 4. Before discussing our major findings it is important to draw attention to the kind of inference which we can make from the data we have collected. What we have are children's representations as revealed in writing, taking them as indicators of ideological positioning. These written representations are inevitably influenced by the children's control over the written word in the context which we have created. We have tried through our coding procedures to minimise these effects by focussing only on the basic argument used - but what children do not say we cannot code.

### 2.1.6 Levels of meaning

We have argued that the same comment or statement made by individuals in different class locations or of different sexes, might have different meanings; and conversely that different statements made by differently located individuals might have the same meaning. The meaning of a question may also be understood differently by those in different class locations. We have suggested for example that when asked "What stops you from doing exactly what you want to do?" the 'you' is read as a generalised 'one' by middle class boys, who then provide a general answer, whereas working class boys may read 'you' in a more local, personalised sense, and respond accordingly. In support of this contention we also found evidence in a subsample of adolescents whose scripts were explored more closely, that
middle class children when talking about 'hard' work meant hard mental work whereas working class boys at least meant hard manual work. It would be of value to test this hypothesis rigorously, perhaps using a two-stage technique, and pursuing in an interview at the second state the interpretation which the respondent had made of the relevant question, and the meaning which inhered in the same statements made by individuals of different sex and class.

There is a crucial interrelation between theory and empirical research for the development of both (see Glaser and Strauss, 1967 and Glaser, 1978). In the process of applying our initial theoretical perspective to the empirical data which we collected to test this perspective, we were able, indeed obliged, to refine and redefine aspects of the theory. Were a similar study to be pursued in the future it would start from the position we have reached, and any research instrument devised would be more focussed in terms of the redefined theoretical perspective - for example we know which of the questions we used are more crucial for approaching the issue of gender relations, and which additional or other questions it would be sensible to ask. In general the changes which we could make as a result of the current study might range from minor issues of rephrasing particular questions, to more complex issues involving a reconsideration of the coding categories employed. In terms of both concepts of class and patriarchy which we have employed in this discussion, the theoretical development made here could lead us to the study of crucial groups or transitions in more depth, using a different methodology entirely, for example a combination of ethnographic and intensive interview procedures - a critical case study approach.

Whilst it might be useful to use a questionnaire for an initial approach to whatever specific area of concern from amongst those generated by this study was considered most interesting and potentially fruitful, it could be that a questionnaire would be an insufficiently delicate procedure, and that the other methods suggested would be more able to capture nuances rarely revealed with this technique.

The statistical methods used in the study, whilst they may appear inelegant compared with more sophisticated correlational techniques, in fact enabled us to confront the raw data and to trace specific differences between our groups. This would not have been possible with correlational techniques
since at the general level there was relative homogeneity in ideological positioning between the groups. For example most children in all groups hold strong classification of gender differentiation, and particularly for the older age group strong classification of the social division of labour. Whilst correlational techniques would have enabled us to examine more precisely ideological consistency with respect to the modelling of the areas investigated for individuals within our groups, the overall patterning of the responses for our groups with the techniques we have used enables us to infer such consistency.

3 Major findings

We have examined variation in responses on the basis of class, intra class location, gender and age for the adolescents' modelling of what we have taken to be key features of the social formation - gender, work, education and other selected political and social issues. A complex series of findings have emerged the more interesting of which we will touch upon briefly in the following discussion.

Couched in the conceptual vocabulary of this thesis, our major hypotheses were that the working class group would have stronger classification of the areas and issues we have examined than the middle class group, and within the middle class that those in the field of production would have stronger classification than those in the field of symbolic control. Subsidiary hypotheses related to differing interactional practices in the families of these groups, and particular orientations towards education. We have found considerable support for these hypotheses in the data, but we have also found interesting variation and departures from them, which we have attempted to explain. Our discussion will be based on issues relating to the following areas: education, work and the social division of labour, political and other social issues, and gender. Gender and class differences and similarities wind their way through all of these areas, but we are attempting to provide some focus for our findings by concentrating on each area and the major issue associated with it in turn.
First we will reiterate the results from an analysis of Wells' data (Chapter 6) which support our hypothesis of different family interactional practices in the working class compared with the middle class, and within the middle class. This analysis of data on mothers' reports of interaction with their young children provided a clear indication of a relationship between class and intra-class location and types of interactional practices in terms of personal or positional behaviour towards the child, related to both general socialisation practices and more specifically to gender socialisation. Those in the field of symbolic control were more personal (-C) in their interactional practices than those in the field of production (who were more positional). In turn the working class groups were more positional (+C) than the middle class group. The field location of the mother, or whether or not she was in white collar work also had an effect on interactional practices; those in white collar work in the working class group tended to move the family towards a personal orientation, as did a mother in the field of symbolic control within the middle class. The importance of the position of the mother to the ideological positioning of the children emerged at other points in the study.

3.1 Education

What can we say about the role of education in the reproduction of class and gender relations as revealed in the representations of the adolescents in our sample? It seems that the meritocratic ideology has a deep hold on most of these children, and this was manifested at many different points in the study including those not directly related to education. We had thought perhaps that adolescents in the field of symbolic control would be influenced to a greater extent than those in the field of production by the processes of education, and that this would reveal itself in a greater concern to acquire education, a greater endorsement of the meritocratic ideology, and indeed a greater recognition of both the systemic and classificatory relations between education and production. There is some evidence to support this hypothesis, particularly in the individual topics covered in the part of the study specifically relating to education, and for example in the educational plans of our groups. The responses of the older girls in the field of symbolic control certainly demonstrate our expectations. It is clear, however, that educational qualifications and more generally pedagogical capital, has become an important element in the reproduction of both intra-middle class fractions.
We had speculated that the working class response towards education might include:

(1) a recognition of the systemic relation, related to an acceptance of the meritocratic ideology;
(2) a rejection of the ideology, or of the capacity of the educational system to enable the realisation of high levels of aspiration for them;
(3) a notion of the irrelevance of education. In this instance they might base their expectations on family or neighbourhood patterns of employment and experience.

We have seen that the working class children were oriented towards the systemic relation between education and production to a greater extent than the middle class groups. Whilst the middle class are well aware of this relation, and well persuaded of the meritocratic ideology, they are also aware, to a greater extent than the working class, of the relative autonomy of education from production. Within the working class response may lie both an acceptance of the meritocratic ideology and/or an instrumental approach towards the function of education.

To some extent we can see also, amongst the older working class boys, some signs of a rejection of the meritocratic ideology, or the relevance of schooling to their own futures - 38% of the older working class boys do not think that what they do at school will be of any use to them in the future.

The endorsement of the meritocratic ideology can be seen as a legitimation of existing class relations, as manifested in the occupational hierarchy, and its reward structure. In the case of the middle class children, allied with the ideology of equal opportunity it can lead to a weakening of representations of gender division. For middle class girls, education does provide the possibility of a degree of economic independence via a route to the top jobs in the female ghetto, and for a minority to other work fairly high in the occupational hierarchy. For middle class boys the combination of the meritocratic ideology and that of equal opportunity enables them to make an identification with girls and to argue that the same work can be done by men and women when they are of equal capacity. For both boys and girls these tendencies are stronger in those from the field of symbolic control than those
in the field of production. Indeed on a question specifically related to gender differentiated education, we find the girls and boys in the field of production moving rapidly apart with increasing age, with boys increasingly endorsing such segregation, and girls increasingly opposing it. A similar pattern can be found within the working class on this question.

To return once again to the working class group, we can pose the question, what happens to the representations of working class children who act on the meritocratic ideology and have high educational aspirations? For at least some of these children such aspirations represent a desire for upward mobility, particularly in the case of the 15+ boys, 36% of whom aspire to non-manual work at varying levels. From our data on 15+ year olds in this study it seems that these high aspiring working class children become more like the middle class and less like the rest of the working class group in their ideological positioning, with interesting variations relating to particular aspects of the division of labour in relation to particular fields of the middle class. In the case of the educational indices which we have used, there is a movement towards those in the field of symbolic control, as we might have expected given our views about the positioning of the field of symbolic control in education. The working class children move into stronger classification and more legitimation of the social division of labour, more so boys than girls, and here the similarity is with those in the field of production (who have stronger classification overall in this study than those in the field of symbolic control). Classification of gender relations and differentiation, which for all children in this study tends to become weaker with age, becomes even weaker in those working class children who have high educational aspirations than in the rest of the working class group. In this they tend to become more like middle class children in the field of symbolic control.

These children are taking on the ideological messages of the dominant grouping, and differentiating themselves in this way from the rest of the working class group. For the working class girls the effects of patriarchal gender hierarchy affects the degree to which this identification takes place, it is less than in the case of the boys. The likelihood of a mother in white collar work, perhaps even in the field of symbolic control, and the concomitant relational practices in the family is greater for this group of working class high aspirers. We could argue that for this group of high
aspiring working class boys the realities of the market place, and the closure
of the class structure as reflected in the social division of labour might come
as a harsh shock. But perhaps for the working class boys the meritocratic
ideology itself, allied with the organisation of the public examination system
and the level of education in the working class, will deal with the problem. If
these boys do not achieve the level of education they aspire to en route for
their plans for social mobility, the error will be seen as in themselves, not in
the system which they evidently support.

It could be that the acceptance of the meritocratic and equal
opportunities legitimation for class relations helps to weaken gender relations
for those who are oriented towards the educational system as a means of
either the reproduction of their class or intra-class location, or upward
mobility into the middle class. Despite this effect, we have seen that
differences in the strength of classification of both the social division of
labour and gender relations remain between the middle class group and the
educationally aspiring working class group.

3.2 Work and the social division of labour

We have seen from our discussion of education above that there is
considerable legitimation of class relations and reproduction as demonstrated
by endorsement of the meritocratic ideology amongst our groups. When
directly asked whether or not income differentials are fair, a majority
(considerable in most cases) of all our groups agree that they are. A small
group of dissenters emerges amongst the middle class girls, more especially
from the field of symbolic control. By and large the children allocate
themselves along relatively conventional class and gender lines into the social
and sexual division of labour. We have noted the exceptions, (1) a group of
middle class girls who reject gender stereotyping in occupational choice, and
(2) a group of working class children with high educational and occupational
aspirations.

As the children grow older their classification of the social division of
labour becomes stronger in terms of their support for income differentials.
Here we find support for our hypothesis of differences in strength of
classification amongst those in the field of production compared with those in
the field of symbolic control. It is boys in the field of production who move most dramatically into strong classification. On both the index of classification of the social division of labour and the individual topics related to it, we can see the older boys from the field of production moving to a more conservative, more strongly classified, more orthodox position with respect to class than any other group, particularly when compared with those in the field of symbolic control.

Working class girls, although they hold slightly stronger classification of the social division of labour at 15+ than at 12+, remain largely weak in their classification. There was some indication here that, although these girls accepted and agreed with income differentials, to some extent this legitimation was related to the view that manual work was adequately paid. These working class girls considered that some manual workers were high income earners, and so were not accepting the mental/manual distinction which privileges the mental. The aspiration to be a motor mechanic, a carpenter or an electrician in response to a request for job choice as a member of the opposite sex are further suggestions of an identification with the working class on the part of a considerable proportion of these working class girls. These girls are also less likely than all other groups, especially the middle class children, to make negative statements about workers, in the context of questions about unemployment and trade unions. Some of these girls did have relatively high educational aspirations, and amongst this group there would be a number with concomitant mobility aspirations.

3.3 Politics and other social issues

Relations of dominance and hegemony have provided a major theme for this work and in the comparative responses of our middle class and working class groups, we were able to find some connecting threads in different areas of our study. There was a dramatic difference for example in the degree to which the children from the two class groups considered that they experienced autonomy over decisions related to their educational experience in terms of taking examinations. The middle class children saw themselves as being closely involved, and the working class saw the decision as being made by others. For the working class group we can see that to a large extent they accept the meritocratic argument about education, they endorse the systemic
relation between education and production to a greater extent than the middle class children, and they value education, a very high proportion consider that what they do at school will be useful when they leave. But they do not see themselves as having any control, they accept, consent to what happens to them in this crucial area. Not so for the middle class group.

Whilst many of the working class children claim little interest in or knowledge of politics, itself a possible reflection of an implicit acceptance of crucial decisions being taken by others, a consent to being ruled, those who are prepared to indicate what they consider to be the importance of political parties, for example, show a strong contrast with the middle class children. The middle class children tend to emphasise the representation of differing viewpoints, an endorsement of parliamentary democracy, but also, however illusory, a belief that their views and opinions have some sway in events at this level of decision taking. The working class children suggest leadership and the preservation of the national interest as the major function for political parties and governments. A consent to being governed, ruled, and an implicit recognition of a consensual patriotic ideology. The interpretation of our final example of 'consent' is somewhat complex. The issue is also of relevance to gender divisions, as we shall see below. When asked about constraints on individual freedom of action in a very open-ended and non-directive way: "What stops you from doing exactly what you want to do?" the middle class children locate constraint with the state and the police force, and the working class with adults, particularly parents. Does this imply on the part of the middle class a recognition of the power and control exercised by the state and its legal structures, towards which they are oriented by virtue of their own potential future positioning, and that of their parents in terms of the social division of labour and relations of dominance? The functioning of the state provides the support for the dominating principles of the society; class and patriarchy. The state functions in both other major fields of the social division of labour in terms of our model, and agents from the two fields function within the apparatuses of the state (in whatever field the agency is located). The working class response could be seen, as we have suggested elsewhere (Chapter 11, p. 399) as perhaps a personalised, particularistic reading of the question, as opposed to a more generalised reading by the middle class children. We could suggest that it also implies an awareness of issues of power and control on the part of the
dominant middle class group which is submerged in the case of the dominated working class group, and which could be seen as emanating from consent to such rule.

3.4 Gender

Some differences between the sexes are well established empirically, although the meaning remains in dispute; is nature or nurture the source? We are thinking not only of physical attributes and capacities of the sexes, but also of social behaviours and beliefs. The determined environmentalist will point to the myriad counter examples to the 'norm' for each sex within a culture, to cross cultural, subcultural and historical variation. If really determined this environmentalist might even point to the costs of rigid and stereotypical gender differentiation in terms of human welfare for all sexes, and for various definitions of the public good.

How do these differences in the construction of gender appear in our data?

It is on issues of gender differentiation and the index of gender classification that we have found most differences in this study. These differences are clearly in line with our hypotheses on strength of classification. That is that for both sexes the working class have stronger classification than middle class children in the field of production, who have stronger classification than those in the field of symbolic control. There are also dramatic differences between girls and boys, with girls of all groups less likely to have strong classification, and on individual issues less likely to support sexual division, than boys. Although this relative weakness of classification takes place within the context of a majority of all groups having strong classification of gender relations, in the case of middle class girls at 15+ this majority is a narrow 51%. Within the middle class, it is girls in the field of symbolic control who are weakest in their classification and so the most radical on gender divisions. At 15+ only 46% have strong classification of gender relations. There is a movement into weaker classification with age for all class and gender groups, but the age changes are greatest for girls. Boys in the field of production are exceptions to this
movement into weak classification and once again are moving in radical opposition to girls in this field on strength of gender classification. The girls in our sample then become less accepting of patriarchal power and its realisation in gender hierarchy over this period of adolescence.

From our data it appears that working class groups have more traditional practices in terms of gender relations in their own homes than middle class groups. In this way they are similar to children in the field of production compared with those in the field of symbolic control within the middle class.

Our most radical group on gender issues were girls in the field of symbolic control, who have considerably weaker gender classification at each age level than any other of our groups. These girls consistently reject traditional forms of gender differentiation, and argue for equality between the sexes. They are for example determined that their sex will make no difference to the career which they will pursue. As a result of this belief, these girls might receive a rude shock on contact with the actual market place, where the position of even highly trained and qualified women is in general systematically inferior to that of men in terms of the range of work available, levels of authority attained, and amount of money received. The conflict between belief and actuality may further radicalise this group of girls from the field of symbolic control.

The examinations which our adolescents plan to take show a stereotypical gender patterning, but when asked whether or not some school subjects are more suitable for girls and others for boys, half of the children in the sample reject this proposition. Here there are both class and gender differences in response. Middle class children are more likely to reject sex stereotyping of school subjects, and overwhelmingly girls are more likely to do so than boys. It appears, however, that although in principle the girls overwhelmingly reject gender stereotyping in education, their examination choices reveal that in practice they are still positioned within it.

A degree of uncertainty about the age of leaving school alerted us to an interesting difference within the middle class. Girls were less certain than boys about their school leaving age, despite the fact that middle class
children, particularly those in the field of symbolic control, have clear plans for continuing their education. We attributed the uncertainty on the part of these girls to the fact that their future education is more dependent than that of boys on examination success. We consider that middle class parents are more likely to support a boy's educational future relatively irrespective of level of examination success, but these parents would require much stronger evidence of success in the case of girls to underwrite their educational future.16

The meritocratic argument combined with that of equal opportunities, perhaps encourages middle class boys relative to working class boys to be less stereotyped about women's work, at least in terms of their own work choice as a woman. Many of the working class boys found it extremely difficult to identify with working class girls or women, as revealed by the extent to which they avoided answering the question about the work they would do as a member of the opposite sex. We have suggested that patriarchal dominance relations, the only area of working class boys' potential hierarchical superiority, may be operating here to suppress such identification.

We have found that the division between the private sphere as the woman's sphere of operation, and the public as that of men, has importance for our adolescents. This distinction between public and private spheres emerged when the children were asked about constraints on freedom of action, when girls located this constraint in the private world of adults, particularly parents, whereas boys located the constraint in the public world of the state and its legal apparatuses.

In summary we can see that the patriarchal principle holds both in general and in particular, but it holds for boys to a greater extent than girls. Some of the boys in our sample may have weak classification of gender relations, but since the patriarchy supports and privileges the male, there is good reason to believe that it is the exceptional boy or man who will reject the principle and urge equality for the sexes. We shall now consider the crucial socialising institution for both patriarchy and class, the family.
3.5 Class and Gender

The family and marriage are of great importance to our adolescents, a considerable minority of boys state that this will be the most important thing in their lives, and almost all of the children in our sample plan to marry. There is some evidence in our data that the girls are taking on the role of housewife and mother, and the boys that of breadwinner. There are class differences in this, however. The groups most likely to be taking on the domesticity/breadwinner distinction are working class children, particularly working class girls at the age of 15+ who we could argue are closest to that experience in terms of their own current activities, and their short term future expectation. Middle class girls in the field of symbolic control are least likely to think in these terms. These girls are intent on pursuing careers in non-female stereotyped areas, and many of them consider that domestic labour should be shared. Many also, however, plan to stay at home with their young children, so demonstrating as a group the contradictions of the middle class woman's situation. The desire for a career, the belief in the meritocratic ideology which supports that intention, and the exacting demands of the middle class socialisation process on the woman, are the elements in this contradiction. We have seen the importance of the part played by the mother in the socialisation of our intra-middle class groups, and the effect that a mother in a particular field location has on the representations of the children (in Chapter 5).

At the younger age level middle class girls in the field of production and working class girls identify the most important element in their life as family and marriage. As girls in the field of production grow older, however, it is abstract attributes such as health, freedom, love and happiness which emerge as important, and in this respect they are similar to the girls in the field of symbolic control at that age. We have seen this move as a way for these girls of sidestepping the contradiction in terms of the demands of their role in the family and the socialisation practices of their class, coupled with their desire for an education and a career. Perhaps the move to abstraction is no solution to this contradiction. The girls in the field of symbolic control in our sample, whilst accepting their role in the socialisation of children, prefer shared domestic labour and to some extent childcare with their future spouse. However, girls and boys in the field of production, as we have noted, are moving in opposition in their views on crucial issues relating to gender
divisions. The weaker classification of gender relations of girls in both fields should have an effect on the socialisation practices and family interactional practices of the next generation of children, unless we can dismiss the representations which we have found as an accident of research methodology, or no more than a teenage rebellion against the patriarchy and gender division.

In addition to the differences between the class groups which we discussed in relation to the family, we also found that in general gender divisions were more apparent and more explicit, in the working class group than in the middle class group. We argued that perhaps patriarchal divisions are more marked for the working class group than class divisions, whereas class is more marked for the middle class group. We can see some evidence for this in the clear patterns of high and low earners, produced by the middle class adolescents, where the mental/manual division is strong. We might argue that the middle class adolescents see the mental/manual division as dominant and therefore produce clear cut occupational distinctions which legitimise their own position and in so doing ignore manual exceptions to low income. The working class perhaps are here less concerned with the mental/manual division and therefore offer a mixed classification of high earners. On this analysis the working class are identifying with the working class whereas the middle class are more concerned with the hierarchy of class relations. From this point of view class relations are embedded in the working class responses as much as they are explicit in the middle class response.

We linked the salience of patriarchal divisions in the working class to the more apparent divisions with respect to male and female work. For the boys we suggested that patriarchy legitimises their only area of hierarchical superiority.

We have regarded the work aspirations of the children in the sample as indicators of the insertion of self into the social and sexual division of labour. Class and gender are particularly marked here. A third of the boys within the working class, relative to their father's position, desire upward social mobility. When working class girls register occupational aspiration, this is generally limited to the female clerical ghetto. In the middle class, as we have noted before, the girls' aspirations tend to non gender stereotyped work. There is, however, a difference in the level of aspirations between middle class girls and boys. Despite the fact that many of these middle class girls are relatively and refreshingly confident in their own skills and capacities, and
hold a powerful belief in equality of opportunity and the meritocracy, these girls always aspire to work at a lower hierarchical level than boys.

Finally we should like to draw attention to an important finding. Differences in women's work and men's work are frequently attributed by the adolescents, particularly the older children, and particularly those in the middle class, to the issue of physical strength. The power of this ideological message about women and men is demonstrated by the fact that the group of children who use this argument most are our otherwise relatively questioning and radical older girls from the field of symbolic control, for whom in terms of their own aspirations and family experience manual work is least relevant. Class and gender have become interwoven in relation to this issue, but perhaps we could argue that it is class which carries the most weight by using the words of one of the middle class girls themselves:

"(This) only really applies to manual labour - men are mainly road workers and lorry drivers etc., women always do char work or work in shops or as secretaries. However, at higher levels of work, I don't think this is nearly so true (male and female lawyers, doctors, administrators)."

4 In conclusion

We have seen here the interplay between class and patriarchy in the representations offered by our adolescents, showing points of acceptance of class and patriarchy, and points of rejection. We have tried to explain the complicated patterning of these children's belief structures, analysed at the very general level which we have attempted, in terms of the individual's ideological positioning, which includes concepts of self and concepts of power and authority relations incorporated through the experience and internalisation of the classification of the categories of the social and sexual divisions of labour, and the material and interactional practices of crucial socialising institutions.

From our perspective we have seen in this study some evidence of both the hegemonic power of the dominant messages about class and patriarchal relations, and of the spaces in which resistance and change might occur.
NOTES TO CONCLUSIONS

1 We have not been specifically concerned with material aspects of class and gender inequalities, although these are fundamental to the experience of such inequalities and have entered our discussion where relevant above.

2 Whilst using the term 'reproduction' we are constantly aware of the negotiated nature of the process, reproduction is not a unitary process there are conflicts within and between the institutional sites, frequently at the ideological level.

3 Bourdieu suggests that practice can be analysed by use of the formula $\langle \text{habitus}(\text{capital}) \rangle + \text{field} = \text{practice}$ (1984: 101). For Bourdieu, 'capital' includes economic, social and cultural capital, the latter becoming empirically defined as nature, type and extent of educational qualifications.

4 Gramsci argues that the supremacy of a social group can manifest itself in two ways, as 'domination' which implies the use of force, or as 'intellectual and moral leadership' which is hegemonic control, (Gramsci, 1971: 57). Bernstein has never discussed his analysis of the field, agencies and agents of symbolic control in relation to Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

5 For example the desire to find in Gramsci's work the justification and theoretical explanation for Eurocommunism.


7 See Buci-Glucksman (1982).

8 In the author's current study (Chisholm and Holland 1984) a twelve year old boy adamantly insisted that were his wife capable of earning £300 a week and he only £50, she should stay at home and look after the children and he should go out to work.

9 Once again we refer here to the special role of education in the maintenance and reproduction of this class fraction.

10 The table here shows the percentages of mothers and fathers with particular combinations of field location in the sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 The overviews of Chapters 5-12 summarise the findings in each area covered by the investigation, in relation to our basic hypotheses.
12 We have seen this as an indication of the privileged place that education has in (a) the reproduction; (b) the nature of the consciousness of the individual and (c) the actual work experience in the middle class particularly in our view for those in the field of symbolic control.

13 It should be noted, however, in relation to our comments about different meanings associated with the same response from different class/sex positions, that an aspiration to be a secretary or as the opposite sex a motor mechanic would represent upward mobility compared with their mother's (or indeed father's) occupational level for many of the girls in our working class sample.

14 Differences between top athletes is frequently pointed to as the bottom line on physical differentiation between the sexes. An interesting couplet of articles in *New Scientist* (Dyer, 1984; Sharp, 1984) demonstrate the impact of both nature and nurture in this respect. The astonishing rate at which women's sporting performance has closed on men's over the past fifty years demonstrates the contribution of nurture to such differences; a detailed account of physiological sex differences outlines the contribution of nature.

15 See Pratt et al (1984) for recent work on the persistence of stereotyped option choices made by girls and boys. See Chapter 10 for an indication that this patterning might be even more extreme for working class girls with relatively high educational aspirations.

16 We were supported in this interpretation by the work of Sutherland (1978). It seems also from our data on possessions that many of the things which boys claim to own are more costly than those claimed by the girls in our sample.
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Appendix 1

A few examples of fathers' occupations falling into specific field locations

(not all categories have examples)

FIELD OF PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0101</td>
<td>Runs a group of companies</td>
<td>0201</td>
<td>MD of large transport co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td>Company solicitor</td>
<td>0207</td>
<td>Commercial manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107</td>
<td>MD large firm</td>
<td>0208</td>
<td>Publican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108</td>
<td>Personnel manager</td>
<td>0210</td>
<td>Antique dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0110</td>
<td>Own small firm</td>
<td>0212</td>
<td>Warehouse foreman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0112</td>
<td>Foreman in factory</td>
<td>0214</td>
<td>Lorry driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113</td>
<td>Builder (several skills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0114</td>
<td>Pub cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0115</td>
<td>Building labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Monetary</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0303</td>
<td>Works in his own business</td>
<td>0404</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0304</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>0408</td>
<td>Postmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0306</td>
<td>Computer manager in bank</td>
<td>0409</td>
<td>Estate agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0307</td>
<td>Bank manager</td>
<td>0410</td>
<td>Own panel beating co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0308</td>
<td>Finance officer</td>
<td>0411</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310</td>
<td>Owns 80% of insurance firm</td>
<td>0412</td>
<td>Head waiter Spanish restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0311</td>
<td>Bank clerk</td>
<td>0413</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0414</td>
<td>Train guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0415</td>
<td>Road sweeper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIELD OF SYMBOLIC CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Diffusive</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Reproductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0503</td>
<td>Freelance photojournalist</td>
<td>0604</td>
<td>Professor at university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>Radio producer</td>
<td>0605</td>
<td>Biology teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0505</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>0606</td>
<td>Maths advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506</td>
<td>Producer/editor</td>
<td>0611</td>
<td>School secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0510</td>
<td>Film distributor, cinema owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0513</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Reparative</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Shaping: science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0704</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>0804</td>
<td>Forensic scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0705</td>
<td>Probation officer</td>
<td>0806</td>
<td>Civil engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0706</td>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shaping: culture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0903</td>
<td>Quite a famous tenor</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Policy advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0904</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Diplomat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0905</td>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Civil Service ESO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0906</td>
<td>Technical illustrator</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Clerical officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0907</td>
<td>Director of museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIELD OF THE STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Judiciary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Self employed QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>DI police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>Police officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Introduction to the research for the adolescents

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Cross National Enquiry into the Division of Labour

We are asking you to fill in this questionnaire as part of a study which is taking place in several European countries. We are interested to find out what young people think about work and other related topics.

Your name is not required on the questionnaire, so what you write is anonymous and entirely confidential. The only people who will read your answers are the researchers at London University who are carrying out the study. The names of the schools taking part in the study will not be mentioned in any report.

The questions are not a test and, as you will see, are not directly related to school work. We hope that you will find them interesting to think about and to answer.

Filling in the questionnaire

Put your age in years and months at the top of page 1 in the space provided.

If you are not certain about what a question means try to decide for yourself and answer in your own way.

We need to know your own views so please do not discuss your answers with other people.

Try to answer all of the questions.

Remember to give reasons for your answers, tell us more than just 'yes' or 'no'.

Appendix 3

Factor analysis

From a principle factor analysis with iterations a factor with 9 variables with factor loadings of .3 or above emerged. (See Child, 1970: 45.)

MFSUBS       Male/female school subjects
MFJBMIMP      Importance of work to male/female
HAPFBOS1      Happy working for female boss
HAPFBOS2      Reasons for this
RESHSWK       Who is responsible for housework
MARRY         Will you marry
AGEMAR        At what age
DIFSFAM       Income differentials fair?
YDIFSB1       Why are they fair, reference to agent

There is then some support for an underlying dimension to a number of the questions on sexual division. No other factor emerged.
Appendix 4

(a) Figures from which Table 5.1 was derived

Levels of significance of differences between boys and girls on three indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+ MC</th>
<th></th>
<th>15+ MC</th>
<th></th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>15+ WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Measure of support for status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>91 102</td>
<td>94 96</td>
<td>76 61</td>
<td>81 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not</td>
<td>14 47</td>
<td>11 20</td>
<td>32 49</td>
<td>20 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Reduced set of items for measure of support for status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>90 95</td>
<td>93 96</td>
<td>77 51</td>
<td>75 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not</td>
<td>19 51</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>33 57</td>
<td>19 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Reduced set minus questions on sexual divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>101 123</td>
<td>97 105</td>
<td>96 84</td>
<td>88 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not</td>
<td>4 24</td>
<td>8 19</td>
<td>11 23</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 continued

(b) Figures from which Table 5.2 was derived

Levels of significance for differences between adolescents in the fields of production and symbolic control in giving answers predicted for those fields on a set of questions.

### Membership of fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12+ Prod</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>15+ Prod</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Those in the fields of production and symbolic control

Measure of field orientation

|       |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Prod | 31 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 32 | 9 | 18 | 3 |
| SC  | 1 | 10 | 7 | 25 | 7 | 20 | 20 | 37 |

2 Embedded groups within fields, 'ideal types'

Measure of field orientation

|       |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Prod | 25 | 26 | 20 | 21 | 16 | 5 | 14 | 3 |
| SC  | 1 | 7 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 12 | 14 | 31 |

3 Mother and father in the same field

Measure of field orientation

|       |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Prod | 25 | 26 | 20 | 21 | 16 | 5 | 14 | 3 |
| SC  | 1 | 7 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 12 | 14 | 31 |
Appendix 5

The index of the adolescents' modelling of the social division of labour

1 Figures for 'ideal type' groups within the fields of production and symbolic control

2 Figures for those with both mother and father in the same field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod M</th>
<th>Prod F</th>
<th>SC M</th>
<th>SC F</th>
<th>% Prod M</th>
<th>% Prod F</th>
<th>% SC M</th>
<th>% SC F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 'Ideal type' groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod M</th>
<th>Prod F</th>
<th>SC M</th>
<th>SC F</th>
<th>% Prod M</th>
<th>% Prod F</th>
<th>% SC M</th>
<th>% SC F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Indices of the recognition of the classificatory and systemic relations between education and production

1 Figures for 'ideal type' groups within the fields of production and symbolic control
   (a) Classificatory relation
   (b) Systemic relation

2 Figures for those with both mother and father in the same field
   (a) Classificatory relation
   (b) Systemic relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ scores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ scores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 'Ideal type' groups

(a) Classificatory relation

(b) Systemic relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12+ scores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ scores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Mother and father in same field

(a) Classificatory relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>% Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Systemic relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>% Prod</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7

The adolescents' modelling of the educational process: a question by question approach

The distribution of our groups onto the quadrants of the model for education on four questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i.e.</th>
<th>weak systemic</th>
<th>strong classificatory</th>
<th>weak systemic</th>
<th>strong classificatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>% Prod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have you got out of being at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Strong systemic</td>
<td>9 8 7 6 18 15 15 12 13 8 16 13</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>43 34 37 59 82 88 73 82 77 83 73 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong systemic</td>
<td>9 9 10 4 26 16 16 18 19 7 23 15</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>42 39 35 51 78 84 74 78 66 84 70 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the things you do at school be useful when you leave?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Strong systemic</td>
<td>48 50 35 56 97 95 83 76 73 79 86 81</td>
<td>Weak classificatory</td>
<td>6 13 8 9 6 11 10 20 17 13 5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong systemic</td>
<td>45 41 50 53 84 71 79 82 94 87 76 67</td>
<td>Weak classificatory</td>
<td>8 6 3 6 17 11 14 12 6 10 15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What helps people to get on at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>29 27 26 37 46 48 49 41 34 52 41 41</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>13 23 10 16 32 38 22 33 21 23 28 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>22 22 24 28 31 45 39 44 45 46 46 42</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>17 15 13 22 33 34 30 30 25 36 30 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would be important for your children's education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>21 9 7 8 18 12 21 14 13 11 16 10</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>24 32 24 38 60 60 41 48 50 54 53 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>3 - 3 2 2 5 - 4 2 2 2</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>5 9 9 10 16 24 9 14 19 14 14 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>8 9 12 17 10 12 14 18 23 28 9 11</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>24 14 13 17 3 43 42 28 25 28 31 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak systemic</td>
<td>8 12 13 12 13 17 14 24 23 20 12 16</td>
<td>Strong classificatory</td>
<td>8 12 13 12 13 17 14 24 23 20 12 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8

Aspirations and expectations of all groups in terms of the top three levels of the Hall-Jones scale

(a) Comparison between MC and WC groups

(b) Intra-MC comparison

(Tables show percentages of those aspiring to or expecting non manual work who aspire to the highest levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N</em> =</td>
<td>12+ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot N =</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N</em> =</td>
<td>15+ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot N =</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N</em> =</td>
<td>12+ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot N =</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N</em> =</td>
<td>15+ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot N =</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = those aspiring to or expecting non-manual work.

** Most MC girls aspired to continue their education (Prod 60%, SC 77%)